OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Volume 11, Number 1 (Fall 2018)

ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES

Volume 11, Number 1 (Fall 2018)

Open Words: Access and English Studies is dedicated to publishing articles focusing on political, professional, and pedagogical issues related to teaching composition, rhetoric, reading, creative writing, ESL, and literature to open-admissions and "nonmainstream" student populations. We seek original scholarship in areas such as instructional strategies, cultural studies, critical theory, classroom materials, technological innovation, institutional critique, student services, program development, etc., that assist educators, administrators, and student support personnel who work with students in pedagogically difficult settings. Articles should consider the particularities of context—issues, for example, surrounding the identifier of "open access," intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability, regional and cultural differences, and the range of competencies students bring with them to classrooms—in conjunction with the goal of English studies to empower students' critical and creative endeavors. We value works pertinent to specialists yet accessible to non-specialists, and we encourage submissions that take into account what interactions with students teach us about the broader, democratic goals of open-access education and English studies.

Open Words is an established journal, which began in 2007, and has produced at least one issue a year since then with the support of Pearson. John Tassoni and Bill Thelin served as the previous senior editors. In 2016, the journal was handed over to Sue Hum, who brought on two additional co-editors, Kristina Gutierrez and Yndalecio Isaac Hinojosa. The work of producing an annual issue—reviewing submissions, identifying reviewers, sending manuscripts out for peer review, working closely with authors on revisions, creating proofs, and making copyedit corrections—is handled by the three senior editors. The first issue under their editorial leadership was published on March 13, 2017.

In 2019, the new editorial team transitioned the journal away from Pearson and to the WAC Clearinghouse for ongoing support and as the venue for publication. The open-access approach of the WAC Clearinghouse aligned with the philosophy of Open Words as an open-access journal with goals to cultivate a robust and dynamic body of scholarship on issues of access in higher education institutions and within communities. By addressing issues related to class, this journal has been historically a part of the CCC Working Class, Culture, and Pedagogy Working Group with a target audience that includes scholar-teachers and practitioners in rhetoric and composition, education, and affiliated disciplines who want to read critical discussions about issues of access. The scholarship published by Open Words complements the scholarship highlighting issues of access in other Clearinghouse journals, such as *The Journal of Basic Writing* and *The WAC Journal.*

Available on the web at wac.colostate.edu/openwords.

ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES

Volume 11, Number 1 (Fall 2018)

OPEN WORDS

ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES

Volume 11, Number 1 (Fall 2018)

Contents

OPEN WORDS

ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Volume 11, Number 1 (Fall 2018)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 1 – 8
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.01
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Editor's Introduction: A Spotlight on Marginalized Communities

Yndalecio Isaac Hinojosa, Ph.D.
Texas A&M-Corpus Christi

Bienvenidos! Welcome!

I am excited to present the 2018 issue of *Open Words* (*OW*) that features Octavio Pimentel, Professor from the Masters in Rhetoric and Composition Program in the Department of English at Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas, as our invited contributor. The scholars, practitioners, and graduate students who contributed to this issue engage in scholarship that speaks to access for marginalized communities. Personally, each contributor offered me an opportunity to reflect on my academic journey. In educational environments, adequate access can be a difficult achievement for marginalized communities, especially along the U.S.–México border. In such settings, many Latinx have had to struggle with the erasure of their ethnicities and histories (López, 1997; García & Castro, 2011; San Miguel, 2013). As someone who identifies as Latinx, I invest in providing access for underserved and underrepresented populations and their communities, especially in a political climate when alt-right radical conservatives are vindicated and validated for their speech or actions against people of color, emboldened by President Donald J. Trump's racist rhetoric. So, before I introduce contributions in this issue, please permit me to share, spotlighting the marginalized communities I came from and the challenges I faced to access education.

I was a first-generation student, born and raised in rural south Texas. Most of my growing up time was spent on the King Ranch, owned by Captain Richard King.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

Covering over 850,000 acres, the King Ranch is the largest ranch in Texas (*Maps – King Ranch* 2018). My mother's parents were Kineños, Captain King's people who lived and worked on the ranch. Moving from the Lower Rio Grande Valley, my father's parents settled in Kingsville, the small community named after Capitan King and only established when his wife, Henrietta King, designated a portion of ranch land for purchase and the construction of a railroad near the ranch (*About Kingsville* 2016). This cultural setting was the backdrop of my youth. I am the eldest son and grandson in a Mexican American/Latino-Kineño household, the first to graduate from high school and college and the first to go beyond those expectations of me.

In my community, where my father and mother experienced a racially segregated education, I had access to public education, but my ethnicity limited that access. My white guidance counselor in high school tended to advise Latinx students to withdraw from high school because she felt Latinx students did not need further education. She and I would occasionally meet not to discuss college but to discuss how withdrawing from school would serve my best interests. Despite my low grades, I could not drop out of school. I resisted her advice, and in my fifth year, I graduated from high school. However, part of that achievement was not based on my own merits. That achievement was due, in part, to an altered final grade in English. Altered how you may ask? Well, even though I had failed English, my teacher, also white, changed my final grade from failing to passing at the last minute. As a result, I was now eligible and graduated with the class of 1990. Years later, after earning my B.A., I substituted for that English teacher, and she confirmed the grade alteration publicly. She used that alteration and me as an example for her entire class. As I recall, she said, "All of you Latinos can succeed too, if you just apply yourself despite your limited circumstances." However, was I a success? Maybe, given such a shaming, I did not feel like I had accomplished anything with a college degree.

In my community, there was a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), Texas A&I University that later became Texas A&M University at Kingsville. This university was situated on the road between Kingsville and King Ranch, but I was never expected, either from school counselors or my parents, that I would enroll in college someday. In my household, we never spoke about the possibility of attending college. Also, we never acknowledged the university we passed by daily on the way to the ranch. I admit that at the time I did not even realize what going to college involved or why going to college would be important. Yet, on a whim, a friend and I visited the campus one day, during the summer after graduating from high school. That day was the first time I had set foot on university grounds, and she and I were registered--just like that. How? She and I entered the registration building by accident, and a gentleman asked if we

wanted to go to college. We said, with no confidence whatsoever, "Sure." So, he filled out all the paperwork and designated me a Kinesiology major, and a week later, another individual filled out all the financial aid paperwork. Complete. All that was left to do was to show up for classes.

Eight years. That's how long it took me to earn my B.A. degree in Theatre Arts. While in college, I excelled in math and science, but I felt like my achievement in these areas was also an unexpected occurrence from students like me, a brown boy from the local community. Once, a professor accused me of cheating when I earned a perfect score on a business math exam. I had sat in the front row, and I was the last student to leave during the exam. Yet, the professor insisted that I had cheated. Someone like me could not have done so well.

How could I possibly do well, given these low expectations? Even though I was attending an HSI meant to serve students like me, I regularly faced low expectations, an implicit message that my time at the university was temporary. Any strengths I had were challenged, and all my weaknesses fulfilled those low expectations. Reading and writing were weaknesses for me in college. I had to enroll in developmental reading and writing classes several times. Looking back, I can understand why I was unsuccessful in such courses, especially writing. Instructors did not teach writing; instructors only pointed out my mistakes. Conversations that took place in my writing classes centered on the premise that we, Latinx students, were first, bad writers who could not complete a simple sentence; second, students who were unable to understand how the writing process works; and third, people who were unable to write in an academic voice, or rather could not learn how to say it right. I stayed away from those intensive writing courses until my sister enrolled for college. With her, I had a partner. We enrolled in writing courses together, and we passed, in part, because we helped each other with writing in academic settings.

After graduation, I enrolled in graduate school at the same institution. I earned an M.A. degree in Guidance and Counseling, a two-year program that took me four years to complete because I had to work full-time for the State of Texas as I completed my degree. At the time, I thought this degree would help me gain social mobility in my employment for the State of Texas. But supervisors stressed that I was too young to hold any supervisory position even though I was already performing the duties assigned to a supervisor. So, I left my employment with the State of Texas, and I decided to return to graduate school. This time, however, I enrolled at Texas A&M University in Corpus Christi, another HSI located nearby. There, I earned my second M.A. degree, this time in English and completed within three years, and on the encouragement by professors, I decided to see if teaching writing would be something

that I would like to do. I figured that I might have something to offer all those students, who like me, were dismissed, alienated, or found themselves in unexpected circumstances after enrolling for college. Eventually, on advice from faculty, I went for my Ph.D. Despite my financial burden from student loans of the previous degrees, I realized for the first time that earning a Ph.D. was possible. The Ph.D. was the logical next step on my academic journey and to secure, hopefully, that coveted tenure-track position teaching. I figured this degree would give me access to apply to four-year institutions, not as contingent faculty but as tenure-line faculty. So, I traveled north to the University of Texas at San Antonio to begin a doctoral program. It took me nine years, and throughout my studies, I taught writing full-time at a community college, often taking on course overloads to pay for tuition and bills.

Twenty-five years. From 1990 to 2015, I was a first-generation college student, and since then, I have learned many things. I felt like I was not shapeshifting in cultural, linguistic, and intellectual terms, as Juan C. Guerra describes in his definition of "transcultural repositioning" (15), a strategy used by many underrepresented students. No, I don't believe that I self-regulated my rhetorical practices between and among different languages, dialects, classes, or cultures. How could I really? As a first-generation student, I would be unable to shift into shapes or forms or linguistics because those literacy practices were ones I did not recognize. The ability to reposition oneself assumes that I had some familiarity with the forms I was encountering or that I had previously mastered such forms in order to be able to shift among them.

By contrast, any of my successes were based on trial, error, and happenstance. It was only by chance that I entered college, and it was only through lucky mentorship, employment dissatisfaction, and personal persistence that I advanced from one degree to the next. In sum, I had to learn how to access and navigate academic settings, a central concern of the contributors for this 2018 issue of *OW*. Contributors spotlight the forms of access available to marginalized and/or novice communities. When I look back at my academic journey, I wish I had joined Latinx interest organizations. I wish I had encountered more practitioners who were attentive to marginalized students. I wish I had known about community education programs. I wish I had known how to utilize social media technologies for self-promotion and professionalization. Also, I wish I had encountered more alt-pedagogies that promoted acts of self-reflection. So, now, without further delay, let me introduce the contributions made to this issue of *OW*.

Octavio Pimentel opens with "Counter Stories: Brotherhood in a Latinx Fraternity." Pimentel reveals how academic success for poor Latinx students is possible when these students join social organizations that will help them access social

networking and essential literacy recourses. Because the Latinx population will represent three out of every ten persons by 2050, such growth may result in increased numbers of Latinx attending and graduating college. So, he calls on educators to pay attention to Latinx students more closely, specifically to increase graduation and reduce attrition rates. In this article, Pimentel describes a qualitative study on Gamma Zeta Alpha, a Latinx-interest academic fraternity. This study critically challenges mainstream narratives that construct "poor Latinx students as ill prepared for college and thus destined to fail academically in college." As part of countering these narratives, Gamma Zeta Alpha maintains a 90% graduation rate, according to Pimentel, and provides the support system that many Latinx students need to reach academic success. Therefore, Pimentel spotlights for us a counter story, a "new" narrative that shows the potential of fostering Latinx student success, especially when these students join organizations like Gamma Zeta Alpha.

Next, Victoria Ramirez Gentry and Sonya Eddy reframe the work we do, as practitioners, to increase inclusion. Ramirez Gentry, a student seeking a Master of Arts degree at Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi, offers us a unique hands-on perspective in "Recognizing Deaf Writers as Second Language Learners: Transforming the Approach to Working with ASL Speakers in the Writing Center." She demonstrates how a skilled, thoughtful, and attentive writing consultant can develop important findings. She shares lived experiences working with a deaf writer at the Center for Academic Student Achievement (CASA) Writing Center on campus. Plus, she reflects on the training she received at the center and her experience working with this deaf writer who communicated with American Sign Language (ASL). Working with second language learners (L2) and coming from a multilingual environment, Ramirez Gentry finds similarities in her approach of working with deaf and L2 writers. She takes a courageous position to reveal for readers her own vulnerability in working with this deaf writer: "I had failed to make explicit connections between the writer's first language, ASL, and her second language, English." Through her experience as a writing consultant and through her experience in writing this article, Ramirez Gentry has learned "not to scan through papers for errors, but to examine thoughtfully the writer's choices."

Next, Sonya Eddy turns our attention to community education for social transformation. In "Deliberative Acts in Reclaiming the Hays Street Bridge in San Antonio," Eddy presents a case study of a community engagement project that turned the Hays Street Bridge complex in San Antonio, Texas to a public space. The community-motivated revitalization effort was led by the Esperanza Peace and Justice Center (EPJC), which organized a public education program called Puentes de Poder

(PDP). Eddy focuses on how this historic Hays Street Bridge represents a lifeline to marginalized, low social-economic communities. She examines how the EPJC in the PDP program augmented the deliberation process, instrumental in enabling the expression of community cultural identity. Through the program, the EPJC established ways for marginalized groups to access rhetoric as deliberative acts to promote community action. In her examination, she reveals several interconnections between the PDP program and the rhetorical process called el camino de la mestiza/the mestiza way, advocated by Chicana feminists.

Next, Christopher D. M. Andrews brings our attention to the integral role that social media technologies can play for developing social networks for novice and emerging professionals. In "Professionalism *in vivo*: Graduate Students on Facebook," Andrews highlights how social media technologies, as a resource for professionalization, serve graduate students, who are on the fringe of the professorate. His study reveals how doctoral students can utilize Facebook not only for social networking but also for professional, academic networking. Andrews concludes that Facebook offers graduate students access to a network of scholars, an ability to learn and inhabit academic roles, as well as opportunities to enter professional communities. He indicates that graduate students can use Facebook as a tool for cultivating professional networks and for engaging in self-sponsored moments of professionalism and mentoring.

Next, in "'It's Essentially Writers Talking about Writing': The Roles of Reflection in a Co-Curricular Writing Studio Course," Jerrice Donelson, Anthony DeGenaro, and William DeGenaro discuss how alt-pedagogies, such as writing studios that represent co-curricular, small, student-centered spaces, can provide students with opportunities for reflection about writing and the writing process. Their contribution highlights how students who encounter difficulty can thrive when given opportunities to reflect and receive additional support. By examining how students use self-reflection, the authors assert that writing studios aid students with becoming more aware of themselves as writers. Such reflection, in turn, offers students an opportunity to "access the metacognition of different writing events in order to foster the transfer of knowledge from those writing events in their course." An added benefit from their study is that studios have a particular utility in pedagogical settings where open-admissions take place.

Finally, new to this *OW* issue are book reviews. Six book review contributors share their insights on some more recent publications.

In closing, this 2018 issue of *OW* spotlights how marginalized communities struggle with access. These contributors share strategies for how practitioners can, in their daily praxis, provide forms of access to those communities. This issue provided me with further insight on how best to serve marginalized communities, insights our readers may gain as well. The contributors offered me ways to fulfill my call to empower underserved and underrepresented populations as well as to learn how best to create participatory communities. Despite the limited access I encountered throughout my academic journey, I graduated from high school and managed to earn four college degrees. I carry that knowledge with me when I enter the classroom and when I encounter students who can relate to my experiences, students in whom I invest wholeheartedly.

Works Cited

About Kingsville. (2015). Retrieved August 06, 2018, from http://www.cityofkingsville.com/visit/about-kingsville/

García, M. T. & Castro, S. (2011) *Blowout!: Sal Castro and the Chicano struggle for educational justice.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Guerra, J. C. (2004). Emerging representations, situated literacies, and the practice of transcultural repositioning. In M. H. Kells, V. Balester, & V. Villanueva (Eds.), *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity, and Literacy Education* (pp. 7–23). Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

López, I. F. H. (1997). Race, ethnicity, erasure: The salience of race to LatCrit Theory. *California Law Review. 85*(5), 1143-1211.

Maps - King Ranch. (2018). Retrieved August 06, 2018, from https://king-ranch.com/about-us/maps/

San Miguel, G. (2013). *Chicana/o struggles for education: Activism in the community* (1st ed.). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

About the Author

Yndalecio Isaac Hinojosa is an Assistant Professor at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi. He received his Ph.D. in English from The University of Texas at San Antonio, where he specialized in rhetoric and composition and Chicana feminism. He focuses research on Latinx students, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and geopolitical borders issues. Prior to Corpus Christi, he worked for a community college in San Antonio, where he helped to create and implement an accelerated

learning program for developmental students. He has presented work at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English, The International Conference of the Life and Work of Gloria Anzaldúa, and CASP: College Academic Support Programs. He also serves as Assistant Editor of Nonfiction for the *Windward Review*, an annual print literary journal celebrating the spirit of south Texas.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 9 – 28
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.02
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Counter Stories: Brotherhood in a Latinx Fraternity

Octavio Pimentel, Ph.D.
Texas State University

As Krogstad (2016) reports, the "Latino population has reached fifty-seven million in the United States, with California having more than fifteen million Latinos, and New Mexico having the largest Latinx population of any state at forty-eight percent" (p. 1). Despite these large numbers, Latinx are no longer the fastest ethnic growing population in the United States. This demographic distinction now represents the Asian growth pattern. Even though Latinx are no longer the fastest growing ethnic group in the United States, Latinx are still considered to have a powerful force in the United States due to their sheer numbers. According to Lopez (2014), "In 2014 Latinos… surpass[ed] whites as the largest racial ethnic group in California" (p. 1). Additionally, the U.S. Latinx population is much younger than other groups in this country. According to Saenz (2010), "there are five times as many children under 15 years old than persons 65 and older among Latinx. In contrast, there are about an equal share of children and elderly in the white population" (p. 1). According to these demographics, the Latinx population will nearly triple from an estimated 49.7 million in 2010 to 132.8 million in 2050 and about two-thirds of the U.S. population growth during this 40-year period will be due to the growth in the Latinx population. By 2050, Latinx could represent three of every ten persons in the United States.

As should be expected, as the overall Latinx population continues to grow, so does the number of Latinx attending and graduating from college. With the college student demographics becoming more diverse, it is crucial that educators examine both the college graduation and attrition rates of Latinx students. From research that

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

does just this task, researchers (Brown, 2011; Guardia & Evans, 2008; Mina et al., 2004) have found that Latinx who join organizations in college are likely to increase their college completion rates by gaining access to social networks and many other resources.

To learn more about social network groups and their effects on Latinx college students, I conducted a qualitative research study on Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity—a Latinx-interest academic fraternity—that maintains a 90% graduation rate. Specifically, since Gamma Zeta Alpha is an academic fraternity, I sought to examine how the push for literacy within the fraternity has led to a high graduation success rate. Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated is a Latinx-interest organization founded December 7, 1987, at California State University, Chico (CSUC), with the purpose "of uniting and directing all persons interested in the promotion of the Latinx culture and ethnic origins via community interaction and the educational system" ("Gamma Zeta Alpha web page"). An organization such as this was desperately needed at California State University, Chico because the few Latinx men (about 2 percent) enrolled at the university at that time had minimal academic and peer support. Although there were some professional offices, such as the Educational Opportunity Program and the Student Learning Center, which offered support to Latinx students, there was no organization on campus that provided Latinx opportunities to interact with peers of their same ethnic group. With the goal of providing peer support to Latinx students, Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity was founded by fifteen students, one of who was White European American (WEA) who will forever be remembered at CSU, Chico for starting one of the first Latinx-interest fraternities in the western United States.

The purpose of this article is to critically challenge the stock stories commonly produced within 'mainstream' culture by demonstrating how Latinx are reaching academic success. As such, this article provides a counter story to the stock story that constructs poor Latinx students as ill prepared for college and thus destined to fail academically in college. This article contradicts these deficit-oriented stock stories by showing that academic success can be reached by Latinx students as long as they are provided the support system that so many desperately need. This article has great significance to the *Open words* (OW) audience because its focus is on class and race, while also intersecting the education experiences of "nonmainstream' students, which fits the primary interest of their intended audience.

Following is a short explanation on how this data was collected, as well as a compacted literature review. The article then focuses on two case studies (Quetzalo and Mayo), while providing specifics about their academic success. Lastly, the article provides a critical discussion about the data, while focusing on their counter stories.

Methodology

As a way to collect data on the literacy practices used within the context of Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity, I used multiple qualitative research methods, including oral narratives, interviewing, and participant observations to collect data on literacy practices produced by the organization and the community members. Since I am associated with Gamma Zeta Alpha and thus was viewed as an "insider," I was allowed to collect data in almost any circumstance I desired.

The data for this study draws from thirty-years of being actively involved with Gamma Zeta Alpha. These data demonstrate that the fraternity offers its brothers both the opportunity to learn about and serve the Latinx community as well as achieve academic excellence. The data specifically focus on how the fraternity commonly provides its brothers a space where they can practice and polish their literacy skills. The data additionally show that the fraternity brothers utilize the literacy practices produced within the confines of fraternity activities to be successful in academic and professional settings.

Oral Life-Narratives

The primary method for collecting data for this study is oral life-narratives. I use this method because it gives me the best opportunity to collect the "unmediated" stories concerning my fraternity brothers' experiences within the fraternity. Oral narratives are effective in many ways, but primarily because participants simply love to share their stories. Researchers like Riessmann (1993) support this approach by explaining that storytelling is a fun activity that most individuals enjoy. In my case, the participants in this study loved to talk about their experiences within the fraternity.

Interviews

Although data was collected on 20 Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity brothers, I conducted a more detailed data collection, including interviews, with six brothers. Conducting these interviews, which included both unstructured and structured interviews, allowed me to gain access to data that supplemented the data I collected during my participant observations. For this particular article, I focus on the research data of two brothers: Quetzalo and Mayo. Below, I define the three primary

methodological tools I utilized in this study: unstructured interviews, structured interviews, and participant observations.

Unstructured Interviews

Additionally, I collected data using unstructured interviews, which gave me, the researcher, an opportunity to engage in conversations with my participants about their literacy experiences within the fraternity. Much different from structured interviews wherein I sought responses to specific questions, the unstructured interview gave me the freedom to have a much more open conversation with my participants. Although unstructured interviews give me the freedom to engage in various topics of conversation, the truth is that the interviews were structured to some degree because there were specific points I wanted the participants to address.

Structured Interviews

Structured interviews are another way I collected data which allowed me to seek specific information that was not collected during my unstructured interviews. When I conducted structured interviews, I asked my participants specific questions about the fraternity as it relates to my study. For instance, I asked questions like a) What are your thoughts about the fraternity? b) What are your academic goals?, and c) What role does the fraternity play in helping you reach these goals?

Participant Observations

One of the primary ways I identified some of the specific literacy practices of Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity was by spending large amounts of time interacting with the various fraternity brothers. During this time, I was a participant observer, which is commonly defined as a researcher who participates in the social setting of the research site yet maintains his or her capacity as a researcher (Spradley, 1980; Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011). Participant observations provide the most effective way of embedding myself in the research context and interacting with the fraternity brothers. As a participant-observer in the fraternity (among other settings that included general body meetings, specific group meetings, social activities) I was moved in and out of spaces where I occupied the role of both participant and observer. This role proved to be an effective way for me to collect an abundance of critical data because I held the position as an insider as well as a researcher.

Counter Stories

Counter stories are a direct challenge to dominant ideology that are often guided by White European American (WEA) perspectives. In other words, counter stories are an analytical framework that helps fight against master narratives that continue the oppression of marginalized people. Considering the constant rhetorical oppression that Mexicans face daily in United States as a result of these "stock stories," it is critical for researchers to acknowledge the "counter stories" that exist within many Mexican communities, including those at a university. By giving value to these counter stories, researchers can show that there are many positive aspects about a specific culture, in my case Mexican, that are at best ignored in the larger society. This chapter is an attempt to challenge these master narratives that often frame not only fraternities, but also Mexican college students. As it will be shown in this chapter, there are many positive things that are happening with both fraternities and Latinx college students.

As mentioned before, a major goal I have in this research project is to provide counter stories to the majoritarian negative rhetoric that commonly surrounds Mexican Nationals, Mexicans, and/or Mexican Americans. Counter-story telling comes from Critical Race Theory (CRT) that was founded in the law field in the 1970s. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) define counter-storytelling as "a method of telling the stories of those people whose experiences are not often told" (p. 26). Counter stories can be used to challenge any negative stock stories that are often rooted against "othered people." At the same time, counter-stories do not need to be a response to a certain discourse but can simply be used as an opportunity to share narratives that are often ignored or belittled.

As mentioned before, Mexican Nationals, Mexicans, and Mexican Americans are often subjected to a negative discourse that is deeply rooted in racist ideologies in the United States (Pimentel, 2015). This negative discourse appears in many different venues in the United States, but as Gates (2014) writes, they are especially present in Hollywood where Latinx, and other cultures, are commonly stereotyped. Gates elaborates, "In a recent study about the effects of the public attitudes toward immigrants on U.S. immigration, University of Cincinnati researchers found that Latin America stereotypes have the biggest [negative] impact [on society]…" (p. 2). Other articles like "21 Stereotypes about Latinx men that Latinx men want to dispel" address the abundance of stereotypes that exist against Latinx men that are simply not true. Some of the stereotypes include: Latinx men are bad or absent dads, Latinx men are yellers, Latinx men are uneducated, Latinx men are lazy, among seventeen other examples (Singh, 2015). Lastly, Gamboa's (2017) work magnifies the racist

immigration practices of the United States, which further fuels racist discourse against Latinx. Gamboa writes:

> There's no doubt Mexican-Americans have made great strides in Texas, where Latinx make up 40 percent of the state population and are overwhelmingly of Mexican descent. But historians and civil rights activists see a thread of historical racism and discrimination running through the implementation of SB4 (p. 3).

Additionally, Blakemore's (2017) work also provides a detailed history of the racism against Latinx, and specifically the violent acts against them: "Even [Mexican] children became the victims of this violence" (p. 2). As can be seen through these previous examples, and many more, Mexicans/Chicanos face intense racist discourses in various aspects of their lives that unfortunately often hinder their academic success. As a way to challenge this discourse, I provide data from my participants that counter the stock narratives that are commonly produced in the media and other social wells about Mexicans; my participants have positive stories that need to be heard, such as: Mexicans are resilient people who often experience success despite the various obstacles they commonly face. Plain and simple, my data shows that most Mexicans are successful and should be considered positive role models.

There are various prominent scholars who echo this important message and who have used counter-stories in a similar fashion as I do in this study. In *Historias de exitó within mexican communities: Silenced voices*, Pimentel (2015) writes about Quetzin and Joaquin's notions of success that did not follow the stock definition of success and were thus labeled as unsuccessful by many WEAs. Through case studies, Pimentel shows how both Quetzin and Joaquin are considered successful within their own communities, thus providing a counter story to the stock narrative. Similarly, in "Undocumented (Im)Migrant Educational Pipeline: The Influence of Citizenship Status on Educational Attainment for People of Mexican Origin," Covarrubias and Lara (2014) address the various trends that impact the educational experiences of undocumented Mexican students, which challenge the homogenizing narratives against Chicanos/Chicanas. For example, it is commonly professed, subsequently helping create the majoritarian narrative, that all students have an equal chance of succeeding in their education path. This article counters this narrative by featuring counter stories that claim that being a US citizen gives students a huge advantage in reaching their academic goals. Covarrubias and Lara (2014) write: "As one moves progressively along the citizenship continuum, there is an increase in educational

attainment for POMOs (people of Mexican origin) at all educational levels" (p. 96). It is through data like these that a counter narrative to the "unsuccessful Latinx student" begins to emerge.

Other scholars like Levin, Walker, Harberler, and Johnson-Boothby (2013) also address counter stories in "The Divided Self: The Double Consciousness of Faculty of Color in Community Colleges." Using a critical theory and social identity lens, this work discusses the social identity conflicts that these faculty encounter on a daily basis. Through their work, the authors conclude that these professional and social identities are not compatible and thus faculty of color are often pushed to use what the authors call a "divided self." According to Levin et al. (2013), institutional narratives are guided through a WEA perspective. They write, "From the perspective of faculty of color, the narratives suggest a dominant and monolithic organizational or corporate culture, wherein rules, norms, values, and resultant behaviors are guided by the majority White faculty and administrative population" (p. 318). In their text, the authors continue to claim that this practice has a tremendous effect on the institutions' hiring practices, which continues to favor WEAs. For instance, a participant named Ruben offers the following counter narrative:

> [W]hat this district needs to change in order to increase the number of diverse faculty is the composition of those hiring committees. There has to be some clear guidelines as to the diversity, not only diversity in language, but ethnicity; socioeconomic just obviously doesn't affect us because most of us are the same socioeconomic level now (p. 319).

By offering this counter narrative, Ruben suggests that to have a significant change on an institution's hiring practices, the importance of diversity needs to be continually declared to a point where it becomes normalized and thus institutions increase the diversity of their faculty out of common sense. Levin et al. conclude by stating that this continual investment is not currently practiced, as faculty of color are often forced to negotiate their professional and social identity. These findings are all relevant to my work because they amplify the various complex problems that Latinx face daily, thus forcing Latinx to strive to succeed in two different worlds, which is something that these fraternity brothers commonly face.

Data

Brotherhood

Latinx students, who are strong-minded, hard-working individuals, who hold an intense desire to graduate from college as well as a strong interest in Latinx culture, can define the bonding within this fraternity. Although this fraternity is an academic fraternity, the grade point averages and the class levels vary tremendously within the brotherhood. The fraternity brothers range from distinguished graduate students to freshmen on academic probation. Additionally, the fraternity is very diverse. Although the majority of the brothers are Latinx (with Mexicans holding the highest ethnicity numbers), there are brothers who are white, black, and Asian. What all these diverse fraternity members have in common is that they have been marginalized by society, thus desperately need a support system while in college. Also, important to note that despite a brothers' ethnicity, the brotherhood between these brothers is very strong. The fraternity's success, however, is documented by the fact that this fraternity has a 90% graduation rate. Without a doubt, this is an impressive graduation rate, considering that nationwide, "two-thirds of Latinx never complete their college degree" (Farr, 2005, p. 10).

Within this brotherhood, each fraternity brother defines academic excellence differently. For example, a fraternity brother who maintains a 2.0 GPA throughout most of his academic life may consider a 2.5 college GPA a great achievement. In contrast, a fraternity brother who is hoping to attend law school, medical school, or graduate school, may think that receiving less than a 3.5 GPA is an academic failure. Every semester there are usually about twenty active brothers (defined as paying semester fees, attending meetings, and participating in extracurricular activities associated with the fraternity), who participate in academic and social communities. Usually each member chairs a committee for at least one project. This fraternity has affiliations with both traditional campus-based fraternity councils, whose membership is traditionally white, and with multicultural campus-based councils, whose members are traditionally students of color. This fraternity is the only fraternity or sorority at CSU, Chico that has affiliations in both councils because they want to show their ability to participate in both predominately WEA events, as well as multicultural events. The other fraternities do not have a cross-affiliation with the different councils because they believe that both the multicultural council or Intra Fraternal council, and not a coalition, meets their needs. Gamma Zeta Alpha holds its weekly 90-minute meeting in the university student union conference room, which is centrally located within the university and more importantly, within a two-minute walk from the university library. Many of the fraternity's brothers feel that having the meeting close to the library is an advantage; since most meetings are held at night, they can schedule the meeting during study breaks. As a way to further collect data on the fraternity and

to theorize about my findings, I conducted two case studies on Quetzalo and Mayo that provide thick descriptions about these two students, the fraternity, and the different activities the fraternity is involved in, which in theory also provides data to understand the making of their counter story.

Case Studies

Quetzalo

Quetzalo, 23 years old, was born in East Los Angeles. His father emigrated from Ensenada, Mexico, through the Bracero Program in 1960, and his mother followed soon after. Quetzalo has one brother and sister who were born in Mexico, and he is the first in his family to be born in the US. In 1975, his family moved from East Los Angeles to a small town in northern California because they wanted to leave all the big city problems behind. In northern California, his parents quickly found jobs. His father washed cars for a car company, while earning $13.00 an hour. His mother holds different minimum wage jobs throughout the year.

In the first interviews that focus on historical and academic issues, Quetzalo shared that he enjoys writing and shared that the fraternity helped him develop a positive attitude towards writing by providing an environment where a constructive attitude towards writing is produced. There are various ways the fraternity emphasizes writing, especially within the internal activities of the fraternity, such as writing reports, and memos, which in both cases require research to support the claims. Since the fraternity is involved in many different activities, it is important for the fraternity brothers to have accurate notes, so they can refer to them at a later date when he is writing a report or memo. By providing Quetzalo with a supporting environment where he is mentored on writing effective notes shows how the fraternity has shown him a valuable skill. By engaging in many of the fraternity activities Quetzalo developed a skill that allowed him to produce effective notes that then transferred over to his academics.

In one interview, after speaking to Quetzalo for about twenty minutes, I learned he does not use a specific note-taking strategy and instead attempts to write everything down. In his preliminary notes, Quetzalo primarily focuses on information that is relevant to the content of the discussion. For example, on one occasion, he took notes on each of his fraternity brother's specific duties for an activity. After the meeting, Quetzalo then rewrites his notes to make them clearer and more focused.

The writing stages of Quetzalo's notes are similar to the writing stages Flower and Hayes (1981) identify when they address the common steps in writing. These authors write, "'Pre-writing' is the stage before words emerge on paper; 'Writing' is the stage in which a product is being produced: and 'Re-writing' is a final working of the product" (p. 275). In Quetzalo's case, he realizes that if he rewrites his notes, the notes will become much clearer for him, therefore making it easier for him to follow the sequence of thought within his notes and therefore likely producing a stronger report to the fraternity's officers. It is fair to assume that Quetzalo views his original notes much like Flower and Hayes (1981) envision writing and rewriting. As Flower and Hayes (1981) might suggest, Quetzalo looks at his original notes as a work in progress that eventually, after rewriting them, become a final product.

In Nancy Sommers (1980) article, "Revision of student writers and experienced adults writers," she further addresses the issue of revision. Sommers points out that those students may not have the academic jargon to conceptualize what they are doing; however, as she says, "Students understand the revision process as a rewording activity. They do so because they perceive words as the units of written discourse" (p. 46). When I asked Quetzalo why he rewrote his notes, he said that his initial writing of notes is unclear and messy. When he rewrites his notes they are much clearer, and as a result, he is able to write down specific information about the fraternity's events. It is apparent Quetzalo is participating in is what Sommers refers to as cleaning up speech: "The aim of revision according to the students' own description is therefore to clean up speech" (p. 47). In this case, Quetzalo follows the ideas laid out by Sommers in that he often rereads his notes many times until they reach clarity to him. Other researchers, such as Collins and Parkhurst (2006), also address the way writing is now commonly viewed: "Writing is viewed as an act of constructing meaning, and students are encouraged to use it as a tool for learning" (p. 2). For Quetzalo, the notes he takes describe the activities the fraternity is involved in and thus inform him of important information, and therefore, the meaning he is constructing.

In the process of learning the various steps Quetzalo goes through in rewriting his notes in the fraternity context, I asked Quetzalo if this activity influenced his note-taking practices in the context of his academic classes. He responded by saying that by many times participating in this activity he has learned the value of rewriting class notes as well. He explains that much like the notes from the fraternity, the first time he writes his notes in class, they are often messy and disorganized. After he rewrites them, he says, they are much clearer and more focused. Quetzalo adds that rewriting his notes are valuable in all his classes this was especially important in his small group

communication class because the teacher's lectures often disorganized and complicated.

In our interview Quetzalo mentioned that he approaches literacy as a tool. Expanding on this, it is apparent that Quetzalo, as well as the fraternity body in general (because of the high demand of literacy required of its brotherhood), view literacy as a tool for academic advancement. In Quetzalo's mind, the better an individual writes, speaks, and presents, the more opportunities that individual will have academically and professionally. Quetzalo's perspective speaks nicely to Minzhan-Lu's (1994) "From silence to words: Writing as struggle," where she writes about her own literacy experience as she was growing up: "for both home and school presented the existent conventions of the discourse each taught me as absolute laws for my action. They turned verbal action into a tool, a set of conventions produced and shaped prior to and outside of my own verbal acts. Because I saw language as a tool, I separated the process of producing the tool from the process of using it" (p. 173).

Mayo

Mayo is 26 years old and was born in Monterey, Mexico and has one younger brother and two younger sisters. His family immigrated to central California in 1985. In Mexico, his family owned a farm where they grew and sold different crops. Unfortunately, this business was not profitable, so they commonly lacked basic living essentials. Hoping to overcome their economic hardships, the family moved to central California. Once they arrived in central California, the family was given the opportunity to live on a farm, with the condition that they would harvest and maintain the farm. The family agreed and has been living there ever since. After Mayo graduated from high school, he worked for a couple of years. While working, he realized he wanted to pursue a college degree, so he applied and was accepted to CSU, Chico. Mayo has attended Chico State for five years and expects to graduate next spring. He says it has taken him six years to graduate because he switched majors four times. Mayo is currently a Spanish major. He pledged Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity four years ago.

Unlike my other participants, Mayo works outside the university as a Drug Prevention Workshop Specialist for a county office. In this position, Mayo conducts workshops for various age groups on various prevention topics, ranging from pregnancy to drug use. Although these workshops are presented throughout the county, Mayo prefers to hold workshops in areas where there is a high percentage of

Latinx. During one interview, Mayo mentioned that he really enjoyed his job because he educates many Latinx about different social problems.

When interviewing him, I learned that Mayo's first language is Spanish and that he attended school in Mexico until he was nine years old. Mayo's fluency and understanding of Spanish led to his interest in learning the grammatical construction of the Spanish language and in reading Latinx literature. Holding these two interests made Spanish an ideal major for him because he wants to continue working on his advocacy work with a community he deeply cares about.

Although Mayo prefers speaking Spanish, he is fluent in English and therefore can read and write in both languages. More impressive is that Mayo "code meshes" Spanish and English with ease (Young & Martinez, 2012). As an example, Mayo states, "La fraternity has always had my esquina. Por ejemplo, cuando estaba buscando trabajo, the fraternity guys were the first ones to help me. Está suave…that was cool." The fraternity embraces the idea of the Chicano identity because it pushes the brotherhood to be proud of their Latinx heritage. Similarly, the fraternity also encourages its brothers to excel in spaces like academia, which may require them to embrace non-traditional Latinx roles (like only speaking English in certain spaces and participating in situations which may not be sensitive to Latinx culture).

In this fraternity, the brothers are asked to be active participants in various projects that the fraternity is involved in. Often, these projects require the brother to present information to the community or to various organizations within the university. The brothers of the fraternity are then required to give weekly, detailed reports of their work in the general meeting. In preparation for these presentations, the brotherhood provides ample guidance to the brother who is preparing a "talk." This advice is provided throughout the entire process in order to develop ideas until the final discussion. For, Mayo, his big brother ("Jose") helped him prepare a proposal for a *tamale* fundraiser. As Mayo explains, "Without my big brother's help, my presentation would have been terrible."

Van de Bergha, et al. (2006) write in "State College Rates Show Increase" on the difficulty of writing clearly. Their work discusses how Peer Assessment (PA) is commonly used in higher education to improve students' writing. More specifically, it is common to use peer review activities within college classes to teach students how to become more effective writers: "[One] reason for working with PA is that assessing and providing feedback among peers resembles professional practices" (p. 135). More specifically, when the students write that often the person in charge (teacher or boss) does not have the time to individually help everyone, so therefore the PA helps out a lot in these situations. My observation of Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity shows that

they encourage PA among their brotherhood. In Mayo's case, his PA was a more experienced fraternity member who helped him complete the many tasks he was involved in.

According to Mayo, another literacy practice the fraternity has helped him polish is his oral presentations. During an interview, he told me that this literacy practice has been especially helpful/useful at his job. He said, "I commonly present many different things in front of the fraternity, so when I had to get up in front of other groups, it was easy." He then added that it was his big brother Jose who originally taught him how to present. He says, "Jose taught me how to present. He taught me the different parts of a presentation. He also taught me how to relax and to learn that it was really no big deal when talking to a big group. That was so helpful for me to learn. Now at work, I am the only one who does not get nervous when I present."

When I asked Mayo if the fraternity has helped him develop the literacy skills he uses in his classes or at work, he responded by saying that the fraternity has taught him almost *all* of them. He tells me: "The fraternity has taught me to write and present better, and simply be a much more confident individual." When I asked him to explain this, he said the following: "When I first joined the fraternity, I had many different ideas that I wanted the fraternity to be involved in. What I learned was that the process of how the fraternity chooses to be involved in different activities was complicated and required a strong commitment from the brotherhood."

One of the most fascinating aspects about Mayo's case is the way he talks about literacy. Unlike Quetzalo, Mayo describes literacy with a broader meaning, which includes numbers and graphics. For example, he commonly told me how the fraternity taught him to write proposals (with a detailed budget playing a key role) and about presentations, which often used graphics.

Mayo also mentions that the fraternity taught him to be extremely proud of his Mexican cultural ways of being, and in particular, with speaking Spanish. The fraternity supports his identity by either speaking Spanish during fraternity events or by actually pushing the fraternity brothers to enroll in Spanish classes. In cases where Spanish or other portions of Latinx culture are not part of a brother's experience, the fraternity actively pushes Latinx culture to its brotherhood. I have observed this process on various occasions. For example, some fraternity brothers did not speak Spanish before entering the fraternity, but now they do.

Mayo also experiences what Pratt (1991) has identified as a "contact zone." As Bizzell (1994) writes, "A contact zone' is defined primarily in terms of historical circumstances. It is circumscribed in time and space, but with elastic boundaries. Focusing on a contact zone as a way of organizing literacy study would mean

attempting to include all material relevant to the struggles going on there" (p. 166). In Mayo's case, the contact zone I am referring to is the positive justification of his Mexican cultural ways of being and language that the fraternity produces. What the fraternity has done is to make an obvious connection to a "contact zone" that pushes their brotherhood to engage in literacy practices, while in many cases using their native Spanish language. This engagement is crucial to the fraternity brothers because they recognize the value in their Mexican cultural ways of being. Without a doubt, the fraternity has influenced the importance of a college degree to Mayo, and thus he claims that he will graduate at all costs. Mayo has been enrolled in the university for five years and remains enthusiastic about school. In fact, in our conversations, Mayo shared his frustration with Latinx youth. He mentions that, in today's society, the Latinx youth are not academically focused enough.

When questioning Mayo about his motivation to succeed in school, I learned that he believes that the fraternity made him realize the importance of an education. He shared that when he first enrolled at the university he felt out of place. Once Mayo joined Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity, his engagement with successful academic brothers reassures him that it is important to retain his Latinx culture and language while pursuing a higher education. As can be seen, Mayo has made a strong connection to an ideology that allows him to develop an identity as a strong Chicano academic. With this in mind, he is learning how to be academically successful as he maintains his security within his Mexican cultural ways of being.

Discussion

Achieving Academic Excellence

Quetzalo and Mayo faced many of the same obstacles that many other Mexican American students face at the university. For Quetzalo and Mayo, they joined a Latinx-centric organization that supported them and taught them literacy practices that helped them refine their existing literacy practices. Additionally, the fraternity provided them the support and community that these college students desperately needed. For example, Gamma Zeta Alpha taught their brotherhood the importance of certain Mexican holidays like *el día de la independencia* (September 16) and *el día de los muertos* (November 2), which influenced the fraternity brothers to be proud of their Mexican culture.

The development and eventual transformation of the fraternity brothers' literacy practices represent a slow and complicated process. The fraternity brother

must first become confident with using the literacy practice within the context of the fraternity. After this initial time period with the fraternity, he must recognize that the same literacy practice can be applied to his academics. Recognizing this, the fraternity brother must then transfer these literacy practices to his academics. The fraternity brother can then use the literacy practices with confidence in academic settings.

It is important to discuss the similarities between the literacy practices used in the context of the fraternity and those in the context of academics. As in the context of the fraternity, within many university classes, students are asked to turn in drafts of their work with the expectation of having to rewrite their work after it has been commented on by a tutor, teaching assistant, peer, or professor. There are many ways in which the fraternity's literacy practices mirrored those in academic settings, but perhaps the important lesson the fraternity brothers learn is that writing is a process. In learning this process, the fraternity brothers become aware that there are various steps to writing and that it is a long and complicated process. This message is clearly received by my participants, Quetzalo and Mayo. In their cases, each of my participants are asked to have their project (notes, proposal, or presentation) commented on by one of the fraternity officers (more experienced members). After these participants received these comments, they are expected to implement them into their projects, which they all did.

Once my participants learned these skills within the fraternity context, they then transferred them over to their academics. This transfer was especially apparent in Quetzalo's case where he quickly transferred literacy practices from his academics by asking for help with literacy assignments, at different times, as he was going through the writing process (draft to final stage). For example, Quetzalo showed proof of these literacy practices transferring by taking the initiative and asking to meet with his teaching assistant and professor to review his paper thoroughly at the various writing stages.

Another literary practice the fraternity emphasizes to their brotherhood is the importance of public speaking. As shown in the data, and specifically shown by Mayo, there are various activities that put the fraternity brother in a position where he must speak publicly. This activity once again reflects the accomplishments that are often present within academic contexts. The fraternity providing their brotherhood the opportunity to polish these presentation skills within a friendly, non-grading environment gives the fraternity brothers a clear advantage over other students because they are learning how to become better public speakers by getting advice on their posture, clarity, and interaction with the audience. This preparation often helps the fraternity brothers develop good public speaking skills, hence improving their

academics. Mayo especially excelled in the transformation of this literacy practice into his position as a county workshop leader. In his case, after learning the benefits of receiving advice, he always asked his supervisor for advice on his workshop presentations, which he always took into consideration.

Introducing the fraternity brothers to these literacy expectations makes the fraternity brother aware of these skills, which in many cases pushes the fraternity brother to seek academic advice from experienced brothers (varying for each project) that can help him excel in these literacy skills. Being guided on how to improve their literacy practices had a major influence in many of the fraternity brothers' lives because these individuals learned to become academically and professionally successful in a country that presents various obstacles to people of color. Through either teaching them about Latinx culture or by teaching them important literacy practices, the fraternity has helped many fraternity brothers become academically and professionally successful. Without this fraternity, many of the brothers who are successful in life would have had a much more difficult time reaching their goals, academically and professionally.

Meaning/Implications

As it is well documented, fraternities and sororities do not have the best reputation. In many cases this reputation is earned because the fraternity and/or sorority has engaged in questionable activities that often involve a lot of drinking. Luckily, Gamma Zeta Alpha is an exception to this image, be it reality or perception. Although they do participate in an active social life, the brothers in Gamma Zeta Alpha also participate in other activities that make them unique. For instance, as mentioned before, Gamma Zeta Alpha is a fraternity that deeply cares about their fraternity brothers' grades, so they provide them different avenues to continue their academic success.

Universities must recognize that not all fraternities are bad. Importantly, fraternities like Gamma Zeta Alpha actively promote the counter stories that their fraternity brothers produce. Perhaps fraternities like Gamma Zeta Alpha ought to put together a symposium every semester to talk about their individual success stories that would counter the master narratives at their university. Ideally, if fraternities and sororities shared their own academic success stories, then students from around the campus could benefit from hearing these stories.

Along with fraternities and sororities recognizing the importance of their counter stories, it is perhaps more important for college educators to be aware of these stories. For example, it is critical for all teachers to recognize that students of color

most often come with exceptional experiences and stories that completely demystify the master narratives. For example, it is common for marginalized students to outwork their counterparts because it is frequently ingrained in their culture to outwork everyone. That said, it is important for teachers to create a curriculum, and more importantly, assignments that center on these counter narratives. These assignments often work best when teachers think outside the box and consider what students are actively participating in. For example, asking the students to produce a video of their positive experiences at a university can give them the opportunity to focus on a positive perspective of a university.

Many times, universities look at fraternities as social groups that participate in various social functions, and thus student organizations often do not have the best reputation at universities. Despite these concerns, universities should also recognize that some fraternities and sororities impact members' academic achievement in positive ways. Consequently, it might be valuable for universities to work more closely with fraternities and sororities for the greater good of the students.

Studies such as this one show, for example, that fraternities, and in extension sororities, often require their brotherhood/sisterhood to engage in various literacy practices within the context of their organization that are also required within members' academics as well. In most cases, the fraternities/sororities do not see these connections because the participants of these organizations often see them as two completely different entities. Perhaps if universities offered workshops like "The Connection between Student Organizations and Classroom Practices," they might push the participants of these organizations to recognize these similarities. Once these similarities are recognized, and with perhaps further training, organizations can enhance their strategies to refine their members' literacy practices, and then be able to reproduce them with better results within the brotherhood/sisterhood classroom space. By the same token, the leadership of these organizations should also recognize these connections and thus work with various academic centers like "The Writing Centers" and/or the "Tutoring Center" and invite them to conduct workshops for their organizations.

By meshing these two distinctively different environments, and recognizing their similarities, students' academic achievement is likely to increase. Although practicing this in all cases is important, it is especially important to do this within organizations that have a high Latinx student population because Latinx students especially have a high dropout rate. By doing this, a "new" narrative— showing the success stories of Latinx students—can emerge. These counter stories will challenge the stock stories that commonly emphasize the academic failures of Latinx students.

In helping create this new discourse, I am optimistic that perhaps some of the negative rhetoric against Latinx students will be minimized, and thus begin to "chip-away" from the racism Latinx students face.

Works Cited

Blackemore, E. (2017). The Brutal history of anti-Latinx discrimination in America, History Channel. 25 January 2018. Retrieved from http://www.history.com/news/the-brutal-history-of-anti-Latinx-discrimination-in-america.

Brown, S. (2011). Organizations join forces to increase Latinx college completion rates. *Activity*, *49*(1) 1.

Bizzell, P. (1994). Contact zones and English studies. *College English, 56(*2*)*, 163-69.

Covarrubias, A., & Lara, A. (2014). The undocumented (im)migrant educational pipeline: The influence of citizenship status on educational attainment for people of Mexican origin. *Urban Review*, *49*(1), 75-110.

Collins, N. D., & Parkhurst, L. (1996). The writing process: A Tool for working with gifted students in the regular classroom. *Roeper Review, 18*(4), 1-5.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic field notes, 2nd Edition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Farr, M. (Ed.) (2005). *Latino language, and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387.

Gamboa, S. (2017). History of racism against Mexican-Americans clouds Texas immigration law, *NBC News*. 25 January 2018. Retrieved from https://www.nbcnews.com/news/Latinx/history-racism-against-mexican-americans-clouds-texas-immigration-law-n766956

Gamma Zeta Alpha Inc. (2006). Gamma Zeta Alpha. 18 May 2018. http://64.17.128.150/gammas.html

Gates, S. (2012). Impact of Latino stereotypes: Latino Americans viewed most negatively in immigrant comparison study. *Latino voices*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/21/Latinx-stereotypes-impact-negative-study_n_1818087.html

Guerra, J. C. (1998). *Close to home: Oral and literate practices in a transnational Mexicano community*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Krogstad, J.M. (2016). Key facts about the U.S. Hispanic population is changing. *Pew Research Center*. September 8, 2016. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/08/key-facts-about-how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/

Levin, J., Walker, L., Haberler, Z., & Jackson-Boothby, A. (2013). The divided self: The double consciousness of faculty of color in community colleges. *Community College Review*, *41*(1), 311-329.

Lopez, M. H. (2014). In 2014, Latinx will surpass whites as largest racial/ethnic group in California. *Pew Research Center*. January 24, 2014. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/01/24/in-2014-Latinx-will-surpass-whites-as-largest-racialethnic-group-in-california/

Lu, M. (1994). From silence to words: Writing as struggle. In S. Perl (Ed.). *Landmark Essays: On Process Writing*. California, Davis: Hermagoras, 165-176.

Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (2011). National constitution. May 9, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.umich.edu/~mechaum/Natconst.html

Pimentel, O. (2015). *Historias de exitó within Mexican communities: Silenced voices*. US: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession 91*. New York: MLA.

Sing, K. (2015). 21 Stereotypes about Latino Men that Latino men want to dispel. *Latino voices*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/stereotypes-about-Latinx-men-dispelled_us_56003629e4b00310edf7db88

Solórzano, D.G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8(*1*)*, 23-44.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 378-388.

Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant observation 1st edition*, CA: Wadsworth Press.

Van de Bergha, V., Mortelmans, D., Spooren, P., Van Petegem, P., Gijbels, D., & Vanthournout, G. (2006). New assessment modes within project based-education- The stakeholders. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 32(4), 345-368.

Young, A. and Martinez, A. (2011). *Code-meshing as world English: Pedagogy, policy, performance*. New York: NCTE.

About the Author

Octavio Pimentel joined the Masters in Rhetoric and Composition Program in The Department of English at Texas State University in 2005. Since then Dr. Pimentel has published 2 books: *Historias de Éxito within Mexican Communities: Silenced Voices* and *Communicating Race, Ethnicity, and Identity in Technical Communication.* Dr. Pimentel is also in the final stages of completing 2 more books that will be published by Fall 2018: *Racial Shorthand: Coded Discrimination Contested in Social Media,* and *Cuentos & Testimonies: Diversity & Inclusion at Texas State University.* Lastly, Dr. Pimentel has published over 20 articles, and presented in over 30 international/national conferences.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 29 – 41
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.03
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Recognizing Deaf Writers as Second Language Learners: Transforming the Approach to Working with ASL Speakers in the Writing Center

Victoria Ramirez Gentry
Texas A&M-Corpus Christi

Introduction

As a writing consultant at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi's Center for Academic Student Achievement (CASA) Writing Center, I have worked with writers whose first languages are not English. I have consulted with Vietnamese, Japanese, and Spanish speaking students among many others as the center provides access for a range of students from different cultural backgrounds. Because CASA welcomes all students, the center trains consultants in specific strategies for working with second language learners (L2) on their writing. In addition to providing professional development training that implements L2 scholarship, the center also prepares consultants to help students with disabilities. This training consists of bi-weekly meetings during the fall and spring semesters to ensure the consultants are thoroughly prepared to work with students in the center. Through the training and meetings, consultants read assigned articles over writing center and composition theory and pedagogy and participate in projects and discussions. The assigned articles consultants read for training may be related to working with specific kinds of students such as Veterans and athletes, examining the importance of collaboration with other consultants and strategies for spotting error patterns.

As a consultant who often worked with L2 students and grew up in multilingual environments, I found the articles on second language pedagogy particularly interesting and beneficial in helping me understand how to best assist

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

students working with English as a second language. For instance, in the training designated specifically to prepare consultants for L2 learners in the writing center, we read Bartholomae's (1980) "The Study of Error," in which we learned to analyze and close read errors in student writing:

> If we learn to treat the language of basic writing *as* language and assume, as we do when writers violate our expectations in more conventional ways, that the unconventional features in the writer are evidence of intention and that they are, therefore, meaningful, then we can chart systematic choices, individual strategies, and characteristic processes of thought. (p. 255)

This article taught me, as a consultant, not to scan through papers for errors, but to examine thoughtfully the writer's choices, which in turn helped me identify how to best assist the writer. Along with Bartholomae (1980), consultants also read Rafoth's (2015) *Multilingual Writers and Writing Centers* as well as other scholars, all of which presented us with ways of examining L2 writing and helping students in their writing process by making sure to go through the process slowly to ensure the students understand the concepts before moving on. In addition, we also read articles on students with disabilities. Daniels, Babcock, and Daniels (2015) discuss inclusivity in the writing center and the importance of not assuming students have a disability, but allowing students to disclose their disability on their own. For instance, Daniels et al. (2015) suggest that consultants ask students a "generic type of question at the beginning of all consultations" such as *is there anything you would like me to know about your writing before we get started?* (p.22). This inquiry then allows students in the center the opportunity to talk about their disability if they so choose. Thus, the training on students with disabilities offers ways for consultants to navigate sessions by making sure the students feel comfortable, similar to the prior L2 training.

While the disability training at the writing center works well to familiarize consultants with ways to assist students with disabilities, Deaf student writers do not receive sufficient attention since these trainings do not focus on them as second language learners. Throughout this article, I refer to people who are Deaf (capital D) specifically because these are the people whose first form of communication is sign language and they identify within the Deaf Culture (Babcock, 2011). Although attention should be paid to deaf writers and students whose first language is not sign language, I focus specifically on Deaf writers because my personal involvement working with a Deaf writer who communicated via American Sign Language (ASL) showed me how her writing experience was similar to that of L2 writers. Once I started

consulting Deaf writer, Alex[1], I began to seek out more research on Deaf writers and L2 scholarship. I also began connecting the similarities in the approaches to working with L2 writers and students with disabilities. For instance, some L2 scholarship focuses on the importance of assisting with grammar, lexical issues, and sentence structure when working with L2 writers because these components enhance the clarity of the text, thereby effectively communicating their intended purpose (Eckstein, 2016; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015). Likewise, scholarship focused on writers with disabilities, such as Deaf writers, urges for more attention to grammar since it often overlaps with content (Babcock & Thonus, 2012). Ultimately, what I found indicated that disabilities scholarship and L2 scholarship focuses on both being directive with these students *and* understanding that content and grammar may be equally important depending on the situation. Nonetheless, I eventually noticed that, while these strategies do help, they were not enough for Alex. In talking with Alex's interpreter, I realized that I had failed to make explicit connections between the writer's first language, ASL, and her second language, English. Once I recognized the student's struggle to adhere to the conventions of Standard English, I also saw a gap in writing center scholarship, particularly between how second language learners are placed in one category and Deaf writers in another. Based on my experiences, I see the need to address the similarities between the two groups.

While the scholarship of recent decades has provided helpful strategies for and studies based on both second language learners and Deaf students, these two categories have not been explicitly connected (Babcock, 2012; Eckstein, 2016; Liu, 2016; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015; Tuzi, 2004; Williams & Severino, 2004). From the perspective of a writing consultant who worked with L2 writers, I noticed the ways in which the current L2 scholarship relates to how students work through the writing process (Eckstein, 2016; Liu, 2016; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015). However, because I also worked consistently with a Deaf student whose first form of communication is ASL, I noticed the similarities in the way this student approached writing in English to other L2 writers. For instance, Alex often brought the structures and rules of her first language, ASL, into her writing, just as other L2 students bring rules and structures from their first languages. Although some current strategies for Deaf writers and L2 students when seen in separate categories may work well for assisting students in the center, we need to start including ASL communicators within the category of second language learners. By including ASL communicators within the L2 category, we can directly acknowledge the ways in which Deaf writers

[1] Name changed to provide student anonymity.

bring ASL into their Standard English writing as well as better prepare writing centers to assist students whose primary form of communication is ASL.

To explain the importance of bridging the gap between L2 students and Deaf students, I first outline my experience working as a writing consultant with Deaf writer, Alex, pointing out the specific areas I failed to successfully address due to not making the connection between this student's first and second languages. Next, I make connections between the writing sessions I worked through with Alex and current scholarship on second language learners to clearly explain how the conversations in the field of second language pedagogy relates to this Deaf student's experience as well. Finally, I explore the ways in which Deaf writers fit in the category of L2 and the possible solutions to be made in connecting the categories and acknowledging ASL writers of English as second language learners.

Tutoring Sessions with an ASL Communicator

When I first began working with Alex, a Deaf undergraduate student, at the writing center, I did not make the connection to L2 writers. Instead, I focused on how I could navigate the barriers we, tutor and student, faced in communicating, all of which from my perspective related directly to Alex's disability. For instance, when Alex first came to the center, she did not have an interpreter; thus, we spoke to each other via handwriting back and forth on spiral notebooks. While this communication process was definitely challenging since handwriting feedback proved time consuming, I also noticed very little improvement in Alex's writing. No matter how many times Alex came to the center for an appointment or how much I tried to explain something, she always seemed to ask the same questions. Alex's questions often focused on grammar and sentence structure, asking if what she wrote was correct. Sometimes Alex would ask about citation methods or wanted me to explain her teacher's assignment prompt, but these questions always fell predominantly in the category of grammatical concerns. Specifically, Alex often wanted me to go through her paper and edit or "fix" her grammatical mistakes, despite my reminders that, because the center is not an editing service, I could not just go through her paper and change things without her understanding of why things may need to be changed. Although I did not recognize it at that time, Alex's deep concern for grammatical correctness related to L2 scholarship as L2 students often expect and desire grammatical help from writing tutors (Eckstein, 2016). I was so focused on avoiding simply editing Alex's paper and trying to get her to self-correct through my explanations of grammar rules, I did not think that there

may have been a problem with my understanding of how to approach Alex's particular grammatical concerns.

I then realized Alex did not simply have problems with grammar, but she was bringing some of the structures and rules of ASL into her writing, such as flipping the English sentence structure and omitting words altogether. I was familiar with other L2 writers transferring structures from L1, such as in the Indonesian language, *Bahasa Indonesia,* where writers may omit articles and confuse the singular and plural when writing in English; however, it had not occurred to me to look for the same indicator in Alex's writing. I finally came to this realization when Alex set up weekly appointments with me and started bringing an interpreter to help in our communication process. The interpreter arrived to Alex's appointment early one day and we talked about the differences between English and ASL. I learned that the structure of ASL is different from English and sometimes prepositions and articles are omitted. For instance, if an ASL speaker were to say "I'm going to the writing center tomorrow" in English, the ASL form would be more like "tomorrow writing center I go." This sentence structure is not only flipped, but also omits words that may seem unnecessary such as "to" and "the," which many ASL speakers ignore completely when communicating with each other.

The interpreter's explanation of the ASL structure alerted me to Alex's error patterns in English. From that session on, I approached the sessions with a plan to work with Alex the way the writing center had trained me to assist L2 writers. When I noticed inverted English sentences such as "globalization research I do," I recognized it as an example of Alex's first language (ASL) blending into her attempts to write in Standard English. Instead of simply explaining the rules of English structure, I related the sentence to Alex's own language and made explicit connections as to why it is flipped in English, taking into account the legitimacy of Alex's first language. In approaching this problem with "In ASL you word it this way? Standard written English requires a different structure" and then expanding on the rules of English, I not only made a connection between the languages, but also showed Alex there was nothing wrong with her first language. Still, I emphasized that she would have to follow English writing structures if she wanted to ensure less confusion for English readers, i.e., her audience. I connected this approach to Babcock's (2012) assertions that sometimes Lower Order Concerns (LOCs), such as grammar and sentence structure, must take precedence over content because Deaf writers may need explicit explanations to express their ideas. This assertion about Deaf writers relates directly to the L2 training I received as a writing consultant at the center, since I was taught that sometimes LOCs must take priority depending on the L2 writer's needs. Although Babcock's (2012)

assertions prove helpful, without making a direct connection to Deaf writers' first language as we do for L2 writers, we cannot as easily pick out the error patterns nor explain them as sufficiently when working with Deaf writers.

ASL Connections to L2 Scholarship

Non-Directive vs. Directive in the Writing Center

While my experience working with a Deaf writer included my own revelation in focusing on her second and first language when explaining error patterns, much of my approach included emphasizing more directive feedback when working with the writer. Directive feedback consists of being clear and specific with students as to what they need to work on, rather than allowing students to reach the answer on their own by asking questions, which refers to non-directive feedback. In this section, I connect my experience working with Alex to current scholarship on L2 students, specifically in the ways the conversations emphasize the importance of recognizing non-directive vs. directive tutoring strategies. While much writing center pedagogy encourages writing consultants/tutors to cultivate a more non-directive approach so that students remain in complete control of their writing, recent scholarship on second language learners counters this practice, advocating for more directive approaches. For instance, Eckstein (2016) notes Blau and Hall's study on L2 writers showed that writers who received direct advice on language structure were able to make deeper meaning of the language. While this study focused on the importance of making meaning with grammatical assistance, Eckstein (2016) also discusses L2 writers' desire for a better understanding of grammar since 44% of L2 writers within the study described grammar as their top concern. Attending to grammar as a Higher Order Concern in some writing cases, though, proves difficult in writing centers because consultants are trained to focus on content and overall flow of text as a Higher Order Concern, while grammar and sentence structure are considered secondary. The center encourages this hierarchy for multiple reasons, one of which relates to the fact that if students fixed all their grammar in a paper but still needed to work on content, they would have wasted time in cleaning up content that is subject to change. Furthermore, this order is important because overall content is viewed as a higher priority than grammar. Nevertheless, this order sometimes faces conflict when professors place more grade value on grammar than content, or second language learners desire to improve their grammar and seek directive feedback. In fact, Myers (2003) notes that "[m]any international graduate students, in particular, usually have a good idea of what they

want to say, but are often at a loss as to how to say it" (p. 52). Thus, these students seek out directive feedback related to grammar and surface level issues.

Because of the rise of second language learners in writing centers and this conflict over directive vs. non-directive feedback, Williams and Severino (2004) have emphasized strategies to assist L2 students. As L2 writers desire more directive feedback, writing centers need to actively seek information on L2 writers and account for the ways in which these writers experience language differently (Williams & Severino, 2004). Further, tutors must be more directive with L2 students in certain situations and act as "cultural informants" (Myers, 2003; Willams & Severino, 2004). In this strategy, the feedback is not simply editing, or telling the writer what to do, but allowing writers to negotiate, as Liu (2016) puts it, between their first language and their second language, providing more opportunity to learn as well as facilitate confidence. Thus, the tutor will work to bridge the gap between what writers currently know about English and what they do not, providing upfront explanations rather than getting stuck trying to draw information out of writers with which they are unfamiliar and wish to understand. I experienced this situation firsthand when working with Alex: rather than simply giving her the answer or making her guess the answer to encourage self-reflection, we held discussions about her first and second languages, the structures, the rules, and the cultural aspects. Furthermore, encouraging self-correction "will only succeed if the learner has at least partial mastery over the form," thus, some directive feedback is crucial in the tutoring process (Williams & Severino, 2004, p. 167). This scholarship proves that while some techniques work for native speakers, the same techniques will not be as sufficient for second language learners.

Because such techniques will not work for every writer, scholars pay attention to the unique differences that L2 writers bring to a tutoring session. For instance, Williams (2004) discusses cross-cultural communicative barriers in a study on the communication between tutors and L2 writers, indicating non-directive approaches led to L2 writers simply guessing for an answer. Instead, Williams (2004) advocates for a "show" and "explain" rather than "asking" or "telling" (p.195). For example, a tutor who models writing strategies would be taking part in showing and explaining. In my work with Alex, I modeled sentences and then we would work together to come to an understanding of why I wrote the sentences in a particular order, rather than simply telling her "this is how you do it." This approach emphasizes directive strategies that does not require Alex to come up with an answer on her own, but it also does not simply give her the answer like an editor would, because there is still a component of explanation that facilitates learning. This detailed feedback consistently shows up in recent scholars' work, such as Séror's (2011) study that reveals students find peer

feedback helpful since it offers more detailed descriptions on how to improve writing, including grammar as well as content. While writing consultants and tutors do sometimes struggle to maintain focus on global issues while still meeting L2 writers' requests for lexical and syntactic assistance, these components relate directly to making meaning of a text (Nakamaru, 2010). Because of this significance, Rafoth (2015) notes that writing centers must prepare "tutors to help writers navigate" the global and local issues, recognizing that they overlap and work together (p. 5). Thus, such scholarship does not contradict writing center pedagogy against editing. Rather, it offers a balance and an understanding that students working in a second language need more direct feedback as they do not always have prior knowledge on specific rules or guidelines of their second language and cannot pick it up through non-directive probing. I experienced this balance in my training at the CASA writing center as I learned about the ways in which to adapt when working with the students and shift from non-directive to more directive depending on the L2 students' needs.

How Deaf Learners Fit In

Just as L2 scholarship points out, Deaf students also need more directive feedback to account for their possible lack of prior knowledge in the English language. For instance, Babcock and Thonus (2012) pointed out that when tutors work with Deaf writers, they may sometimes accidentally read papers aloud. While reading papers aloud is a common practice to help the students self-correct and catch phrases that might "sound funny" or identify where they might have omitted necessary words, this strategy does not help Deaf writers. This failure is similar to that faced by L2 writers; reading papers aloud does not always work for them since they generally have a "less developed sense of what 'sounds right'" in their second language (Williams & Severino, 2004, p.167). Furthermore, Babcock's (2011) study revealed Deaf writers' preference for directive approaches to tutoring as well as their potential struggles with cultural issues, another similar struggle of L2 writers. This connection to cultural issues relates to Williams and Severino's (2004) assertion that tutors need to be more directive in their role as cultural informants with L2 writers since L2 and Deaf writers may not be fully versed in the cultural norms of Standard English. Hence, Babcock (2012) emphasizes the importance of implementing focus on both Higher Order Concerns (HOCs) as well as Lower Order Concerns (LOCs), despite the fact that writing center pedagogy often encourages tutors to prioritize HOCs over LOCs for most students. Thus, the scholarship comes full circle as L2 pedagogy emphasizes this shift in non-directive toward directive strategies, similar to writing center research on writers with

disabilities, as Babcock (2012) brings up the importance of finding a balance between HOCs and LOCs. This balance proves important since L2 writers, and here I am including Deaf writers in this category, bring the cultural and linguistic forms of their first languages into their use of Standard English. The importance of recognizing language interference, as noted by Babcock (2012), relates to Deaf writers' experiences when writing in their second language.

Recognizing the effects of students' first languages upon their second language writing proves significant as it may help tutors approach error patterns more clearly, recognizing that the writers' patterns relate to a logical structure in their first language. ASL speakers, as with other second language learners, are used to a different structure. During my work with Alex, I learned of some of the many differences between ASL and English. For instance, for speed of communication, ASL leaves out many words that English speakers use because they are unnecessary in ASL, such as articles. Additionally, ASL's structure is also different from English as some sentence structures are inverted from the standard Subject-Verb-Object arrangement. These differences between languages relate back to the ways in which other L2 writers bring aspects of their own first language into their second. This difference is important because, while many scholars focus on Deaf writers within the disability category, the uniqueness of their language is often forgotten. Overlooking ASL is even more problematic since the language has not always been valued as a legitimate language and has even been previously "discouraged" from being used in deaf schools (Yule, 2014, p. 200). ASL, nevertheless, is intricate and legitimate as the signs' structures, movements, and locations as well as facial expressions and finger spelling create meaning as nuanced and articulate as oral languages (Yule, 2014). Thus, it is helpful for writing centers to look at Deaf writers as L2 learners since they are experiencing English similarly to the ways in which other L2 learners do and they must work through their natural inclination to include their first language's structures within their Standard English writing.

Proposition: Including Deaf Writers in the L2 Category

Because ASL is a legitimate language, with structures and grammatical rules of its own just as any other language, I propose a new framework for looking at the ways in which we can tutor and work with ASL communicators both in the writing center and in other tutoring situations. While Babcock (2012) has provided much scholarship on working with Deaf students and has given me the initial tools to connect Deaf writers to L2 students, I advocate further research to examine ASL writers not only in the

category of disabilities, but also within the context of other second language writers. I believe this approach will provide writing centers and writing consultants better clarification in tutoring Deaf students for they will look for language patterns, just as they would for other second language learners. The following includes solutions I propose for including Deaf writers in the category of second language learners for writing centers.

Consultants receive training strategies for working with L2 students

While Babcock (2012) suggests writing centers be more prepared for Deaf students and encourages writing centers to specifically train their tutors to communicate in ASL, such as learning to fingerspell so that they become "familiar with readings on dialect and language interference in writing" (p. 179), I do not suggest the same. It would be ideal if all consultants in the center could communicate fluidly in ASL so that they could better assist Deaf writers and, I have found it to be very rewarding when I was able to sign a few words with Alex because my signing has helped build rapport and further legitimize the importance of ASL as a language. However, I understand that not all consultants will be able to learn ASL. Furthermore, not all consultants will be able to learn the other first languages of students that come into the writing center such as Spanish, Japanese, Korean, and etc. Despite consultants' inability to speak every language, writing consultants are prepared for L2 writers through training, meetings, and frequent readings on L2 pedagogy. Thus, to better assist ASL communicators, training must include ASL information in the L2 category. This training requires that future L2 scholarship should include Deaf writers within their studies, because this could provide writing centers the material and guidance to include Deaf writers when talking about L2 learners.

Consultants learn to balance between grammar and content

While the struggle between directive and non-directive feedback and the balance between grammar and content exists within L2 scholarship currently (Eckstein, 2016; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015; Williams & Severino, 2004), I find it important to note specifically the importance of this issue in relation to ASL speakers. For instance, both categories, disabilities and second language learners, focus on these topics. In Babcock's (2011) study on Deaf students, she explains directive feedback worked most frequently in these sessions and tutors need to be flexible in the ways they approach writers' needs. Furthermore, Rafoth's (2015) research on second language learners

showed it is important to prepare tutors to work with diverse writers and become more directive when necessary. I find both examples important, and the CASA writing center trained me to adapt and switch between being directive and non-directive in sessions depending on students' needs, but in order to more effectively use these strategies in the writing center, these separate categories need to be connected. When working with Alex, I recognized that in some instances I had to focus on grammar first to reach full understanding of the content. This approach was not simply because Alex has a disability, but it was because Alex was using ASL structures in her writing. If I did not understand her mixing of language, I would not have been able to effectively explain to Alex how to best communicate her message to her audience.

Conclusion

Ultimately, L2 learners and ASL communicators must be connected, for consultants and tutors must be adaptable to accommodate all writers. All writers deserve the same opportunities and the writing center is to be a place accessible to everyone. Therefore, we look at each individual writers' needs and provide them the best feedback possible. In implementing second language strategies when working with Deaf students, and in examining ASL as a language with unique properties that influences the writer's second language, I believe we will provide writers a better opportunity to improve their writing, implement revisions, and internalize strategies for writing projects in their future. The scholarship I found when researching this topic as well as through personal development training at the writing center provided the basis for my understanding of L2 students and students with disabilities. I recognize the significance of the training I received from the writing center and the work the scholars in the field have put forth in making writing centers a more accessible and welcoming place to all students. In experiencing firsthand consultations with a Deaf student, I recognized the need to expand our definition of L2 to include Deaf writers as well. While this approach may be new to many, it will be beneficial for students seeking help in better understanding the English language. Going back to Bartholomae's (1980) notion of treating "the unconventional features" in student's writing as "meaningful" (p.255), I believe this concern is of utmost importance if consultants are to offer ASL writers assistance through acknowledging "the unconventional features" and examining the meaning behind these features. By including Deaf writers within the category of L2 writers, we can focus primarily on their language rather than on the disability which will, in turn, offer clarity and understanding between the tutor and the writer which will result in a successful writing collaboration.

Works Cited

Babcock, R. D. (2011). Interpreted writing center tutorials with college-level deaf students. *Linguistics & Education*, *22*(2), 95-117. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2010.10.001

Babcock, R.D. (2012). *Teach me how it reads: Tutoring deaf and hearing students in the writing center.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.

Babcock, R.D., & Thonus, T. (2012). Tutoring "different" populations. *Researching the writing center: Towards an evidence-based practice.* (pp. 86-110). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Bartholomae, D. (1980). The study of error. *College Composition and Communication, 31* (3), 253-269.

Daniels, S., Babcock, R.D., & Daniels, D. (2015). Writing centers and disability: Enabling writers through an inclusive philosophy. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 13* (1), 20-26. Retrieved from www.praxisuwc.com

Eckstein, G. (2016). Grammar correction in the writing centre: Expectations and experiences of monolingual and multilingual writers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(3), 360-382. doi:10.3138/cmlr.3605

Liu, P.E. (2016). These sentences sounded like me: Transformative accommodation in L2 writing. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 180-185). Colorado, Bolder: University Press of Colorado.

Myers, S. (2003). Reassessing the "proofreading trap": ESL tutoring and writing instruction. *The Writing Center Journal, 24* (1), 51-70.

Nakamaru, S. (2010). Lexical issues in writing center tutorials with international and US-educated multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(2), 95-113. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2010.01.001

Rafoth, B. (2015). *Multilingual writers and writing centers.* Colorado, Bolder: University Press of Colorado.

Séror, J. (2011). Alternative sources of feedback and second language writing development in university content courses. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(1), 118-143.

Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers & Composition*, *21*(2), 217-235. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003

Williams, J., & Severino, C. (2004). The writing center and second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(3), 165-172. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.010

Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(3), 173-201. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009

Yule, G. (2014). Gestures and sign language. *The study of language* (5th ed.) (200-211). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

About the Author

Victoria Ramirez Gentry is a graduate student at Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC). She is currently writing her master's thesis which focuses on multiracial identities and racial categories in the Harlem Renaissance. In addition to these interests, Victoria recently presented on ASL and L2 writers at the 2018 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Kansas City. While pursuing her degree, Victoria works part-time as a writing consultant and teaches first-year composition at TAMU-CC.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 42 – 57
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.04
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Deliberative Acts in Reclaiming Hays Street Bridge in San Antonio

Sonya Barrera Eddy
University of Texas at San Antonio

The Hays Street Bridge in San Antonio, Texas is a reclaimed public space that the community may access for family gatherings, wedding photography, poetry readings, dance, and art exhibits. The bridge was assembled from several other bridge parts, including a bridge that once served as a lifeline to marginalized neighborhoods cut off from the city center. Without bridges like the Hays Street Bridge, access to those neighborhoods, where the railway and other blue-collar individuals lived and worked, would be difficult, placing undue hardship on the community, and the city as a whole. This bridge provided access to places of employment for many, but the site fell into disuse and disrepair and was slated for demolition. However, the community that surrounds the bridge complex decided to reclaim this bridge as a public space, and, by so doing, not only saved the bridge as part of engineering history but also turned the bridge into a symbol of the revitalization efforts in south San Antonio.

The community-motivated revitalization effort was in direct opposition to other forms of revitalization, namely gentrification, which is typically led by corporations or individuals from outside of a community. The San Antonio Southside community resisted city government and big business investor plans to bring the bridge down. They reclaimed the historic Hays Street Bridge as a public space first, and second, renewed its relevance as a lifeline to marginalized, low socio-economic communities. These goals were met with the help of *Puentes de Poder* (PDP), a public education program organized by the Esperanza Peace and Justice Center (EPJC). PDP generated enough community engagement to galvanize community resistance and help sustain this reclamation effort. The program deliberately employed a rhetorical

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

strategy, which I connect with Chicana feminism, to serve a culturally specific goal: save the bridge for our community. The EPJC used their resources through PDP to straddle two opposing worlds in the city of San Antonio--city governance and marginalized communities--by building public excitement and interest in the bridge and ultimately by engaging public deliberations across many communities. The community education initiated by the EPJC was a deliberative act to fight against a more massive bureaucratic structure, city government, and big business for the benefit of marginalized communities in south San Antonio.

I begin by defining deliberation and deliberative acts. Deliberation about public spaces tends to include people who hold power in a city, such as city planners, government officials, and experts employed by the city to conduct specific research. This deliberation is often "open to the public" or performed for the public in scheduled talks or town meetings, where the public is invited to give input or to watch and witness such proceedings. However, to participate, members of the public must know when meetings occur, have access to transportation, and be able to attend. Any restrictions to such conditions are a cause for concern because these restrictions make the process of deliberation accessible only to privileged people who have knowledge, means, and access to such public forums. Deliberative acts are different, in that these acts are not limited or designated to be effective only in such formal public forums where individuals with access and privilege are the only ones who attend. In other words, deliberative acts are different from deliberation because deliberation usually occurs with equal individuals who hold power. Deliberative acts span multiple communities and varying degrees of power. Deliberative acts involve "speech acts," but are not limited to simple acts of speaking. Deliberative acts also may include all types of performance, including arts, photography, poetry, literature, and dance (Lyon 25). These acts are augmented by community education and allow for the performance of cultural difference as part of the deliberation process.

By adopting a Chicana feminist perspective, I investigate a culturally specific deliberative act, enacted by EPJC in its PDP effort to reclaim the Hays Street Bridge[1]. Examining the ways community education programs augment deliberative acts offers us a rhetorical understanding of how marginalized communities access and claim power through enactments of self and performance. The EPJC provided a safe space through PDP for people to stand up through art, poetry, music, drama, and literature. They educated the community on the ways in which they, and people like themselves,

[1] The EPJC is a social justice organization in south Texas that serves and helps many different historically marginalized populations, who do not always have the same access to power or forums for public address.

have been excluded from the process of shaping their own neighborhoods. PDP is a community education project steeped in deliberative acts that ignited the public deliberation which surrounded Hays Street Bridge. In an interview, Travis Sparks, lead engineer involved in the restoration of the Hays Street Bridge, states, "It is through their [EPJC] action that people got involved and were able to reinterpret the history of the bridge"(*NCPTT | Texas Dancehall Preservation and the Restoration of Hays Street Bridge (Podcast 30)*). We can learn about the role that community educational spaces and deliberative acts play in the process of public deliberation by examining the ways community education programs, like PDP, augment deliberation to expand ideas about public spaces through deliberative acts.

Community Actions as Deliberation

Coalition building and bridge building are important ideals from Chicana feminists. These ideals add to my understanding of deliberation and expand my rhetorical repertoire on what constitutes a deliberative act. Chicana feminist perspectives help me to see that community actions as forms of deliberation in which people resist and claim spaces by saying, "*we are here*!" Chicana feminists often use performance and artistic expression to gain access to public fora from which they were previously excluded, speaking back to the dominant culture that may not always be interested in hearing about the oppression of marginalized people. Thus, I connect how the EPJC, like Chicana feminists, provided a space for deliberative acts through PDP, giving marginalized people in the city of San Antonio access to public forums that not only allowed them to speak of their cultural difference but also change the world around them in significant ways.

In *Deliberative Acts: Democracy, Rhetoric, and Rights,* Arabella Lyon defines deliberative acts as speech acts, performance, or performativity that enact difference or perform cultural difference with the aim of transforming the material world in structural or formal ways (25). One of the benefits of deliberation is that it is not persuasion; yet, it is a more suitable concept for the twenty-first century because it emphasizes action (Lyon 25). Deliberative acts do not try to engage rhetors and interlocutors across a power divide as traditional persuasion does. In deliberation, no one person is "right" and the other "wrong," and no argument ensues where one person "wins" as the other individual's mind changes. Instead, as Lyon suggests, deliberation denotes a long and careful process of discussion and consideration; it enacts careful movement through thought; and, requires that everyone have equal power to access public space. Instead of trying to engage across a power divide

deliberative acts are implemented to build bridges and form relationships, so that those with and without power are acknowledged, as Lyon observes. Deliberative acts eliminate the argumentative stances so that a true deliberation in a literal public space can occur, especially in culturally significant places in the community, such as a centralized park or a social media platform. Unlike the traditional process of argumentation, deliberation is an action and such actions must be performed. Within a community, performance offers an opportunity to express cultural identity.

The PDP program was a tool for the EPJC to enable the expression of community cultural identity by offering ways for marginalized groups to access rhetoric as deliberative acts in part to engage community action. I build on Lyon's notion of deliberative acts, expanding our understanding of what "speech acts" are, to include not just speech but other forms of community actions. This syntactical change from "speech acts" to "actions" offers me an opportunity to investigate *all* actions that perform cultural identity in the EPJC's effort to save the Hays Street Bridge with their PDP program. The PDP represents a program that does not necessarily whitewash difference but draws attention to cultural difference, creating a "we" and an "I know you" moment in the community to bridge power dynamics and cultivate relationships between marginalized groups and those who hold power in the city of San Antonio.

As actions that perform cultural identity, deliberative acts as part of community engagement create a specific kairotic moment that can help to successfully reclaim spaces for public use, case in point Hays Street Bridge which was slated for destruction. Through the deliberative acts enacted by the PDP program, the EPJC empowered a community into action to create a safe space for marginalized communities by giving them access to the deliberation process. The EPJC has a reputation in the San Antonio community for building bridges and coalitions. One of the ways in which the EPJC built bridges between Black and Latinx communities affected by Hays Street Bridge was by holding a series of workshops through the PDP program. The flyer, reproduced in Figure 1, was distributed throughout the community and listed the goals of the workshop, which underscore the need to "meet for deep understanding and knowledge" as well as a recognition of "what makes a space public." By focusing on such an abstract term such as "public" and by acknowledging those communities who reside within the marginalized community, the flyer speaks to audiences that typically do not get to explore such questions "outside of the college classroom." Thus, the EPJC uses the flyer to embrace the ambiguity of the term "public" as well as to embrace the duality of mind. The flyer acts like a catalyst or a bridge to augment deliberation and ignite deliberative actions by individuals in marginalized communities. These individuals and communities are empowered to be part of a process that

previously excluded them. As a result, many diverse groups in San Antonio came together to voice concerns about the Hays Street Bridge.

To help establish the PDP program, the EPJC adopted five specific steps. These steps align with what Chicana feminist Gloria Anzaldúa's refers to as e*l camino de la mestiza*, or the mestiza's way. This path involves a series of steps that helped the PDP program serve as the catalyst for community engagement, igniting a deliberation in new places and new communities traditionally kept out of the deliberative process. In a later section, I go into further detail on how each step correlates with the PDP program, but for now, let me quickly introduce the steps. The first step in *el camino de la mestiza* is to take inventory and discover from where all the different "baggage" (Anzaldúa 104) comes. The second step is to "put history through a sieve" (Anzaldúa 104) to discover what is truth and what is fiction. The third step is to communicate a "conscious rupture with all oppressive traditions of all cultures and religions" (Anzaldúa 104). The fourth is to document the struggle so others have access to it. The fifth step reinterprets history and, using new symbols, shapes new myths, and adopts new perspectives towards the dark skinned, women, and queers (Anzaldúa 104). This last step is very particular to Anzaldúa's work; however, it expands when used by different mestizx and latinx communities. By adopting the steps from *el camino de la mestiza,* the EPJC used the PDP program to augment deliberation because the program acted as a catalyst for community engagement, bridging power gaps between communities of power, such as city governments where deliberation about public spaces normally occurs, and the marginalized communities that were directly impacted by the bridge closure. This augmentation of deliberation paves the way, so to speak, for the historical structure to be saved for both communities, those with power interested in preserving history and those without power who were interested in saving their communities. PDP empowered the voices of marginalized communities of color to engage in deliberative acts because it gave these individuals safe spaces where their identities were accepted and validated within the dominant discourse.

Reclaiming Hays Street Bridge through Community Engagement

Two discourses were present in the preservation of the Hays Street Bridge: those with power in community who use their expertise in deliberation and represent the dominant discourse and those who used deliberative acts which represent the subordinate discourse. The first discourse, that of expertise, was utilized by experts who get involved and petition city governments or other entities who have control for the preservation of historic places and spaces based a perceived importance to specific

histories. These individuals called on the preservation of the Hays Street Bridge as part of engineering history. The deliberation of the dominant discourse was ignited when well-known Texas engineer, Douglas Steadman, identified the historical significance of the truss structures of the bridge and was able to get the bridge designated as a historical engineering landmark through the American Society of Engineers. Those without power in a community and who organize to serve the community, like the EPJC, represent the subordinate discourse. The discourse was utilized by the communities that surrounded the bridge, members who called for its reclamation as a public space. Both discourses were instrumental in saving the bridge; however, the subordinate discourse enacted by the EPJC through the PDP program is what I see of value as deliberative acts from cultural community action.

Those who were part of the reclamation of Hays Street Bridge as a public space were not unaware of the discourses at work in the preservation of the bridge. In his podcast interview, Travis Sparks, chief engineer on the Hays street bridge restoration project, attributes its restoration to the grassroots organizations: "[P]eople have got to want to keep their old bridges and that's really the essence of keeping them and saving them even in the face of opposition from powerful entities like the state DOTs [Departments of Transportation] or the Federal Highway Administration, or the municipalities, or the railroads; whoever [sic] is pretty determined to replace things." This emphasis on the community and organization is the non-legalistic rhetoric that aided to save the bridge. As Sparks notes, community support played a vital role.

With the PDP program, the EPJC created a space where the community could come together to critically engage the dominant discourses at hand. Once the space was created, the community was given an overview of the discourses and power structures at work so that those affected members of the community could understand how the power imbalance was affecting their choices, or lack of choice, and what they could do that have say in the public deliberation. The combination of community education, deliberation, and *el camino de la mestiza* enacted by the PDP program created a space for culturally specific performances of deliberation to take place. To stir up community interest, the PDP program provided anyone with an internet connection the legal material, such as court documents about the bridge, that can often be hard to locate. In addition to efforts to educate the community, the PDP program initiated a media campaign to generate local media coverage about the bridge. PDP made sure the local communities were educated on ways that other communities had successfully dealt with similar situations. The community was then asked to share their specific stories and narratives of how they fit into the history of the city to reframe the discourse not just as a legalistic discourse, but as a community discourse. These acts

built momentum, spreading community-wide engagement that eventually culminated in the successful reclamation of the Hays Street Bridge as not only a historical designation but also as a public space for all to access.

Deliberative Acts in PDP

The rhetorical moves implemented by the PDP program are culturally specific deliberative acts that focus on the importance of community education. These moves aid in creating a safe space where deliberation can occur and where community excitement and understanding of what rhetorical agency is as well has how it is developed and used. To help with these goals, members of the EPJC relied on Chicana feminism. For instance, in 2015 the splash page for the Hays Street Bridge on the EPJC website described the bridge as a "public education project" to "create a space for people to meet on an ongoing basis to build an understanding of the reasons behind the struggles our communities face" (EPJC). This declaration aligns with *el camino de la mestiza.* Thus, the PDP program is an alternative education project for the community that, much like *el camino de la mestiza,* helped the latinx community (or other marginalized communities) come into consciousness to understand the controversy surrounding the Hays Street Bridge. In the next few pages I will analyze each step on *el camino de la mestiza,* manifestation of a culturally specific deliberative act, and how it was enacted by the EPJC in the PDP project in the rhetoric surrounding Hays Street Bridge.

Step One: Taking Inventory

An important part of empowerment is for members of marginalized communities to become aware of and acknowledge the existing power structures that affect their lives. As a community education program, PDP offered a safe place for community members to confront and recognize the difficult observation that power distribution is not always equal let alone equitable. "Taking inventory" cannot be done in isolation; there must be a cultural safe place for this recognition to occur. Taking inventory of and discovering the different "baggage" that each party brings to a rhetorical situation is the first step on *el camino de la mestiza.* By taking personal inventory and discovering the types of strengths and weaknesses, each individual rhetor as well as different parts of the community bring to the discourse, the power structures that move in a city are not only visible but hopefully acknowledged and understood by those that are being affected.

Figure 1: Puedes de Poder Flyer

Education is important so that individuals and communities can understand their own struggles as well as those of others around them. The first step on the road of *el camino de la mestiza* is examining our baggage or "taking inventory." Taking inventory means deciding what we know and what we need to know. This step that includes a deliberative pause is often taken for granted because it seems to happen without effort. However, in problem solving if we do not put in a conscious effort and we omit this step in the process of deliberation, then the results often result in hastily made decisions. The PDP helped the community to collectively take inventory by offering classes that guided participants to consider the different questions about power, communities, city planning, and public spaces that they should be asking regarding the Hays Street Bridge. The program offered participants a way to answer questions such as: "Why are some parts of town poor while others are rich? Why are some voices given more access to the political process? How can we change these things?" The answers to these questions were ones that the participants in the community created together as a group through deliberative acts and public

engagement. A college campus has historically been such a safe space where students are expected to critically analyze the world around them. The EPJC flyer in figure 1 points out that for many individuals who do not attend college, there is no such space or place where they have the chance for critical analysis and observation in their daily lives. The EPJC acknowledges the lack of space for critical analysis in Figure 1, paragraph 2, line 1, noting "while we get to explore these questions if we have access to college classrooms, we seldom get the time or the space in our daily working lives." The PDP itself became the vehicle that created a deliberative space where the community could engage in sifting through their baggage.

Step Two: Separating Truth from Fiction

One of the ways that the PDP put history through a sieve and separated truth from fiction was to expose residents to stories of what communities can do when they pull together. The entire project was kicked off on 23 March 2013 with a screening of the documentary on the bridge itself, *The Garden*. The documentary narrates the story of an urban farm that began as a community garden in Los Angeles. The farm was created and worked on by the Latinx community until the owner of the land decided that the community could not use it anymore. It describes the diverse ways the community came together to try to save their garden. The story was meant to inspire residents as well as let them know that, through organizing, people who feel marginalized and powerless can take on forces that threaten their communities and environments. The EPJC used PDP as a rhetorical strategy throughout six sessions that focused on the Hays Street Bridge as a case study. Focusing on the bridge allowed space for community members, as well as activists and historians, to weed out the truth from the fiction in the discourse surrounding the bridge.

Step Three: A Conscious Rupture

Another session that was meant to cause excitement around the bridge was a session about the history of "land grabs," with examples of current land grabs along with a screening of the 1991 film, *City of Hope*. *City of Hope* is a fictional film about land development in an American city. The developer is encouraging an owner to set fire to his apartments to make room for a major commercial development. In the film, the owner experiences the different power dynamics, corruption, and politics of city government. Both sessions that included screenings of *The Garden* and *City of Hope* represented the sieve where the community was able to sift for themselves through

fact and fiction and filter what they knew as a group. Both sessions were two parts of a single whole as facilitators highlighted what tends to be remembered and erased from history and public memory as well as who usually gets marginalized.

Community education is usually aimed at informing the community about an issue as well as gaining media and other kinds of attention. Another important part of PDP was the panel discussion on economic development that included politicians, educators, and community organizers. Panels are typical rhetorical fora employed by community activists. According to a guide created by Action.org, a panel is a community forum where anyone can attend. It is comprised of a group of experts who speak on a topic followed by a question and answer session. It is designed to allow people to learn about an issue and to recruit activists. The guide notes that "community forums can be a very effective way to raise awareness in your community and to get people involved in an issue" (*action.org).* So, the third session was not one that was a unique cultural expression; rather, it represents a common rhetorical move in activist communities.

The fourth session was culturally specific because it focused on gentrification, which often disproportionately affects people of color. This fourth session took place at the EPJC and included a film screening of the 2012 film, *My Brooklyn,* followed by a discussion with the director. *My Brooklyn,* a documentary film, portrays the perspective of a person involved with gentrification: "Director Kelly Anderson's personal journey as a Brooklyn gentrifier" (*IMDB*). What makes this panel unique is that the director in her documentary and discussion is performing her own journey as a gentrifier and allowing people to question her about it. By performing from her cultural perspective, in this case as a gentrifier, she is performing a deliberative act that allows people to recognize the other and draw connections between her experience in Brooklyn and the controversy surrounding the Hays Street Bridge in San Antonio. The EPJC not only facilitated this moment of bridge building and recognition, but also had its representatives document this rupture as part of the rhetorical moves of *el camino de la mestiza*.

Step Four: Documenting the Rupture

A narrative session called *Eastside Stories* was held on 5 October 2013. This event consisted of community leaders, artists, engineers, historians, and community members gathering to share stories about the bridge to gain more widespread community support for the fight against the City and for the preservation of the bridge per the original agreement. To continue to inspire the community and draw various

members together that could not attend the event in person, it was recorded and made available to the public for viewing by NowCastSA. NowCastSA is a non-profit organization dedicated to local news and information that "works similarly to public television" (*NowCastSA*) to "promote and facilitate an inclusive civic conversation by empowering neighbors to identify common issues and share information through education, training, community news, events, and multimedia" (*NowCastSA*).

It is the sharing of *testimonio*[2] and *memoria*[3] of the struggles surrounding the bridge that became deliberative acts, performative events that facilitated moments of recognition allowing for greater understanding of the different members of the community. It is through the community engagement and understanding that is produced through the rhetorical acts of *testimonio* and *memoria* that deliberation is augmented. PDP invited speakers from various cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds to speak about the history and impact of the bridge on the community, underscoring how their history and stories were valued alongside those of the bridge. By valuing the story of the people and tying them to the history of the bridge, the railroad, and the city brought the community together, giving equal importance to each. The rhetorical use of *testimonio* and *memoria* drew together the African American, the working-class people of color, railroad history, and engineering communities and united them around the single focal point of Hays Street Bridge.

The uniting of diverse communities through the rhetorical acts of *memoria* and of *testimonio* took place at Lockwood Park at the PDP event called *Eastside Stories*, which included talks that were deliberative acts rooted in mestizx consciousness. The event included stories told by invited speakers from varying cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. Invited speakers included founding members of the Hays Street Bridge Restoration group Nettie Hinton, Gary Houston, and Douglas Steadman. B.L. Mier, San Antonio Railroad History Museum; Rosemary Catacalos, 2013 Poet Laureate of

---

[2] *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Research* defines *testimonio* as "first-person narration of socially significant experiences in which the narrative voice is that of a typical or extraordinary witness or protagonist who metonymically represents others who have lived through similar situations and who have rarely given written expression to them. *Testimonio* then is the "literature of the nonliterary" involving both electronic reproductions, usually with the help of an interviewer/editor, and the creative reordering of historical events in a way that impresses as representative and "true" and that often projects toward social transformation. (1119)

[3] *Memoria* is the Spanish word for memory, but it is more than memories. In his piece "Memoria Is a Friend of Ours," Victor Villanueva notes that *memoria* in our Western rhetorical understanding is the mother of the muses, the most important of rhetorical offices. He notes that "memory is tied to voice" and that having a voice or having your voice heard is particularly important to people of color. Villanueva mentions some of the many academics of color that write about the "connections between narratives by people of color and the need to reclaim a memory" (12) as well as the need to reclaim a memory built through generations.

Texas; John Knight, retired engineer from the Texas Department of Transportation; and San Antonio residents Steve Cervantez, and Beatrice Valadez.

The historically working-class community and those of people of color were engaged in the history of the bridge by the introduction of the first speaker, Nettie Hinton. Ms. Hinton is a woman of color, who shared her memories as a fourth-generation Eastside resident. Her stories were those of an African American woman growing up in the Jim Crow segregated South while living in the neighborhood that surrounded the Hays Street Bridge. She reminded the listeners that she is the descendant of an emancipated slave and detailed her family's purchasing of property, as well as detailing some of the unrecognized history of the area as a rich multicultural community. She also spent time illuminating the role of Chinese merchants in the area. As a person of color, she shared her *testimonio* and *memoria* of the bridge.

Another person invited to share a story was B. L. Mier from the San Antonio Railroad History Museum. The members of the community that are interested in railroad history is diverse, but the representative who spoke, Mr. Mier, is a white gentleman who shared from the perspective of a railroad enthusiast and read some accounts of what happened on the railroad. His testimony was not personal in nature, nor was it true *testimonio*. His rhetoric reflects dominant cultural understanding of the Western rhetorical concept of legalistic testimony. He provided testimony or evidence of the importance of the bridge by highlighting its role in the railroads.

Legalistic rhetoric was provided by John Knight, a retired engineer from the Texas Department of Transportation. He provided the history of the railroad, those who lived and worked on the railroad, and the importance of the bridge in the railroad community. His testimony veered into *testimonio* when he explained the importance of the bridge to allow the free flow of traffic when trains were stopped on the tracks, sometimes for up to thirty minutes.

However, one of the most important talks was given by Douglas Steadman, who interrupted the community perception created by the media to highlight different truths that unknown to many people in the community. The EPJC documented this struggle by video, making them available online. Stedman's narrative detailed the donation of the land by BudCo, and the origination of the restoration group. He told the assembled people how the City agreed to accept the land and hold it for public use and then later, the new city council agreed to sell the land to a private brewery for development in exchange for $800,000 in taxpayer money. He also noted that the "Esperanza [EPJC] group have been very helpful in our putting our case before the community and the city, and we are now involved in a lawsuit to see that property

returns to its rightful owners." By "rightful owners," he is referring to the public who owns the history.

Step Five: Reinterpreting for Inclusion

The PDP used performative action to reinterpret for inclusion. Performative action is another rhetorical strategy that can be used to initiate community engagement. The session of PDP billed as a "Performative Action Event" occurred directly on the Hays Street Bridge. Called *Right to the City*, the performative action was designed to inform and engage the community with a discussion of alternative solutions as well as dance performances by well-known activist dance groups and artist/activists including Zombie Bazaar[4] and artist/activist Fabiola Torralba[5]. The event foreshadowed other performance related public events that would take place on the bridge in the future. It was literally the corporeal bodies of these dancers, their flesh, that which created the public space of the bridge and created and idea of the community as empowered. Torralba described her dance as one that demonstrated the "power of story and the power of people coming together" stating that she "facilitates opportunities for movers of all backgrounds to create and engage in issues that affect their everyday lives" (Torralba). The dance and performative work of reimagining the space for inclusion is exactly what the U.S. Department of Arts and Culture[6] (USDAC), says that culture and art do for the greater public. I end this section with the USDAC tagline "Together, we create the world we wish to inhabi.t," This tagline is a statement of values that include the following self-evident truths: "Culture is a human right. Culture is created by everyone. Cultural diversity is a social good and the wellspring of free expression. Culture is the sum-total of public, private, individual, and collective action. The work of artists is a powerful resource for community development, education,

[4] Zombie Bazaar call themselves a "Panza Fusion group." Originally a duo that has grown to a "troupe of 11 womyn," Zombie Bazaar fuses tribal belly dance with various other genres. Their website also states that they are a "fusing of talent, creativity and homenaje a su cultura Xicana," making it clear that it is the cultural Xicana that led to the creation of the dance troupe. The term "Xicana" here is used to signify the queer Chicana feminist ideology. The group is dedicated to activism and "luchando por la causa [fighting for the cause] through movement" ("Zombie Bazaar Panza Fusion").

[5] Fabiola Torralba is an artist and activist who declares she is "choreographer, educator, and activist" who is dedicated to "the transformation and empowerment of our communities"("Fabiolatorralba")..

[6] Their website states "The US Department of Arts and Culture (USDAC) is the nation's newest people-powered department, founded on the truth that art and culture are our most powerful and under-tapped resources for social change. Radically inclusive, useful and sustainable, and vibrantly playful, the USDAC aims to spark a grassroot, creative change movement, engaging millions in performing and creating a world rooted in empathy, equity, and social imagination."

healthcare, protection of our commonwealth, and other democratic public purposes" ("The USDAC")

Conclusion

By examining how the EPJC in the PDP project not only brought the community into the discussion but also augmented the deliberation, we can learn how to reframe argument for inclusion of people who are marginalized and historically kept out of deliberation. Inclusion was critical to the success of reclaiming a historical bridge. Inclusion is also critical for our success in a multicultural world. In this case study, I noted how saving bridges for history is often difficult because few people are interested and affected by engineering history. However, many people were affected by lack of access to public space and to pieces of history of marginalized communities. It was by allowing culturally specific forms of deliberation and community engagement that the bridge was saved.

I explained the ways that the community education program augmented the deliberation process and how the steps of the process of *el camino de la mestiza* came together to give new life to the marginalized communities who live and work near the Hays Street Bridge in San Antonio. I have also outlined the rhetorical contribution of Chicana feminists who have demonstrated one of the ways that community engagement can be an agent of social change by using a rhetorical process called *el camino de la mestiza*/the mestiza way. I analyzed the process by examining the community education project called *Puentes de Poder* (PDP) project to understand how creating a space for public education where people gain a deep understanding of how their community is being affected by decisions as well as finding a space for that community to come together to vocalize their needs.

Community education is a significant part of the culturally specific deliberative acts enacted by latinx and mestizx communities like the Esperanza Peace and Justice Center (EPJC) that use culturally specific strategies such as *el camino de la mestiza*. It is organizations like the EPJC that make safe spaces for the community to come together and find voice. Their community education project enabled deliberative acts that ruptured traditional approaches to activism as well as conventional strategies for community engagement. It is the new understanding of the significance of the bridge in the community creates new narratives. The Hays Street Bridge is now a symbol of community power in San Antonio. It represents a daily reminder of how the entire community with all its intersectional and multicultural perspectives came together and engaged in deliberative acts. Those acts fueled interest in the bridge and gave members

of marginalized communities a safe center from where they could speak back to power. Community education empowered marginalized groups to negotiate with the public discourse of politicians and community activists. PDP and the EPJC created a space where the people are empowered and find the strength and understanding to act and stand firm in the face of large bureaucratic systems that are not meant to work in their favor.

Works Cited

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: La Frontera*, Aunt Lute Books, San Francisco, 1999.

NCPTT | Texas Dancehall Preservation and the Restoration of Hays Street Bridge (Podcast 30). Retrieved from https://www.ncptt.nps.gov/blog/patrick-sparks-talks-about-texas-dancehall-preservation-inc-and-the-restoration-of-hay-street-bridge/ Web. 15 November 2011.

"How to Organize a Community Forum." Retrieved from http://*www.action.org* Web. 12 August 2017.

Lloyd, Moya. *Beyond Identity Politics: Feminism, Power and Politics.* Sage, London, 2005.

Lyon, Arabella. *Deliberative Acts: Democracy, Rhetoric, and Rights*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Pa, 2013.

"Poder del Pueblo" *Our Work* Esperanza Peace and Justice Center. Retrieved from http://esperanzacenter.org/our-work/poder-del-pueblo/. Web. 30 September 2016.

"Stories of the Hays Street Bridge" *NowCastSA.* Retrieved from http://nowcastsa.com/blogs/stories-hays-st-bridge. Web. 5 October 2013.

Sparks, S. Patrick. "Rehabilitation of the Historic Hays Street Viaduct in San Antonio, Texas." ASCE Structures Congress, Austin, TX 2009.

Torralba, Fabiola. "fabiolatorralba dance.community.engagement" Retrieved from https://fabiolatorralba.wordpress.com/ Web. 13 November 2016.

United States Department of Arts and Culture *USDAC.* Retrieved from http://usdac.us/statement-of-values Web. 13 November 2016

Villanueva, Victor. "Memoria Is a Friend of Ours: On the Discourse of Color." *College English*, vol. 67, no. 1, 2004, pp. 9-19.

Zombie Bazaar. "Panzafusion Belly Dance of San Antonio." Retrieved from http://www.zombiebazaar.org/ Web. 13 November 2016.

About the Author

Sonya Barrera Eddy is a Ph.D. Candidate at the University of Texas at San Antonio. She holds an MA in Creative Writing/Writing from Our Lady of the Lake University and a BA in Creative Writing from University of Arizona. Her work centers around the intersection of art, rhetoric, and writing with a focus on the way marginalized communities employ art and community education in deliberative contexts.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online).

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 58 – 81
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.05
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Professionalization *in vivo*: Graduate Students on Facebook

Christopher D. M. Andrews, Ph.D.
Texas A&M-Corpus Christi

This study describes how doctoral students make use of Facebook as a professional academic tool rather than just a social network. A social networking site (SNS) primarily seen either as a plaything or a cultural cesspit—better for sharing pictures with grandma or biased news articles with friends—Facebook also opens up opportunities for graduate students to access networks of scholars, learn to inhabit academic roles, and gain entrance to professional communities. These activities are part of the students' professionalization: the process by which young or pre-professionals learn to adopt values, norms, and skills as they join professional communities. Much more than on-the-job training and learning where the best parking is or when to pick up the tab, professionalization is a normative process whereby individuals learn to understand work beyond particular job duties in a single institution—it is engaging with and behaving as a member of a culture. The methods and practices involved in this kind of "enculturation of the individual into a system of practice" (Polin, 2010, p. 164) has long been a topic in writing studies (Miller, Brueggemann, Blue, & Shepherd, 1997; Ebest, 1999; McNabb, 2001), but researchers are only just beginning to examine the role of social media in the professionalization process.

Researchers in composition, computers and writing, and technical communication have begun to explore social networking sites' value for professionalization and mentoring. SNSes such as Facebook are powerful interpersonal communication tools (Pigg, 2014) as well as spaces where participants experiment with and establish identity (Buck, 2012). Even more, Facebook, Twitter,

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

and other sites have become significant tools graduate students and academics employ to manage their own professionalization. Leon and Pigg (2011) have focused on graduate students' use of social media to perform theoretical concepts they learn about and to understand various writing roles they must inhabit, while Coad (2017) described how graduate students used Twitter backchannels at conferences to make a name for themselves in the field. Faris and Moore (2017) argued that engaging through social media is risky—fraught with complexity and tension as young professionals navigate public and private networks, careers, and communication. Contemporary users are familiar with social networking sites being fraught with frustrating political and social exchanges, a result of overlap and collapse of boundaries that typifies networked public life. Still, Faris and Moore remind us that engaging on social media is also "increasingly important for success and sustenance" (p. 54), a point reflected in the interviews I will report on. Adding to that larger conversation, this study emphasizes the special importance social media holds for students in distance programs, who may not feel like they have the same opportunity to access to professional academic community and culture as face-to-face students.

Distance learning is becoming an increasingly important and popular mode of delivery for graduate schools. According to Digital Learning Compass' 2017 *Distance Education Enrollment Report,* both public and private nonprofit universities have shown consistent enrollment growth in graduate distance programs since 2012[1]. As graduate degrees delivered entirely online grow in number, where does professional enculturation occur? Professional enculturation occurs in myriad locations and various contexts: conversations with other graduate students; shared work and study spaces; service as research assistants or collaborators; observations of faculty interactions and performance in committee, service, and scholarly work; the impromptu office drop-in; social gatherings like the department Christmas party; meetings to go over that IRB draft just one more time; or conversations and academic behaviors seen and heard in hallways and public spaces. These experiences make up a kind of ambient, tacit experience. Such experience—generally provided by residence requirements but

[1] According to data from the U. S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), from 2012-2015, graduate distance enrollments increased by 18.1% at public and private non-profit institutions. Over the same time, undergraduate distance enrollments increased by 9.6%; this growth was exclusively at public and non-profit schools; private for-profit enrollments fell over the same period (Allen & Seaman, 2017). NCES reported that in 2011-2012, 18% of graduate students in the U.S. were enrolled in entirely online programs, and 36% of graduate students took at least one distance education class (Kena et al, 2016).

potentially missing from online programs—not only reinforces the norms, expectations, and behaviors of disciplines, but also enculturates graduate students by giving them a space in which to practice being professional academics. The open path to education afforded by online programs comes with a risk: potential lack of access to the people responsible for helping students inhabit new roles.

My purpose in this study is to highlight the ways in which graduate students deploy Facebook as a tool for cultivating professional networks and engage in self-sponsored moments of professionalism and mentoring. Reporting on the results of eight interviews with graduate students and recent Ph.D.s from online and face-to-face programs, I describe graduate students' use of Facebook as a professional and academic tool rather than just a social experience. Findings are oriented around four major themes: 1) their range of overall attitudes about social media, 2) the multiple education-related purposes for which they deployed Facebook, 3) their experiences using Facebook for professional development and mentoring, and 4) their feelings about mixing personal and professional networks. Participants' comments made clear that social networking sites mediated graduate school for online and face-to-face students alike. However, for distance students Facebook played an especially valuable role in opening access to their program and institution, helping them develop professional identities, navigate the complexities of their discipline, and gain agency as scholars. For all of the distance Ph.D. students in this study, Facebook augmented their graduate education in powerful, positive ways.

Social Media & Professionalization

Social media—and social networking sites in particular—are much more than spaces where writers can practice writing to different and multiple audiences. The constructivist, collaborative nature of these sites makes them valuable for professionalization, and they have been used to augment existing graduate student communities, making visible the networked, rather than solely isolated, nature of academic work. Digital spaces do more than simply mediate multi-author projects: they highlight the value of maintaining and building collaborative relationships (Ridolfo et al, 2011, p. 135). Eyman, Sheffield, and DeVoss (2010) called for academics to take advantage of networking tools like blogs, wikis, and social networking websites to show that learning to create knowledge in disciplinary communities—learning to be a scholar—occurs in collaborative, supportive, and facilitative networks, even when we conform to the "fiction of the originary genius" (p. 49). The research networks they described—which mixed online and face-to-face interactions—fostered

legitimate community, taught skills, and developed critical engagement that graduate students need to learn to engage rigorously in their profession (p. 56).

Social media sites' most important function may be making relationships and entire networks visible. Buck (2012) has shown how social networking sites are woven into everyday life; these networked digital environments profoundly shape users' experiences and are core literacy spaces for the people that use them. As they shape profiles and write to interact with others, users continually and very literally author themselves into being (Brooke, 2009). This sort of constructed social self is not specific to digital social networks, but an important factor of those networks is that they "not only promote decentered exchange but also frequently make social and intertextual connections visible and immediate, and indicate where relationships might exist" (Pigg, 2014, p. 70). That is, the network is not simply a metaphor, but observable in lists, profile descriptions, and typed, threaded conversations. Network visualization of this kind plays an important role in graduate students' process of professionalization—an increasingly important role for graduate students educated in fully online and low-residency programs. By watching members of professional networks engage on social networking sites, these students are able to see community norms, activities, and professional roles—nuances that are not revealed in online class interactions.

In order to become knowledge makers, graduate students depend on tacit professionalizing moments, collaborative experiences, and established, sustained relationships with mentors through a variety of interactions. These moments have predominantly been fulfilled by face-to-face residence requirements but seem to be impossible to replicate in distance education programs (Davis, Harding, & Mascle, 2010). Although synchronous class meetings can go "a very long way" (p. 308) toward alleviating asynchronous coursework's lack of physical space, a sizeable gap still remains: how do distance students professionalize? With this issue in mind, I take up the following research questions:

- What social, educational, and professional roles do digital social networks play for graduate students, both in traditional residential programs and fully online and low-residency programs?
- In what ways do digital social networks help mitigate the physical gap produced by distance graduate education?

Methods

Participants and Recruitment

To recruit participants for this IRB-approved study, I made a broad call for participants on Facebook through groups such as WPA-GO, as well as through disciplinary LISTSERVS such as WPA-L. One problem with the literature on professionalization, as Leon and Pigg (2011) pointed out, is that horror stories are more abundant than research studies, and "there are few stories about how graduate students approach the problems and tensions of professionalizing" (p. 5). To get a variety of perspectives on social media use, I adopted some of Leon and Pigg's methodological choices about sampling and interview methods and attempted to gather responses that represented different distribution points in graduate study.

From a large pool of respondents, I selected eight individuals in an attempt to look across an array of program modalities and stages in their degree and professionalization process. Participants included recent Ph.D. graduates within one year of completion, doctoral candidates, and one doctoral student at the beginning of his program. I also selected one participant from an Ed.D. program, in order to compare her responses to the other participants, all in Ph.D. programs in rhetoric or writing studies. I was interested in discussing the experiences of online and traditional programs, so I selected participants that represented a range of modalities; I interviewed three individuals from fully online programs, two with a hybrid program, and three from traditional, face-to-face programs.

As shown in Table 1, these participants, identified with pseudonyms, came from a range of academic positions, programs, and disciplines. The small number of participants in this study is not without limitations: only two different online graduate programs are represented in the sample, while four traditional programs are represented. Also, because some of the respondents had recently completed their degree and were speaking retrospectively, including data from time-use diaries (see Hart-Davidson, 2007) was not feasible. Although limited in scale, the findings do point to interesting contrasts in the experiences and social media usage patterns of face-to-face with online graduate students. A description of the experiences of these eight participants also provides a set of baseline narratives upon which future scholarship might expand.

Table 1: Participant Profiles

Pseudonym	**Steve**	**Jason**	**Rene**	**Dave**	**Claire**	**Robert**	**Veronica**	**Caitlin**
Status	PhD Student	PhD Graduate	PhD Candidate	PhD Graduate	PhD Candidate	PhD Graduate	EdD Candidate	PhD Candidate
Field	English, Tech, & Media	Tech Comm	Tech Comm	Tech Comm	Tech Comm	Comp & Rhetoric	Higher Ed	Rhetoric & Writing
Program Modality	Online	Online	Online	Hybrid	Hybrid	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional

Data collection and analysis

Interviews were conducted via Skype instant messaging and were 45-90 minutes in length. Interview questions (see Appendix A) attempted to 1) establish participants' experiences with social media and education in general as well as 2) gather details of their experiences using social media for educational or professionalizing purposes as a graduate student or junior faculty member. During these semi-structured conversations, I used an interview script to invite participants to talk broadly about their attitudes toward and purposes for social networking, following up in the moment with more specific questions about social media in coursework, collaboration, professional identity, and mentoring. Interview questions also encouraged participants to talk about their level of engagement and sense of culture or community in their programs. Since interviews took place via text, no transcription was necessary. After archiving the Skype chats in text format and removing identifying data, I deleted these chats from my messaging history.

In his *Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, Saldaña (2013) pointed out that there is no final authority or "best way" to analyze qualitative data, an approach that is similar to Koerber and McMichael's 2008 discussion of sampling in technical communication research. Any approach to coding and analysis must be rhetorical and iterative. Using qualitative coding methods rooted in an emic approach (Black, 1980), I analyzed and coded descriptively, forming *in vivo* codes by looking for common terms emerging from the data to gather as themes (Saldaña, 2013) and then returning to the data in multiple passes to look for places where the data pushed back against those themes. Since my interview questions encouraged participants to reflect on roles, purposes, and tensions in graduate professionalization, I paid specific attention to participants' descriptions of their experiences with Facebook and the particular roles of this SNS in their graduate experiences.

Findings

Relying on the ability of social networks to establish presence, most of the participants in this study reported rich moments of professional development and mentoring at some point in their education. For all interview participants, Facebook use in particular circumscribed their experiences of graduate school, and was a valued source of agency for multiple purposes, whether doing research or keeping tabs on a cohort, writing group, or advisor. These findings reveal that although these individuals' specific attitudes towards social media vary and tension between professional and personal networking does exist, in general participants remained positive about social networks, actively deploying them to understand and engage with their profession. Participants from distance graduate programs in particular felt that their graduate experience would have been fundamentally different without Facebook and other forms of SNS-mediated augmentations.

1. Overall attitude toward Facebook and social media

Seven of the eight participants joined Facebook between 2006 and 2008, most of them citing exigencies connected to graduate school. They were often curious about the then-new and much-buzzed-about website, but all seven said their earliest uses were specifically related to graduate school. The outlier here was Veronica, a doctoral candidate who joined in 2004 as an undergraduate, because, as she said, it was "what college students were doing" that year.

All eight participants described Facebook and social media as important and valuable spaces for connecting to others in ways relevant to their graduate studies, though not all of them were entirely positive about those experiences. Caitlin, a PhD candidate in composition, described a sort of love-hate relationship with the site that readers will no doubt find familiar.

The rest of the participants in the study described social media in largely positive terms, playing roles in classroom, development, and social realms. Steve, a Ph.D. student in English, described the way that social networking sites vitally mediated every aspect of his education: "As a distance student, social media (FB) plays a role in most of my academic interactions, including workshops and professional development opportunities. They are used instrumentally and transformationally." Claire noted that "Talking to (or seeing posts and comments from) other folks in academia--whether professors in my field, profs in my program, recent graduates, or ABD folks in the trenches is so helpful, satisfying, enjoyable."

Some participants commented on the fragmentary, tangential way of making connections that social networking sites allowed. For Dave, a graduate from a hybrid program in technical communication, social media provided him with "a short glimpse of belonging" that supported him as he built relationships and became engaged in the community of his graduate program. Robert, a graduate of a composition and rhetoric program, referred to "overlapping points of connection":

> A post to listserv leads to email contact, yields a Facebook friendship, leads to a conference proposal; a friendship f2f [face-to-face] with someone who moves away leads to a Facebook series of message that provide friendship reinforcement. I use it to maintain and create connections with people of interest to me. (Robert)

Caitlin was the only person interviewed that reported strong negative feelings about Facebook professionalization. For her, there was a powerful tension in Facebook use:

> It [Facebook] makes me feel more depressed and anxious and unworthy than I already do because I realize that people post pictures and info about things they are doing that are exceptional … and I haven't taken a vacation in 8 [years]. (Caitlin)

Although the site provided vital augmentations for her academic life, helped her research agenda, and enhanced her feeling of connectedness to the discipline, it often made her incredibly anxious about her social life.

2. Graduate purposes for Facebook

Professional development activity is important for graduate students. As Leon and Pigg noted, "Seemingly disparate objects and activities have to be connected in order for people to learn what it means to do the work of participating in academic communities" (2011, p. 3). This kind of activity is mediated in significant ways by social media networks.

In large part, interviewees described the most important benefit of Facebook in the general terms of networking with others, both inside and beyond their academic programs. Community-building and, for some students, discovering professional mentors, were central activities. Participants from fully online and hybrid commonly described taking an active role in building relationships with members of their cohort

and program via sites like Facebook, and through email lists and other media in order to have interaction. Participants in online programs described social media networks as avenues for emotional affirmation and support more often than those in face-to-face programs. Interviewees were also asked about using social networking sites as backchannels: non-sanctioned conversations about an organized activity in a secondary, synchronous channel, such as an unofficial chat in which a group of students can comment on a course during class meetings without the knowledge of the instructor. Among this group, there was no reported backchanneling for courses, and only limited SNS use at conferences. (Expectations around participating in official and quasi-official conference backchannel communication, such as conference Twitter hashtags, have grown rapidly since this study took place.)

For participants from all kinds of programs, Facebook played a role in the research process. Jason referred to this role as "bootstrapping [himself] into a research agenda." Facebook provided a good space to ask a question about a new area or what kind of existing research would be a good place to begin and gather responses, citations, and direction from professionals across the network. For Caitlin, Facebook was important as a research site; she used groups to recruit participants, gather data, and maintain relationships related to her agenda.

A common thread for participants from online programs was that social networking sites "circumscribed [their] graduate experience." The site facilitated all types of interactions, including professional development, working with professors and committee members, and connecting with mentors. As Steve noted,

> I am fully and enthusiastically mediated by these (and other) socially networked technologies. Facebook has been vital to community building, both personal and academic/professional. Without FB, I would be having a very different experience. In fact, I probably would not have stayed in the program as a distance student without it. (Steve)

This productive role—and in particular Facebook's role in staying in the program—was also noted by Jason: "I COULD NOT have completed the degree without that online interaction. We relied on each other, we were always there, we were always sharing ideas, brainstorming, etc." Claire, a student in a hybrid program who identified strongly with fully online students, called Facebook a "lifeline" for online students, in particular for "ABD folks in the trenches." For her and Jason in particular, Facebook provided mediation for writing groups, creativity, and productivity as well as being the major way to really know their fellow online students as whole people with interests,

sense of humor. While both online and face-to-face students noted that they would not be able to imagine their graduate education without these mediated networks, online students had the clearest sense of how their experiences might have been different.

While online students used social media to connect with colleagues and faculty within their programs, traditional students established and maintained relationships beyond the boundaries of their program. They found the tool advantageous for forming distant writing groups and finding mentors, especially in the difficult transition from graduate student to first-year professors. While he was in his program, Robert interacted with committee members and other students through Facebook, but put much more value on distant (and persistent) networking:

> Online, the most important interactions have been with other grad students from other places who I knew and interacted with mostly through Facebook. Some of these relationships persisted in interesting ways post-grad school. For example, a group of folks that match this description have been a part of a writing group we formed a year ago as the five of us were beginning our first year in assistant prof gigs. (Robert)

Facebook also provided the opportunity to see shared experiences with graduate students and young professionals outside of the home program. As Veronica noted:

> I've also become friends with some relatively new academics (people that are like 1-2 years out of grad school) and they are awesome sources of news, support, and encouragement. So that's something that's fun as well. (Veronica)

Caitlin described mentoring as a particular area for her, both as a teacher and as a scholar. While her mentors at her university were "amazing," she also took advantage of being allowed to "'stalk' people with research interests and jobs I really want." Whether seeking participation in an academic community (rather than solely social interaction with friends) or networking beyond the boundaries of specific academic programs, Facebook was valuable for the connective work of professionalizing.

3. Professionalism "in vivo"

A common theme in the literature on social networking sites and professionalization is access to interactions with professionals: what Claire called "grown up" academics. Just as *in vivo* coding analyzes discourse "out of life" and works from a participant's

own terms to create meaning, social networking sites allowed participants to observe and engage with professionals mediated by the everyday text of Facebook. Rather than attending professional development sessions, social networking sites allowed graduate students to watch and experiment with "being professional." The "potential of interacting with important scholars" (Coad, 2017 p. 58) is one of the important motivating features for graduate students to curate an online presence, and this sort of interaction is the basis for much advice about how to construct and maintain one's profile online (Buck, 2012; Faris & Moore, 2016). This theme emerged in interviews: Dave compared social networking sites to "a letter of introduction" while Caitlin cited Facebook's welcoming power as a powerful advantage:

> I didn't know that I could discuss scholars' arguments with them but Facebook opens the door to correspondence, maybe like seeing these people at conferences also does, but I was never able to approach a speaker after a conference presentation. I felt like they would be too tired. (Caitlin)

The speed and openness of this access was valuable too, as Jason points out:

> FB broadened my view of TC [technical communication] by allowing me to quickly become friends—not using scare quotes—with other folks in the field. Since we're all such digital people, I think TCers tend to not care so much about whether a person is a f2f friend or an online friend. (Jason)

Another particular affordance of social networking sites is that its users "gain access to existing communities of practice" (Pigg 2014, p. 70). Caitlin applied this strategy to her own writing, turning her network into a teacher: "I didn't know I could ask a captive group of writing studies scholar-teachers about writing strategies, for example but Facebook allowed me to do that."

Communities of practice become not just accessible, but visible, allowing users to observe the field as a field, to note norms for behavior: not cute advice about how much to drink (or not) at conferences, but larger questions about how to handle job markets or tenure processes. These networks provide access to who is working on what well before publications and proceedings come out—networks and relations within fields and subfields become present in conversation threads rather than just citation chains. Social networking sites, according to boyd and Ellison, "enable users to articulate and make visible their social networks" (2007, p. 211). Dave, for example, pointed out that Facebook gave him much the same opportunity as being in the room with people in the field. Facebook gave him:

> The ability to watch, observe, and interact with people digitally as a means to support and enhance my understanding of the implicit aspects of professionalization—the way people are and were and treated each other. [...] by being able to see—transparency again—their professional and social networks, I was able to analyze and understand more about how the academic system worked AS A SYSTEM and then adapt myself to that. apply the rules myself. (Dave)

Veronica, a face-to-face student, noted that she attempted to adopt Facebook with her graduate cohort, but the group did not last. Her Facebook interactions with people in her program were limited to vaguely social interactions. For her, the real value was connecting with other graduate students met at conference workshops or with faculty scholars from other programs:

> It's funny because when my cohort started, I created a Facebook group for us that we interacted on regularly. It died out after the first year. It's still there, but no one pays attention to it anymore. I interact with other students who are in my program, but it's mainly liking their pictures and making jokes about more personal posts. I interact more as a professional with students from other schools than I do with students in my program. (Veronica)

Veronica continues, commenting on the value of Facebook for seeing beyond her program: "I don't know that sporadic conference meetings would have given me the same view of the field and be able to engage with other people in the same way that Facebook has." This "view of the field" sense was noted nearly universally in this group of participants, and seemed especially practical to Jason, who pointed out that one can easily trace the route from Facebook conversation to being "gently shoved" into productive work:

> I've used FB to keep up with what folks are presenting at conferences. Did you see Cheryl Ball's posts about the dig humanities conf she was at? Or maybe it was qual/quant research. At any rate, she was reminding me of some of Geisler's work, which reminded me of Charney, which reminded me. . .you know, that kind of gentle shove you need to keep researching, or keep thinking until you revise your research question. I'd call that professionalization. The "push," as it were, to continue in the professional track of being a scholar. (Jason)

Rene was an important outlier in this study. At the time a candidate in a technical communication program, she repeated a number of times that for her Facebook was a social tool, not a professional tool. She agreed that Facebook and social networking sites in general—especially LinkedIn—could support professional interactions but pointed out that "there is nothing to replace the impromptu water cooler chats that occur if you are face to face." Rene was unusual among this group of participants in that she primarily identified herself as an industry professional seeking academic credentials rather than as an academic professional. Her bias towards LinkedIn is reflected in recent studies of social media and technical writing. Lauren and Pigg point out that while LinkedIn, Twitter, and blogs are crucial spaces for knowledge sharing and professional conversations among technical communication professionals, academics do not value such spaces and are not present in them (Lauren & Pigg, 2016, p. 309). That is, Rene reminds us that this academic/practitioner divide, familiar to readers from technical communication literature, extends beyond knowledge flow networks and into the mixed social and professional space of social networking.

4. Tension between personal and professional persona on Facebook

Of the eight participants in this study, only three described a particular tension or desire to keep their personal and professional lives separate. Dave explained that for him, although he did mix the two worlds on Facebook, his use was largely personal and he felt an awkward professional tension ("I have to pretend to be professional") to avoid cursing and be hypersensitive to audience, especially because his posts might enter the workplace. Still, this sort of ambient awareness was useful, as social media provide information about moods and emotional states that equipped him for face-to-face interaction. Robert described how it took him a little time to reconcile the "mixed audience of professionals and parents." Yet, neither of these individuals betrayed a sense of guilt surrounding their social media habits.

Rene was the only participant who desired a strong separation between personal and professional networks. For her Facebook was specifically about socializing rather than working; she described LinkedIn as more appropriate for the professional connecting she does as a consultant: "I've tried to use it [Facebook] for my companies but don't really want the "closeness" to my work life that would ensue...I really just want to use FB to keep in touch on a personal level with my friends and colleagues (minimal work talk)." Despite this desire for separation, Rene seemed pragmatic about context collapse, noting that as much as professionals may desire to

keep the two worlds separate, "Pandora's box" had already been opened; ultimately, she did not think the separation entirely possible.

Caitlin mentioned a strong sense of guilt about personal use of social media: "I may have told myself I was doing research or getting mentored but instead I was really just Facebooking." She described an ambivalent relationship with Facebook, both relying on it heavily to recruit and interact with her own research participants and experiencing intense depression and anxiety about seeing the "exceptional" things that others in her network were doing. Participating in what she calls the "down the rabbit hole" activity of observing activities of friends and family was, Caitlin claimed, a huge time-waster. Like Leon and Pigg's participants, she saw the ways that social media is essential to her professionalization, but she also felt anxiety about how Facebook seemed to blur personal and professional activity.

Few other participants mentioned such a tension when asked about it explicitly and described how even though social media use might largely be focused on academic life rather than their personal life (or vice versa), they generally felt free to be their whole selves on social media. In fact, some of them described the personalizing effect that social media had for their understanding of academic and professional communities; Robert pointed out that without these connections, he would not have had such a good sense of the "human-ness behind many people who make [up] the discipline." For most of the interviewees in this study, the blending of social and academic lives is a productive—and welcome—one.

Discussion

Though not generally a sponsored or organized on the part of university programs, social networking sites played a valued and practical role in the lives and learning of these graduate students. Along with social purposes such as creating a sense of connectedness and a shared experience through backchannel communication, these graduate students also used social media to visualize and participate in professional networks. In this section, I briefly return to three important areas the interview findings addressed: 1) social networking sites provide mediated access to professional life; 2) users of social networking sites have become comfortable with (or at least used to) collapsed professional and personal contexts; and 3) social networking sites can play an especially valuable role in graduate distance education.

Similar to the graduate students Leon and Pigg (2011) wrote about, the graduate students in this study used Facebook as a tool to gain personal and professional agency. Graduate students used social networking to guide themselves or be guided into professional lives and to get a realistic sense of how personal and

professional mix in and beyond their academic programs. These activities were especially valued by students in online programs.

Accessing professional lives

So, what social, educational, and professional roles do digital social networks play for graduate students, both in traditional residential programs and fully online and low-residency programs? In both online and residential programs, the graduate students in this study used social networks and other technologies to guide themselves into their professional lives. Backchanneling and collaborating on program coursework and networking to find collaborators existed alongside activities such as visualizing communities of practice, finding mentors, and becoming "friends" with the field.

In writing studies, previous scholarship about professionalism has been attentive to the roles that technology and online spaces play in professional life, foregrounding the role of digital work, social networks and multiliteracies and often invoking "the digital" broadly as a set of skills, tools, or competencies graduate students must learn in order to become part of the 21st century professoriate (Selber, 2004; Cohen, 2010; Kolowich, 2010). Other work has emphasized mentorship in producing digital research, calling for graduate programs to recognize the importance of technology skills and an "integrative approach" to professionalization (p. 15). This attention to revising the traditional role of technology in graduate education (Goggin & Boyd, 2009) has been framed variously as remediation (Graupner et al., 2009), remixing (Yancey, 2009), and responsivity (Knievel & Sheridan-Rabideau, 2009). Yancey's remix model for graduate education, for example, emphasized refocusing curricula and learning spaces around technology and materiality. This and other discussions tend, however, to talk about their technologies as tools related to producing research or teaching, rather than as tools for mediating, producing, and accessing professional lives.

Among many other affordances of social networking sites, Spinuzzi (2007) pointed out their particular value for networking and relationship-building "across work activities that have traditionally been separated by temporal, spatial, or disciplinary boundaries" (p. 268). Those informal moments and opportunities to eavesdrop or observe once depended on being co-located but are now accessible through Facebook and other social media. As Claire said, she got to "[see] professionalism modeled *in vivo*." Professional life and relationships can be seen in full, even by people separated by distance. In fact, when describing the professionalization opportunities afforded by social networking sites, nearly all participants turned

metaphors related to physical, often interior settings and physical interactions: opened doors, gentle shoves, landscapes and feeling like "being in the room." Online students were able to have mediated versions of those random hallway experiences and professional moments with their faculty and colleagues within the program, while both online and face-to-face students were able to augment these in-program moments by reaching beyond the program to mentors, faculty, and students at other schools.

Mixing professional with personal

One issue raised by thinking about professional use of Facebook in particular (as opposed to LinkedIn, an explicitly professional service) is how it intrudes on our conception of Facebook as a primarily social toy. While mixing the social and the professional is a risk, for the graduate students in this study the benefits of being able to see and interact with professionals as whole people made the risk worth taking: they were able to get humanized views of professional life.

One of Leon and Pigg's findings was that graduate students experienced considerable anxiety about acting scholarly in their online lives. For the two students they studied, the virtual "blank page" of the open document signified a work space, while social media seemed mostly disruptive, a "fun" space for "playing around" that also incited feelings of guilt (p. 11). Their graduate writers experienced not only blurred boundaries around writing events, but also blurred lines between personal and professional lives online, which resulted for them in a strong sense of tension between personal and professional personae. This context collapse—the convergence of different, once separate spheres of life on social media—is something scholars are only beginning to understand. Similar to Leon and Pigg's discussion, Faris and Moore (2017) described emerging scholars' feelings of anxiety about acting professional on social media in terms of their struggles with context collapse.

The graduate students in this study felt some of this tension; Dave and Renee in particular felt awkward in mixing the two—Dave because he felt like being himself might potentially damage his ethos as a graduate student, and Renee because as a consultant she felt that business and personal spheres should remain somewhat distinct. However, all of the participants in this study shared that they thought professional and social benefits were too valuable to miss entirely. While it would be difficult to advise everyone to embrace a rich blend of professional and personal networks, the mixture can be rewarding.

Social networking for distance education

Do digital social networks help mitigate the physical gap produced by distance graduate education? The responses in this study clarified many education-related purposes for social networks that went beyond course-based uses like mediating reading discussions or project-based collaborations. The participants from distance programs were, as a group, the most optimistic about the benefits of wide adoption of social networking sites in their graduate programs, especially for feeling connected and enculturated as professionals in their programs. Every one of the participants in this group emphasized that social media kept them connected to and successful in their program.

Professionalization depends to some extent on organized training, but it extends beyond the classroom: the impromptu, ambient, tacit experiences afforded in co-located spaces. Such experiences—generally provided in graduate school by residence requirements—not only reinforce the norms, expectations, and behaviors of disciplines, but also enculturate graduate students by giving them a space in which to interact with, model, and establish relationships with professional academics. Residential education—and thus the residence requirement—has traditionally provided a "rich and empowering learning experience" (Inman & Corrigan, 2001) where graduate students can master the "less-often-articulated professionalizing tasks" (Leon & Pigg, 2011, p. 4) of establishing and sustaining relationships with peers, collaborators, and mentors. Students in distance programs (but indeed students in all kinds of graduate programs) are a heterogeneous group, with varying levels of preparedness and pre-socialization into an academic life. Digital social networks are spaces that can mitigate the kinds of physical and cultural gaps inherent to distance education—in particular distance graduate education.

Conclusion

Despite occasional ambivalence about social and rhetorical activities on Facebook and other social networking sites, the participants in this study remained optimistic about its role in professional lives. For these doctoral students, both online and off, social networking played a significant role in helping them feel engaged and part of the culture of their programs and, ultimately, their scholarly discipline.

My point is not to oversell Facebook; an entire ecology of media, sites, and tools surrounded the participants in this study: Twitter, email lists, Ning sites, course wikis, and other tools also filled the experiences these participants described. While

social networks cannot "automatically enhance" learning and "equalize all environments and student positions" (Turnley, 2009, p. 88), these technologies are an important resource and tool for professionalization. The question should not be which modality is better, but rather how those modalities offer different resources. Technologies have affordances, but they are not transparent, and educators should also be aware of the ways a technology might exclude students. We must also remember that these sites are not learning environments but platforms for businesses with corporate interests at their center that may compete with the goals and ethics of distance education. Finally, even if they're not outright against it, some learners and scholars have deep reservations about the substantiality of doing scholarship with social media. This practice has become more accepted in writing studies and other fields but is still an activity at the margins of scholarly discourse. Still, there is a growing sense that social media and social networking sites offer instructors "exceptional opportunities to model for students how networks facilitate work" (Vie, 2017, p.2)

Professionalizing online is not an activity exclusive to Facebook: LinkedIn and Twitter are both considered much more serious and professional spaces for connecting with colleagues and professionals in many industries (Lauren & Pigg, 2016; Vie, 2017). The community around the #womeninTC Twitter hashtag prides itself on distributing professional resources and connecting new professionals with mentors. Neither is this activity especially new; LISTSERVs have long been digital spaces for maintaining professional contact. WPA-L, the Writing Program Administrators' LISTSERV, has been an important social and professional network to its users since 1991: not just a valuable communication space, but a source for ideas about contemporary issues, assistance for isolated teachers and administrators, and resources for enriching teaching, administration, and scholarship. Implicit in the list users' regular requests for sources, recommendations, and lines of argument for new faculty positions is a high esteem for the community's collective knowledge and ethos. While Facebook enabled the professionalization for participants in this study, the WPA-L is a social network that offers not only research resources but also the opportunity for newcomers to connect with established academics. Because of their mediated, visible nature, social networks have reach and longevity as useful professional tools.

Finally, as Inman and Corrigan (2001) claimed, "the challenges […] of distance education are substantial" for graduate programs and their students (p. 414). Using digital social media to augment distance graduate work may help us answer those challenges. In traditional residential programs, there may still be space for ambivalence about digital and social media, because they may still remain secondary to the face-to-face experience of hallways and offices and coffee shops. As writing educators move

past seeing social media as a fad (Vie 2017), the space for this ambivalence will continue to become increasingly smaller. In distance settings, these media become primary places of interaction, such that student and educator ambivalence can get in the way of building those scholarly communities and minding that gap of face-to-face tacit experience. Facebook or LinkedIn do not make for better graduate students or better researchers any more than subscribing to email LISTSERVs necessarily makes one any better of a writing teacher—but, in the overall landscape of institutional change, we find ourselves in and as distance graduate education continues to spread, what these media *can* do is let graduate students see professionals in action when they cannot be seen from down the hall.

Appendix A

Semi-structured interview script

At the beginning of each interview, post the following informed consent message:

> *Before we begin the interview, I need to supply you with informed consent materials (see attachment). Please let me know when you have finished reading and if you have any questions. If you type the words "I give my consent," it means that you have read the materials and that all questions were answered to your satisfaction.*
>
> *The interview has three sections. I'll post the questions from each section, and you can respond to them as we go; although questions are numbered, you don't have to number your responses or anything. Take as much time as you need—I'm in no hurry. And don't worry too much about typos, if you can. :)*

Section A: Basic information. The following questions have to do with your general context and experiences with social media.

1. What graduate degree you are seeking/have sought? In what field or discipline?
    a. Traditional, hybrid, or distance program?
2. Do you currently hold an academic or other professional position, such as:
    a. Graduate teaching or research assistant?
    b. Full or part-time faculty?
    c. Tenure-track or non tenure-track?
    d. Academic non-teaching?
    e. Work outside the academy?
3. What kinds of social media or social networking sites do you use?
    a. (Follow-up questions to help prompt discussion, if stalled)
        i. Do you use social networking sites (SNS), such as Facebook or Google +?
        ii. Microblogging services, such as Twitter or Tumblr?
        iii. Other social media, such as Instagram or Pinterest?
        iv. Do you maintain a blog?
        v. Do you participate in adding content to wikis?
        vi. Do you subscribe to and/or participate in any LISTSERVS?
4. For what do you generally use social media on a daily basis? Could you describe your use of SNSes like Facebook more specifically?
5. To the best of your memory, when and why did you get an account on Facebook?
6. Overall, what is your attitude toward social media, and in particular, about social networking sites like Facebook?

Section B: Graduate education and professionalization. The following questions have to do with your general experiences as a graduate student with professionalization and enculturation.

Definition, if requested by participant:

> *Professionalization is often understood as "the development of skills, identities, norms, and values associated with becoming part of a professional group. Through this process, recruits [. . .] acquire both substantive and methodological knowledge and develop understandings of their roles that permit them to function as professionals in these fields. Also, by training newcomers, [. . .] professions seek to ensure that the work of [the group] will continue congruent with certain principles and practices." (http://www.mla.org/professionalization)*

7. To what extent do you (or did you) feel a pressure to professionalize as a graduate student?
8. How did you manage this pressure? I.e. were there professional development workshops and seminars that you took advantage of? Webinars? Were these at your institution, or at conferences? Formal or informal groups?
9. What roles have social media—in particular Facebook—played in your professionalization?
    a. *(Prompt, if necessary)* What are some examples of how you've deployed social media to engage in professionalizing behaviors?
    b. *(Prompt, if necessary)* Can you think of any examples of how social media has had a negative impact on your professionalizing behaviors?
    c. Can you imagine graduate school without Facebook? Your early professional experience and your transition from one to the other?

Section C: Graduate education and enculturation: The following questions ask you to reflect on the mediated nature of relationships with other students, with faculty within your graduate program, and with disciplinary professionals outside of your graduate program.

10. How much engagement would you say you have or had with other graduate students in your program? With faculty? How critical would you say that engagement was to your success in or feelings of belonging to the program?
11. Did/do you ever feel a sense of isolation related to your experiences as a student?
12. Outside of the classroom, what have been some of the most important social interactions of your graduate school experience?
13. What role has Facebook played in your graduate instruction (or learning to be an academic) in general?

   a. *(If participant has graduated)* What about in your post-graduate professional experience?
14. Do you (or would you) include social media activity on vitae and research statements?
15. If you attend professional conferences, do you participate in social media activities like backchannels or conference hashtag conversations?

Works Cited

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Distance education enrollment report 2017*. Digital Learning Compass. Retrieved from https://onlinelearningsurvey.com

Black, E. (1980). A note on theory and practice in rhetorical criticism. *Western Journal of Communication, 44*(4), 331–336.

boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *13*(1), 210–230.

Brooke, C. (2009). *Lingua fracta: Towards a rhetoric of new media*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Buck, A. (2012). Examining digital literacy practices on social network sites. *Research in the Teaching of English, 47*(1), 9–38.

Coad, D. T. (2017). That's my face to the whole field!": Graduate students' professional identity-building through Twitter at a writing studies conference. *Computers and Composition, 45*, 51–66.

Cohen, P. (Nov. 16, 2010) Digital keys for unlocking the humanities riches. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/arts/17digital.html

Davis, J., Harding, L., & Mascle, D. (2010) Digital connections and learning styles. In W. Ritke-Jones (Ed.), *Virtual environments for corporate education: Employee learning and solutions* (pp. 302–320). New York, NY: Business Science Reference.

Ebest, S.B. (1999). The next generation of WPAs: A study of graduate students in composition/rhetoric. *Writing Program Administration, 22*(3), 65–84.

Eyman, D., Sheffield, S., & DeVoss, D. N. (2009). Developing sustainable research networks in graduate education. *Computers and Composition, 26*(1), 49–57.

Faris, M. J., & Moore, K. R. (2017). Emerging scholars and social media use: A pilot study of risk. *Communication Design Quarterly, 4*(2), 52–63.

Goggin, P., & Boyd, P. W. (2009). Letter from the guest editors. *Computers and Composition*, *26*(1), 1–3.

Graupner, M., Nickoson-Massey, L., & Blair, K. (2009). Remediating knowledge-making spaces in the graduate curriculum: Developing and sustaining multimodal teaching and research. *Computers and Composition*, *26*(1), 13–23.

Hart-Davidson, W. (2007). Studying the mediated action of composing with time-use diaries. In H. McKee & D. N. DeVoss (Eds.), *Digital writing research: Technologies, methodologies, and ethical issues* (pp. 153–170). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Inman, J. A., & Corrigan, D. S. (2001). Toward a doctoral degree by distance in computers and writing: Promise and possibilities. *Computers and Composition, 18*(4), 411–422.

Kena, G., Hussar, W., McFarland, J., de Brey, C., Musu-Gillette, L., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Diliberti, M., Barmer, A., Bullock Mann, F., & Dunlop Velez, E. (2016, May 26). *The condition of education 2016*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/

Knievel, M., & Sheridan-Rabideau, M. P. (2009). Articulating "responsivity" in context: Re-making the M.A. in composition and rhetoric for the electronic age. *Computers and Composition*, *26*(1), 24–37.

Koerber, A., & McMichael, L. (2008). Qualitative sampling methods: A primer for technical communicators. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *22*(4), 454–473.

Kolowich, S. (Nov. 8, 2010). Harnessing social media. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/11/08/sloan3

Lauren, B., & Pigg, S. (2016). Toward multidirectional knowledge flows: Lessons from research and publication practices of technical communication entrepreneurs. *Technical Communication, 63*(4), 299–313.

Leon, K., & Pigg, S. (2011). Graduate students professionalizing in digital time/space: A view from "down below." *Computers and Composition, 28*(1), 3–13.

McNabb, R. (2001). Making the gesture: Graduate student submissions and the expectation of journal references. *Composition Studies, 29*(1), 9–26.

Miller, S., Brueggemann, B.J., Blue, B., & Shepherd, D. M. (1997). Present perfect and future imperfect: Results of a national survey of graduate students in rhetoric and composition programs. *College Composition and Communication, 48*(3), 392–409.

Pigg, S. (2014). Coordinating constant invention: Social media's role in distributed work. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 23*(2), 69–87.

Polin, L. G. (2010). Graduate professional education from a community of practice perspective: The role of social and technical networking. In C. Blackmore (Ed.), *Social learning systems and communities of practice* (pp. 163–178). London, England: Springer.

Ridolfo, J., Rife, M.C., Leon, K., Diehl, A., Grabill, J., Walls, D., & Pigg, S. (2011). Collaboration and graduate student professionalization in a digital humanities research center. In L. McGrath (Ed.), *Collaborative approaches to the digital in English studies*. Logan, UT: Computers & Composition Digital Press. Retrieved from http://ccdigitalpress.org/cad

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Selber, S. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Spinuzzi, C. (2007). Guest editor's introduction: Technical communication in the age of distributed work. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 16*(3), 265–277.

Turnley, M. (2009). Reterritorialized flows: Critically considering student agency in wireless pedagogies. In A. C. Kimme Hea (Ed.), *Going wireless: A critical exploration of wireless and mobile technologies for composition teachers* (pp. 87–105). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Vie, S. (2017) Training online technical communication educators to teach with social media: Best practices and professional recommendations. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 26*(3), 344–359.

Yancey, K. B. (2009). Re-designing graduate education in composition and rhetoric: the use of remix as concept, material, and method. *Computers and Composition*, *26*(1), 4–12.

About the Author

Christopher D. M. Andrews is an Assistant Professor of English at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, where he teaches technical communication, web writing, editing, and postcritical digital rhetorics. His research explores how philosophies of technology, writing, and agency inform disciplinary, institutional, and professional practices. His collaborative work has been published in the *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* and *Kairos, A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 82 – 101
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.06
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

"It's Essentially Writers Talking about Writing": The Roles of Reflection in a Co-Curricular Writing Studio Course

Jerrice Donelson, Michigan State University
Anthony DeGenaro, Wayne State University
William DeGenaro, University of Michigan-Dearborn

What is Writing Studio?

As writing programs shutter basic writing courses in favor of more ethical models of instruction and seek alt-pedagogies that foster agency and access, *writing studio* is gaining interest. "Studio" varies but is usually a co-curricular, supplemental experience wherein students discuss their writing projects and writing classes (Grego and Thompson *Teaching/Writing;* "Writing Studio"). Studio might allow students taking first-year composition to receive additional support on tough assignments by creating space for workshopping drafts. Some institutions have positioned studio as an alternative to basic writing business-as-usual, placing students into "regular" comp *and* a one-credit, concurrent studio (Lalicker), and evidence is beginning to suggest that studio fosters student success as signified by retention and persistence (Chemishanova and Snead). As such, writing program professionals at open-admissions institutions may be particularly interested in the roles studio can play in demystifying academic writing and supporting student success.

Studio has no content beyond student writing and takes as its subject matter whatever artifacts and concerns participants bring into studio. Class size is typically 8-10 and the teacher acts as discussion leader, sometimes clarifying institutional practices to make writing instruction, expectations, and conventions more transparent. Students receive feedback on drafts, as they do during a writing center consultation, but studio

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

also emphasizes discussion *about* writing and the writing process. Studio's small enrollment size and supplemental-curricular ethos make it an ideal learning site to discuss explicitly the transfer of knowledge among various rhetorical-cum-instructional situations. Studio cohorts, comprised of students from diverse academic backgrounds with varying degrees of proficiency, provide a site for students to access the kinds of implicit knowledge that can get them over barriers. Students being given access to transfer of knowledge and the kinds of coded language of writing assessment and instruction fosters a *reflective experience,* which we find to be a crucial component of studio.

Grego and Thompson define studio as "a different way of being with student writers . . . a spatialized and spatializing methodology for institutional change" (*Teaching/Writing* 20). They lay out a reflective, student-centered pedagogy geared toward helping students reflect on the places they occupy within the academy while also giving students access to directing studio discussions. Indeed "studio" suggests a locus of activity (think of an artist's studio/atelier) where students work on writing they deem important and provide a space that is suggestive of intimacy and comfort. Grego and Thompson also build on critical geography (Soja) and the notion that the real place and imagined space are always converging and creating new possibilities. Studio paradigms typically spin Soja's "third space" as a metaphor for the pedagogy's balance of attending to the extant, material concerns of students and fostering imagination with respect to literate activity—Soja's notion of new possibilities. Ideally, studio occupies an unfamiliar, creative new space within the familiar confines of the campus; spatially, studio serves as a space participants have unique access to. Studio also builds on the work of compositionists Jonathan Mauk, who argues that writing teachers increasingly need to account for the "spatial and material conditions that constitute the everyday lives of students" (370), and Nedra Reynolds, who reminds us that pedagogy ought to account creatively for the ways writing happens in real places so that a critical spatial understanding is a key to rhetorical success for our students. Given the emphasis on *understanding* spatial spaces, building opportunities for students to reflect on the contexts of their writing is key.

Studio is small and student-centered, but the scope encompasses broader, institutional or programmatic matters. Tassoni and Lewiecki-Wilson describe how their conception of studio widened:

> This model has shifted our attention from merely working to change composition pedagogies to asking more productive questions about relationships: How do students understand the rhetorical situatedness of

> writing and academic culture more generally, and how do teachers communicate (or not) their objectives to students and other teachers? (69)

Tassoni and Lewiecki-Wilson illustrate how studios can foster institutional and programmatic change by creating "space" where students can articulate how they access and navigate the academy's literacy demands. Change happens if we listen to the voices speaking in those spaces and calibrate accordingly.

The field has begun to look at reflection and metacognition as core goals of post-secondary rhetoric and writing classes, self-awareness no longer on the periphery. We explore the diverse ways in which students who enrolled in our studio during its pilot phase reflected on writing. One of the strengths of the studio model is to help students become more aware of themselves as writers and access the metacognition of different writing events to foster the transfer of knowledge from those writing events into their courses. We were interested in collaboratively inquiring into student learning in the context of writing studio but, more specifically, we wondered what students were doing when given *sustained* chances to comment on writing. We looked at their written reflections and conducted open-ended interviews with studio participants about their experiences. Our data consists of student reflective texts, the notes students kept and posted on class wikis, and interview transcripts. All were spaces where students articulated from their own perspectives the thinking and writing taking place in studio and beyond. We found that reflection both fosters and demonstrates burgeoning awareness of the writing process. We contend that studio uniquely strips away ephemera and distraction to frame student texts as content, providing fodder for multiple forms of useful reflection. Because this increased self-knowledge and focused opportunity for metacognition fosters student success, we argue that studio ultimately has particular utility in pedagogical settings, like open-admissions, where students can uniquely benefit from increased clarity about what, why, and how academic literacy means.

Our own studio grew from a working group assessing the viability of the basic writing course on our branch campus (MacDonald and DeGenaro). In addition to redesigning our basic writing curriculum, the group recommended piloting a one-credit studio as an additional way to serve diverse student populations and start building writing electives that foreground reflection. Students concurrently enrolled in any first-year *or* upper-level writing intensive course could enroll. The class asked participants to bring artifacts—usually works-in-progress from their writing classes, but artifacts could also include assignment sheets or end comments on drafts—to workshop *and discuss* them with other participants, thereby increasing their reflective

understanding of the writing process. Students also completed several reflective writings geared toward assessing their learning, charting their work in studio, and thinking about literacy in and out of writing classes. A tenure-stream professor served as instructor and an experienced campus writing center consultant was embedded in the course to help lead discussions and provide additional feedback on artifacts. A student kept minutes of each session, tracking the conversation and highlighting keywords used to discuss artifacts to provide a living artifact representative of new knowledge being made. During that initial pilot semester, three sections were offered, each capped at ten. A total of 24 students matriculated. Programmatically, "studio" was conceived as a *big tent* elective for L2 writers, honors program students, regular clients of the Writing Center, and anyone else interested in sustained, collegial support for their writing. Course goals included gaining a vocabulary for discussing writing, getting better at providing constructive criticism in peer review, seeking assistance from campus resources when struggling with challenges, and understanding one's strengths and weaknesses as a writer. Learning outcomes focused explicitly or implicitly on reflective capacity and metacognitive understanding of the writing process.

Reflection, Student Agency, and Studio

In her entry on reflection in *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies,* Kara Taczak succinctly addresses reflection's role in student success, asserting that reflection "throughout the process" is fundamental to the acquisition of higher-order literacies. Taczak describes reflection as the nexus of cognition and metacognition, student consideration both of "what they are doing" and "why they [did what] they did" (78). Taczak concludes, "Reflection...must be worked at in order to be most effectively learned and practiced" (79). The "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing"--developed by NCTE, WPA, and National Writing Project--names "metacognition" as one of "eight habits of mind essential for success in college writing." The Framework defines metacognition as "the ability to reflect on one's own thinking as well as on the individual and cultural processes used to structure knowledge" (5). The push to foreground the related constructs metacognition and reflection to increase student understanding *about* writing has frequently led to the adoption of portfolios (Harrington), but the turn toward teaching reflection has also animated the *writing about writing* approach (Downs and Wardle), and, we would add, the value of studio pedagogy.

Reflection is the key to studio's ability to foster agency. Yancey suggests that reflection is "the writer inventing him or herself" (*Reflection* 68) and argues that reflection constructs students as "agents in their own learning" (ibid 5). Yancey has focused on the ways reflective writing tasks can foster learning and empower students, building their capacity to make writerly choices as they navigate rhetorical situations in and out of the academy. In *Reflection in the Writing Classroom,* Yancey's three types of reflective writing largely focus on agency and self-awareness: *reflection-in-action (*revising one's work with critical awareness)*, constructive reflection* (developing a writerly identity)*,* and *reflection-in-presentation* (making critically aware statements about one's writing for a real audience) (200). Harrington builds on Yancey's emphasis on reflection's potential for capacity-building by suggesting that giving students opportunities to perform reflective writing tasks shifts the agency to students and facilitates the type of learning that should be at the center of foundational writing classes:

> Traditional course goals convey a *teacher* agenda--reflective writing allows *students'* agendas to come into the classroom in a powerful fashion. And more than anything else, students should emerge from their semester(s) of composition as writers who understand and manage their own agendas. (47, emphasis ours)

Building more systematic opportunities for students to think and write reflectively and critically about their own writing, learning, and literacy practices has the opportunity not only to increase student agency (Harrington; Yancey, *Reflection*) but also to create a feedback loop for writing programs to listen systematically to student voices and invite students to be program stakeholders. Further, programmatic experimentation with alt-pedagogies like studio provides students access to opportunities that engage a range of reflective writing modes and genres, from self-assessments to wikis focused on thinking about process. These modes and genres can then be actionable documents within writing programs.

If Yancey and Harrington both emphasize reflection as a means to accessing self-awareness and individual agency, then an equally important set of roles for reflective writing in the classroom *also* exists and that can *also* be facilitated by studio pedagogies. Reflection can also engage theoretical and/or epistemological understandings of writing. That is, reflection can be an occasion for students to practice making inferences about language, literacy, composing, and revising in ways that go beyond the purview of the self. Sommers offers an especially useful treatment of this expansive conception of reflection in the classroom, describing his basic writing

students' end-of-term *reflections-in-presentation* in which he asks them to focus on their "beliefs about writing" instead of the more common heuristic points and prompts like the individual strengths and weaknesses of the writer (99). Sommers argues this shift to a focus on epistemological matters deepens the quality of the reflection and aids in knowledge transfer, as students internalize a broader, more portable comprehension of writing's complexities. Beaufort picks up on these themes, stating that giving students a sense of how they think "enables the learning to deepen" (24). She makes a case for reflection as a crucial component in teaching writing for transfer and emphasizes that providing students chances to infer knowledge is key: "Introduce reflection/metacognition," she advises, "about deep structures, broad concepts." She calls this the "wider picture," wider than reflecting on a solitary piece of writing, wider than a sense of the student's own process and product (33). Conceptualizing writing in order to be effective across contexts seems to require not only commenting on one's own texts but also on epistemological truths and insights *about writing, language, and literacy*. It was this diversity of conceptions of reflection that prompted our inquiry. Given the ways reflection can foster access and transfer, we wanted to gauge and describe how reflection looked when it was central within a specific context. We wondered if students were more inclined to focus on self-knowledge or an exploration of abstract/epistemological truths about writing?

Methodology

To understand student reflection in studio in a critical, nuanced, and actionable way, we designed a qualitative study that would foreground student voices and inquire into how studio participants were articulating their strengths and weaknesses as writers, their understanding of what was transpiring during their studio sessions, and their perceptions of the writing process writ large. We operated within a methodological framework we call *collaborative-contextualist,* defined as a methodology that draws on the skillsets, institutional and material situations, and subject positions of multiple change agents engaging in inquiry in real rhetorical situations. This approach centers on collaboration and assumes the most influential, ethical way to change writing programs is to involve as many program stakeholders as possible in each phase of inquiry. Further, this methodology assumes that being change agents is a fundamental goal of researchers (cf. Cushman; Mauk; Porter et al). This collaborative methodology is also suggestive of the value of drawing on multiple skill sets and knowledge bases of researchers/change agents staked to particular institutional contexts. Institutionally, studios occupy a middle "space" between instruction and tutorial paradigms and we

wanted our identities as Writing Program faculty *and* Writing Center professional to represent that hybridity. Further, meaningful and ethical inquiry ought to avoid a top-down approach wherein only, say, the program director engages in knowledge construction within the programmatic milieu. Finally, since the studio pedagogy integrated writing center consultants, it made sense for the complementary scholarship also to integrate what center staff know about tutoring and our *local,* institutional dynamics, from *their own hybrid points-of-view* as senior-level consultants.

We also define our inquiry as *contextualist*, drawing on Cindy Johanek's demonstration that both "place" and rhetorical or institutional situation broadly defined—rather than rigid adherence to a methodological community—determine what methods are operational (3). In *Composing Research: A Contextualist Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition,* Johanek foregrounds a broad conception of "context" in which investigators consider a range of situational, "rhetorical issues" (112), including personal, local, institutional, or disciplinary matters above and before specific questions of method and data analysis. Our concern was primarily institutional and programmatic, and collaboratively we wished to put scholarship in service to a programmatic context wherein 1) we hoped to create meaningful electives for students, 2) we wanted to understand reflection in order to think about ways to integrate reflective pedagogy into the program's curriculum, and 3) we considered our inquiry a form of programmatic assessment (i.e., understand reflection in order to understand student learning and in turn foster access and success among diverse student-writers). In Johanek's paradigm, "context" becomes not only a concern but also a methodology, meaning that at every turn the project considers what kind of knowledge is being discovered and constructed and what that signifies for the actual spaces where a research question is posed. She writes, "While place might determine what research methods are *possible,* the research question determines what research methods are *necessary*" (3). Johanek's emphasis on what is "possible" in real contexts is uniquely suited for inquiry into studio and other institutional programs seeking to imagine alternatives, curricular or otherwise. Johanek's paradigm is also productive because of how serious she takes the notion of place, a guiding concern of studio. It was *necessary* to involve Writing Center staff to inquire into nuanced issues of reflection. Doing so made it *possible* for the studio space to have access to new diverse sets of skills and abilities. The fact that the research was taking place in the hybrid studio space also unleashed additional possibilities. On the intersections of location, writing, and human potential, Nedra Reynolds writes, "Places evoke powerful human emotions because they become layered, like sediment or a palimpsest" (2). And so *our* interactions were important parts of making sense of student perspectives.

Given how intertwined collaboration and investment in our own local site is in our methodological approach, we now clarify our subject positions, and how those positions layer on the place where our project unfolds:

Jerrice: My involvement with studio began prior, when I was a member of the basic writing workgroup, assembled to evaluate our basic writing course. I was asked to research other studio programs and read and provide feedback on student writing from a writing center perspective. Although at the time I was an advanced writing center consultant and a graduate student pursuing secondary teaching certification, my then subject position derived equally or more so from experiences when I was an undergraduate student taking Composition on the same campus. This perspective provided a much-needed view regarding pedagogy, instruction, and curriculum development for first-year writing. I adjusted according to what aspect of my perspective would provide the most benefit, although it seems clear that all of my perspectives have their own subjectivities. Since my position evolved into co-Principal Investigator for the studio project, it is safe to say my personal stakes evolved too, especially when I entered a doctoral program in writing studies and rhetoric midway through the project. With this change in positionality came a change in perspective on program assessment and institutional research. My professional goals as a future faculty and administrator of a writing program clearly became an influence on my positionality as a co-researcher.

Tony: As a then-new part-time faculty member, I was pleased to have the opportunity to participate both in program assessment and institutional research--especially as those two tasks were put in service of ethical curriculum development. I was teaching creative writing and first-year writing (at the time of the studio pilot) and found interviewing students an excellent way to relate further to our local population and get to know students on our campus more deeply, and, in future semesters, believe I was a more effective studio instructor because of this experience. I brought the perspective of a writing teacher and an M.F.A.-poet to the project, but I also believe the work is having a positive impact on *my* professional life, as I co-presented a version of this research at WRAB (Writing Research Across Borders) and, like Jerrice, did a year ahead of me, began a doctoral program in rhetoric and composition. Ultimately, I remain a strong believer in the ethos of studio courses, particularly the embedded Writing Center tutors, being a former undergrad consultant myself.

Bill: Commenting on studio's collaborative ethos, one of our respondents said, "Instead of one voice, now I have many." As program director, I feel similarly. Many voices fill my head and I choose not to separate my role as "administrator" from my role as "researcher." In supporting various stakeholders and trying to build

capacity, I have many voices but, when I was a WPA (as I was during the studio launch), I tried to create venues for exchange. My subject position as WPA involved being a "researcher" who was addressing institutional and ethical imperatives and student needs while also inquiring into something with curiosity. Is it possible to be a researcher working to support (again—"build capacity" in) L1 and L2 writers on campus, including those in upper-level writing-intensive courses on a campus without a serious WAC program? Is it possible to be a researcher working to support colleagues whose careers and professional development aspirations you want to support?

We gained IRB approval and then sought context-rich, empirical data to teach us about the nature of reflection in studio: the minutes that students kept during each studio session; three rounds of reflective writing that students in studio completed during the term; and transcripts of interviews we conducted with participants. Student writing and interviews were deep dives into student points-of-view to understand in open-ended, qualitative ways how they conceived of their own literate lives and experiences. We conducted interviews in the Writing Program office, around mid-way through the pilot term, asking students questions about their experience in studio, their three-credit writing classes, and their perceptions of the writing process. Interviews were recorded on program iPads *and* the voice recognition feature of Google Docs. A partial document with errors would be created in Google Docs that we could then go back and edit by listening to the iPad recording. We also coded the data collaboratively, either in the Writing Program or around Bill's dining room table. We looked and listened for indications of self-awareness, evidence of knowledge about writing and literacy, and related matters. Our goal was descriptive and taxonomical, that is, we wanted to describe what students were doing and saying vis-a-vis *reflection*. Thus we did not use a prefabricated set of categories or terms (beyond our broad interests in charting self-awareness and the ability to *reflect* on literate practices), instead engaging in a process of discovering what specific themes might emerge from the data itself and looking at connections and trends among those themes (cf. Saldana; Warren and Karner).

Analysis & Findings

One studio participant (pseudonyms used throughout) succinctly summed up her experience in studio as "essentially writers talking about writing," a useful blurring of the binary between self-awareness and epistemological-awareness. Whether students were using concrete discourse to assess their strengths and weaknesses or inferring abstractions about the nature of academic writing, they consistently engaged in *writing*

talk, discourse about the processes behind written communication and its contexts. Though thinking in binaries can be limiting, we found the following spectrum, illustrated in Figure 1, useful to consider the student reflective texts we were reading:

Figure 1: Spectrum of Reflective Writing

Under *Finding 1*, we describe these fluid categories in thicker detail. Again, it is noteworthy that these student responses are culled from both "reflection-in-action" and "reflection-in-presentation" in Yancey's paradigm, and are united by the fact that participants, figuratively speaking, were *talking.*

Finding 1: In written reflections, self-focused reflections and abstract reflections both had utility but were distinct in form and impact.

The studio curriculum included three reflective writing prompts assigned throughout the semester in order to provide students opportunity to consider matters like the kinds of writing they were doing in their courses, the ways that studio was (and wasn't) supporting that writing, their own thoughts about the process of moving among a "regular" course and a supplemental space like studio, and the place of written communication in academe. These reflections supplemented the workshopping of student texts and represented the goal of fostering increased metacognitive understanding of academic literacies (*Framework*; Taczak), reflection being a means toward greater "agency" (Yancey, *Reflection)* and student success. Although students reflected in a wide variety of ways, reflections might be described as fitting into two categories: *reflections focused on the self* and *reflections focused on writing as an abstraction.*

Total number of reflective writings produced during first semester of pilot	60 (from 24 different students)
Number of *reflections that focused on the self*	25
Number of *reflections that focused on writing as an abstraction*	12
Number of reflective writings that do both	15
Number of reflective writings that do neither	8

Table 1: Categorizing Reflection

Participants used a variety of discourses in their reflections, as the student voices below attest. Most often they were describing artifacts they had brought into studio for discussion and assessing the positive and negative attributes of those artifacts or inferring insights about the writing process based on those workshop sessions. Some used specialized discourse—including disciplinary language from writing studies—to reflect on and evaluate their strengths and weakness; at other times, they used everyday lingo, a function of various factors including whether they were currently first-year or advanced undergraduates. The various specialized and non-specialized discourses that circulated during studio enhanced students' reflective opportunities and fostered access to transfer.

On one hand, reflections that *focused on the self* tended to make declarative statements about students' own individual strengths and weaknesses as writers or often proactive goals for improvement. These statements tended to be concrete: "*I did x.*" or "*I struggled with y.*" Reflecting in this mode, Malak identifies a precise troublespot and offers a precise goal: "I would also like to improve my diction and syntax … I am concerned that my writing will not be the way my professor likes it." On the other hand, students whose reflections *focused on writing as an abstraction* moved beyond statements about their own textual practices toward a consideration of concepts like genre or rhetorical situation. Kathy reflected on how her conception of "good writing" has broadened after seeing "different types of writing" produced for classes across-the-curriculum. Kathy's approach is different than the explicit goal of self-improvement because Kathy is not talking only about her writing; indeed, she resists a solipsistic objective in her reflection. She uses a reflective opportunity to *theorize* about the broad but very compelling question: what is "good writing" and "how do we begin to define that?" Students whose responses skewed more towards making

broader inferences about writing and the writing process -- *I learned that academic writing is x* -- manage to offer an intellectual musing on the writing process and oftentimes illustrate that musing with examples from studio (witness the frequency of reflections that combine both modes of reflection).

We see in student reflection a good deal of value across both self-assessment and the ability to infer abstractions about writing. Studio's singular foregrounding of opportunities for sustained reflection seems to provide venues for both modes of expression and their attendant potentialities for confidence, self-awareness, and metacognitive understanding--of value in particular for students unfamiliar with the norms and conventions of academic literacies. While both categories leave the student in a position to have better success, reflections on the self tend to be more goal and final product oriented. Ali writes, "I hope to transfer what I learn from the course to my real paper," seeing the reflection within studio as a means to the end goal of higher grades on high stake projects in Ali's discipline. While there's nothing at all wrong with this student's outlook, limiting the uses of reflection and improvement only to the context of a single grade on a single writing project without consideration of a broader context (e.g., what insights writ large were gained from close study of the text), leaves Ali very close to Yancey's tragic figures, described in her article: exhausted, the end result as their only means of self-assessment ("Getting" 13).

Why then it is important that students achieve both self-awareness *and* an epistemological awareness as writers? Simply put, so that students do not settle for "exhaustion" as the only result of all the "talk" about writing. The opportunity studio provides to groom self-reflection habits that can lead to improvement in writing, in critical thinking and analysis, and hopefully have a broader impact across students' college experience--particularly when writing prompts foster reflection that elicits both concrete self-awareness and a chance to engage in abstract insight-building. As Sommers demonstrates in "Reflection Revisited," the value in emphasizing reflective moments regarding writing hugely outweighs the potential "chore" of this task. As we consider how best to be of service to "basic writers" (the departure point for our own institutional inquiry) and other students less familiar with or confident about literacy demands of higher education, we see value in considering ways to scaffold reflective prompts that foster both self-awareness and a more coherent sense of writing-as-abstraction.

We observe that reflections focused on the self are often aspirational and post-mortem. Mallory tells us in her interview that she "hopes this course gives [her] the proper tools to write and revise my writing before I turn in my papers." The benefit of reflection (abstractly) and studio (concretely) is that both of these aspirational goals

should be met by the end of the semester. Studio is built around revision and workshop, therefore after fourteen weeks of practice, Mallory *should* hopefully have developed revision strategies to improve her writing process. Mallory definitely will have access to a new and deepening vocabulary for literary terms, writing devices and conventions, and other concrete "tools" to apply to her process. She renders reflection as an evaluative process where the desired outcome is a better grade. Self-reflections also tend to connect how students write to their material realities, such as schedule, other classes, work habits or spaces, etc. Furthermore, students often named specific strengths and or weakness, through varying levels of specificity, development, and engagement. For example, Courtney "could not even edit [her] peers' work," showing a limited awareness of a perceived skill deficiency. "I was not sure what to look for or how to give good and useful advice," she concludes, identifying an actionable perceived trait.

On the other end of our spectrum, student reflection skewing towards "writing as an abstraction" shows less pragmatic goals. Like Kathy waxing poetic about "good writing" and "becoming a better writer" (in terms vague and unspecified), these learning expectations *are* result-based for the self, but go *beyond* the scope of an A paper. We believe that writing is a foundation for some kind of learning, or insight, beyond achievement, beyond post-exhaustion, beyond the grade. As Kathy says:

> It's just kind of interesting seeing how other people write. Like, I've noticed that my writing is more analytical...It shows me that other people write so differently. There's technical writing, there's engineering, and there's just like a big variety.

This examination of experience, transcending both the self and a concern for external evaluation, ponders the -difference across genre, discipline, and individual voice. While lacking concrete objectives, reflections like Kathy's have the potential to pay dividends later--e.g., during subsequent terms when a student might find herself needing to use very different genre conventions and recalling a broad (and useful) insight about academic writing.

Finding 2: Reflection reveals and fosters deep engagement with writing's complexities.

Studio's foregrounding of reflection seems to have fostered a sense of nuance and complexity. In both our interviews and in their reflective writings, participants said they appreciated the fact that they got feedback from *all* members of studio (instead

of, say, a single peer-review partner in a normal composition class). These students mentioned that it wasn't just about the volume of input, it was also about the diversity of ideas contributing to a wider sense of the possibilities. Several even mentioned learning from moments where they received *contradictory* advice.

What emerged from interviews was a representation of the complexity of the writing process--an ability, willingness, and orientation toward engagement with subtleties and contradictions. Some framed their insights within the emphasis studio places on student perspective. For example, several participants reflected on how they negotiated feedback from multiple points-of-view. They found that when figuring out how to accomplish tasks, there was rarely a single correct answer or a single way to succeed. They spoke in the interview context of the plethora of perspectives and how the ping-ponging of ideas about writing ultimately revealed the imperative for writers to make hard decisions informed by audience expectations. Similarly, informants often praised their emerging understanding of their agency within a cacophony of competing perspectives about written communication. Representative comments include:

> "Everyone has their own way of writing."
> "There are so many different ways one paper can be."
> "You put it (a draft or work-in-progress) through so many filters and then see it."
> "Instead of having one voice, I now have many."
> "I learned from hearing from the room."
> "[You get] the best of however many worlds there are in the class."

On one hand, these sound like positive assessments of *any* peer review session, but there's an especially acute willingness to listen to the wisdom of "the room," even when the room provides disparate advice. Students in studio seem to be reflecting on the value of moving beyond simplistic, black/white conceptions of writing. There is *agency* behind the statements students make *about writing* as they reflect on literate practices. It is striking that, often, their statements offer epistemological claims on literacy and academic writing, as they generalize from their experiences and the experiences in "the room." These statements also sound a bit like general statements about the value of subjectivity, and we reiterate that we certainly are not claiming these are necessarily *eureka moments*. On the other hand, there is power in the type of subjectivity being claimed: "I have…" and "I learned…." Such affirmations illustrate burgeoning agency and a willingness to make claims about the writing process writ large. One respondent's agency was especially pronounced, as he explained in his

interview how he had the opportunity in studio to reflect on his technical writing instructor's assessment of his writing, which he felt offered a too pat assessment that it suffered due to "cultural dimensions." The student, of a non-Western racial background, commented that, "Writing is different for every writer no matter where they're from," elaborating, quite astutely, that differences in one's composing style or surface features are hard to connect definitively to racial or ethnic identity. This student's narrative suggests the utility of agency.

Yancey says in *Reflection in the Writing Classroom* that writing reflectively gives students a chance "to understand and articulate the pluralism of truth" (19). Building on Yancey, we argue that reflection also fosters an understanding of truth's *complexity*, and the complexity of writing, including the range of choices that writers have. The implication here--particularly for teachers in open-admissions settings--is that foregrounding reflection in spaces like studios can make transparent both expectations as well as the range of possibilities open to students trying to navigate those expectations.

Finding 3: Studio is a social space.

When respondents discussed studio in interviews and described the course in their written reflections, they also frequently used the word "talk" to describe interaction with other participants. We were especially struck by the aforementioned participant who summed up the course by saying "It's essentially writers talking about writing." Notably, she doesn't call her classmates "students" but rather "writers," and positions "writing" (not "our papers") as the focus of the conversation. Most notable, though, is the choice of the verb "talk" over "workshop," "edit," or "peer review." Her diction is wrapped up in an ethos of socializing that positions writing itself as a social act. During interviews in particular, participants often used a form of the verb "to talk" in their discussions of studio. Even more often, they described variations on the theme of workshopping-as-conversation. There emerges an implicit definition of reflection that might read, *to talk about something*. The connotation is collegial, friendly—as if the space of studio involves not only artifacts and an embedded writing center consultant but possibly a pot of coffee and some comfortable chairs. This description is consistent with the connotation of "studio" as a singular space. Indeed, as we assessed studio, a positive attribute that emerged was the social potential on a primarily commuter campus to foster community and a space for intellectual exchange.

Implications

Our findings suggest students can most productively thrive when given venues to reflect on *both* their own writing processes *and* on written communication writ large. The present study not only underlines reflection as a core component of postsecondary writing instruction but also makes the case for a foregrounding of diverse opportunities for reflection. Alt-pedagogies like studio that disrupt basic writing business-as-usual, for instance, can more substantively strip away what some students perceive as "excess" and foreground reflection in substantial and sustained ways. Indeed, our program's trajectory suggests reflection might have the most utility for students when incorporated vertically in multiple sites including but not limited to co-curricular sites like studios. Further, reflection seemed to have the most value--as Yancey has argued--when not relegated to the margins of a course or a curriculum. Reflections on "self" and reflections on writing-as-an-abstraction both serve to demystify literate practices like academic writing, offering a marked utility for open-admissions students, students from underserved communities, and others less familiar with the conventions and cultures of higher education. Studio participants reflected on the writing process *throughout* their time in the course, sometimes with structure (e.g., precise writing prompts) but usually without. Many participants even attributed their own learning to the fact that much (perceived-to-be-) extraneous material was stripped away in the context of studio; all of their learning stemmed from their own writing and their own reflections thereon (no outside readings, a/v materials, etc.). It is axiomatic in writing studies to say that student writing should be the subject of college writing courses. Perhaps the corollary ought to be: *reflection on writing should be the subject of college writing studios*. But just as student writing develops most effectively when practiced in college writing courses *and* other classes as well, reflection also develops when practiced in multiple places.

Useful, productive reflection can take the form of writing about *the self* as students build greater awareness of their own process and their own strengths and weaknesses. Equally, reflection can entail writing about writing, as students generate ideas and notions about literacy and language. Both are valid, especially insomuch as the reflective artifacts we studied that fit into both of these camps show in equal part students thinking deliberately and critically, albeit about two distinct points on the rhetorical triangle: the writer and the text. So, building on Yancey, programs can serve an array of student needs by thinking innovatively about how to integrate a *range* of reflective tasks. Often, the field has emphasized "reflection-in-presentation" (Yancey, *Reflection in the Writing Classroom)*, for instance, when they compose a portfolio cover

letter. Useful, of course, but can programmatic initiatives that transcend "the three-credit comp class" build even more sustained and varied chances to reflect? Perhaps.

We think it would be useful for more scholars inquiring into student success and invested in pedagogies and programmatic initiatives geared toward increasing access to utilize methodologies that are collaborative and focused on institutional change. Specifically, we see additional need for inquiry into how studios function with different levels of programmatic and institutional support and different amounts of collaboration across units. The present study suggests a need for additional inquiry into studios collaborating with writing centers and particularly with writing center consultants--who, locally (and elsewhere), are a great and sometimes underutilized asset. Equally, longitudinal research in particular focused on the impact of sections running *without* an embedded writing center consultant (currently our arrangement due to budgetary restrictions) would be valuable. And more broadly, what does interfacing with Writing Centers look like for studios, pedagogically and spatially? *Collaborative-contextualist* work attends to local situations and we think the present scholarship also opens doors for additional case studies, ethnographies, and institution-specific inquiry at open-admissions settings--empirical work establishing correlation between both studios and reflection-based pedagogies and various measures of student success. Moving forward, such data-driven inquiry could provide evidence for those of us invested in fighting for the resources needed to enact such change at our home institutions.

Works Cited

Beaufort, Anne. "Reflection: The Metacognitive Move towards Transfer of Learning." *A Rhetoric of Reflection,* edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 23-41.

Chemishanova, Polina, and Robin Snead. "Reconfiguring the Writing Studio Model: Examining the Impact of the PlusOne on Student Performance and Retention." *Retention, Persistence, and Writing Programs,* edited by Todd Ruecker et al., Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 167-184.

Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project. *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing.* CWPA, NCTE, and NWP, 2011, Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf.

Cushman, Ellen. "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 47, no. 1, 1996, pp. 7-28.

Downs, Douglass, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions:

(Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552-584.

Grego, Rhonda C., and Nancy S. Thompson. *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces.* Southern Illinois UP, 2008.

--. "The Writing Studio Program." *WPA: Writing Program Administration,* vol. 19, no. 1/2, 1995, pp. 66-79.

Harrington, Susanmarie. "The Role of Reflection in First-Year Writing Course Outcomes." *Teaching/Writing in the Late Age of Print,* edited by Jeffrey Galin, Carol Peterson Haviland, and J. Paul Johnson, Hampton, 2003, pp. 39-52.

Johanek, Cindy. *Composing Research: A Contextualist Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition.* Utah State UP, 2000.

Lalicker, William. "A Basic Introduction to Basic Writing: A Baseline and Five Alternatives." *Teaching Developmental Writing,* 2nd Ed., edited by Susan Naomi Bernstein, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004, pp. 29-39.

MacDonald, Michael T, and William DeGenaro. "Negotiating a Transcultural Ethos from the Group Up in a Basic Writing Program." *Journal of Basic Writing,* vol. 36, no. 1, 2017, pp. 25-55.

Mauk, Jonathan. "Location, Location, Location: The 'Real' (E)states of Being, Writing, and Thinking in Composition." *College English,* vol. 65, no. 4, 2003, pp. 368-388.

Porter, James E., et al. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodological for Change." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 51, no. 4, 2000, pp. 610-642.

Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference.* Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Saldana, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers.* 3rd Ed. Sage, 2016.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* Verso, 1989.

---. *Thirdspaces: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Blackwell, 1996.

Sommers, Jeff. "Reflection Revisited: The Class Collage." *Journal of Basic Writing,* vol. 30, no. 1, 2011, pp. 99-129.

Taczak, Kara. "Reflection is Critical for Writers Development." *Naming What We Know: Threshhold Concepts of Writing Studies.* Ed. Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle. Boulder, CO: U of Colorado and Utah State UP, 2015. 78-79. Print.

Tassoni, John Paul, and Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson. "Not Just Anywhere, Anywhen: Mapping Change through Studio Work." *Journal of Basic Writing,* vol. 24, no. 1, 2005, pp. 68-92.

Warren, Carol A.B., and Tracy Xavia Karner. *Discovering Qualitative Methods: Field Research, Interviews, and Analysis.* 2nd Ed. Oxford UP, 2009.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Defining Reflection: The Rhetorical Nature and Qualities of Reflection." *A Rhetoric of Reflection,* edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 303-320.

---. "Getting Beyond Exhaustion: Reflection, Self-Assessment, and Learning." *The Clearing House,* vol. 72, no. 1, 1998, pp. 13-17.

---. *Reflection in the Writing Classroom.* Utah State UP, 1998.

Acknowledgments

Truly this work is collaborative. Thank you to Michael T. MacDonald, who taught studio during its pilot phase and was instrumental in developing the curriculum; Charlene Koppitz, senior writing center consultant embedded in studio as a co-teacher during the pilot phase who worked on this research and contributed mightily; *Open Words* editors and reviewers for their helpful feedback; and studio participants for sharing their perspectives with us.

About the Authors

Jerrice Donelson is a Doctoral Candidate in Writing, Rhetoric and American Cultures at Michigan State University. Her research interests include critical literacy and pedagogy, WAC/WID, Writing studio, writing centers, community literacies and cultural rhetorics. Her pilot research focuses on former dual enrollment students experiences with writing in college disciplines without having had first-year writing. Jerrice is also a teacher consultant for the Red Cedar Writing Project and non-profit founder of Scribe Tribe Writing Tutors.

Tony DeGenaro is a second year Ph.D. student at Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. He is also a lecturer at University of Michigan Dearborn. He teaches first-year and creative writing courses, and has been an instructor and youth mentor for ACCESS and TRIO Upward Bound. Tony has recently presented work at CCCCs, College English, and Southwest Popular & American Culture conferences; his creative work can be found at tonydegenaropoetry.com.

William DeGenaro is professor of composition and rhetoric at the University of Michigan Dearborn, a writer, and a Fulbright Scholar. He has taught in Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates and frequently collaborates with Detroit area non-profits on service learning initiatives. His academic work focuses on community-based teaching, working-class studies, and basic writing pedagogies and has appeared in *Journal of Basic Writing, Rhetoric Review, WPA: Writing Program Administration,* and elsewhere.

This peer-reviewed essay was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 102 – 106
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.07
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *Writing Pathways to Student Success*

Edited by Lillian Craton, Renee Love, and Sean Barnette. The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2017. 162 pp. ISBN: 9781607327691. Available at: https://wac.colostate.edu/books/practice/pathways/

Casey Sigerman
The University of Texas at San Antonio

In *Writing Pathways for Student Success*, editors Lillian Craton, Renée Love, and Sean Barnette bring together essays that examine the benefits of transcending product-based learning, that speak to student engagement in writing processes, and that help build student self and social awareness in and out of the classroom. Contributors represent a range of academic institutions, including community colleges and state universities, and topics under discussion encompass curriculum standards, innovative pedagogies, and a variety of assessments. Practices offered in this collection lend themselves to differentiation within college writing courses as well as secondary English classrooms, both advanced and on-level.

This edited collection speaks to the editors' interests in the teaching of first-year composition (FYC) courses that shape students' experiences through writing in transformative ways. Lillian Craton passionately advocates for mentoring student writers, and Renée Love dedicates her work to building student success through examination of civic rhetoric and individual potential. Sean Barnette teaches first-year writing and works as an advisor for English majors in the Honors College at Landers University. The collection of essays is divided into three sections that respond to questions of why, how, and what we write. Section one— "Why We Write"— explores the "importance of rhetoric and self-expression for students' ability to thrive in and after college" (vii). Section two—"How We Write"—includes discussions on cross-disciplinary practices and how holistic pedagogy benefits both students and teachers

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

in FYC courses (viii). The final section—"What We Write"—provides work grounded in pedagogy to "promote broad-based student learning" (viii). A unique and useful addition, the final section displays how abstract ideas and practices of previous chapters may manifest in actual classrooms. The major trends of this collection include an emphasis on student-centered curriculum, the incorporation of experiential and service-based learning, process-based evaluation, and personalized writing assignments that address student interest and perspectives.

Introducing section one, Barnette underscores the ability of FYC courses to complicate students' views of writing and influence their involvement with the world, a focus that is also a controlling theme of the book. Sarah Hardison O'Connor's "A Confusion of Messages: The Critical Role of Rhetoric in the Information Age" outlines the critical role of rhetorical practices in accessing and processing information in this new digital age. She introduces three principles for writing found throughout the book: communal relations, multiplicity, and listening to develop critical viewpoints. Karen Bishop Morris' "Introductory Writing as the Gateway to Stronger Communities, College and Career Success" focuses on the ways civic and professional participation emerges by incorporating experiential learning (ExL). Morris bolsters the value of community-based writing by bringing authentic experiences into the classroom by encouraging student engagement with their own cultural capital.

Other contributors to the first section discuss how instructors may approach difference in FYC classrooms. In the following chapter, "The Value of Violence in Student Writing," Lori Brown contends that violent texts require teachers' heightened threat awareness in light of the violence in schools. Brown defends the cathartic value of students' writing about violence, therefore underscoring teachers' abilities to differentiate between dangerous warning signs and productive self-expression. Rachel McCoppin, "Embracing Diversity in Composition Courses," focuses on building students' identities as both academics and future members of workplace environments. She provides strategies to encourage student engagement with Otherness through service learning and studying opposing viewpoints. The final chapter in section one, Ruth Goldfine and Deborah Mixson-Brookshire's "Influence of the College Composition Classroom on Students' Values and Beliefs" differs from previous chapters through its psychological framework. They analyze students' inability to articulate the reasoning behind their beliefs, and their findings suggest that instructors have a high level of influence over such beliefs and therefore advocate the importance of FYC courses in shaping student voices. Each section in this collection ends with an essay presents more radical ideas of FYC instruction, and this essay, in

particular, uses data to remind writing teachers of their responsibilities when dealing with student beliefs and arguments.

As the lead editor for section two, Love justifies the inclusion of cross-disciplinary practices which rejecting a "one-size-fits-all" mentality to teach writing. Rachel Fomalhaut, in "Holistic Learning for Real-Life Writers: A Call for Affective Pedagogy in First-Year Composition," promotes the flipped classroom approach for active student engagement during class time with structured support from teachers to access alternative forms of knowledge. Building on non-traditional pedagogical practices in "Acting the Author," Pamela Henney asserts that writing is performative, and students must be given time to rehearse their new academic personas. Building on practices of Method Acting, she claims this rehearsal results in embodiments of these new roles on paper. Next, Casie Fedukovich, "Free to Dance: A Somatic Approach to Teaching Writing," challenges writing instructors to incorporate somatic pedagogy and disrupt the "choreography of the classroom" (87). This disruption allows for differentiation in both teaching strategies and student writing, therefore allowing for greater creativity and fewer restrictions on the writing process within FYC courses. The final chapter in section two, "Who Decides My Grades? Reflections on Team-Teaching and Peer Mentoring in FYC," by Christopher Garland, introduces a new topic: team teaching. Evaluating his own experience with team teaching, Garland outlines the strengths of pedagogical synthesis for both students and teachers. Pedagogical synthesis is beneficial, for both teachers and students, as it allows for less experienced instructors to learn in a group setting with consistent feedback from veteran teachers, and it provides a smaller student-to-teacher ratio.

Craton introduces the final section as including pragmatic applications of previously described philosophies for writing instruction. The final, and most beneficial section, "What We Write," provides specific assignments and strategies to incorporate the abstract disciplines previously discussed. Lynne Lewis-Gaillet, in "Primary Research in the Vertical Writing Curriculum," provides strategies to include primary investigation and archival research in writing assignments; also, she fosters student engagement by emphasizing that writing should have real-world, physical consequences. Similarly, Kathryn Crowther, in "Composing Communities: Blogs as Learning Communities in the FYC Course," shows how the dual purpose of blogging develops individual writing personas while also placing students in communal environments, therefore expanding the classroom and the traditional author/audience dyad. Lisa Whalen, in "Promoting Academic Skills Through Writing: The Survey of Academic Skills Essay Assignment," outlines a detailed step process for writing including communal engagement, peer feedback, and scaffolded drafts with consistent

teacher feedback. Her contribution provides an extremely useful template which can be manipulated for any essay topic and allows for multiple levels of differentiation. Abigail Scheg, in "My Composition or Yours? What We Teach in FYC," emphasizes student-centeredness and advocates for more career-focused writing instruction by requiring students to research writing expectations and samples from chosen fields of study. Finally, Matthew Paproth, in "Confronting the Uncomfortable: Food and FYC," presents a non-traditional topic of study: food. He establishes the rationale for food as a topic because it can be approached by any individual from any cultural background due to its universality, and he then challenges his students with controversial texts to build argumentation and communication skills.

As a secondary English teacher with experience in Special Education, English, and AP Language and Composition courses, I find many access points to the practices described in this collection. Whalen's writing assignment from the final section can be modified for any grade level. Students can easily follow the loose structure laid out regarding scaffold-stepping process in Whalen's chapter, especially when students are encouraged to choose personal topics for engagement. Incorporating this scaffolded stepping process, which interweaves teacher feedback, will help students form their own definitions before creating and conducting a community-based survey that encounters different and possibly opposing perspectives. While tasks such as the question creation and the analysis of findings are completed in class, the application of a flipped classroom is a dynamic that requires independent primary investigation to aid students in positioning their findings for diverse audiences. Students begin to draft assignments during class before moving to peer evaluations, which aim to assess clarity and meaningful acknowledgment of opposing viewpoints. Students then conduct low-stakes speeches in which they speak for two-three minutes before the class outlining their findings and standing in the argument, allowing their peers to question and analyze their work to this point. With this feedback, students then write the final drafts. By incorporating step processes with consistent peer and teacher feedback, students find time to work through the struggles of writing with structured assistance and opportunities to expand beyond the classroom.

Through reliance on process-based evaluation, FYC and secondary teachers can increase student engagement and build the academic identities through including communal involvement, acknowledging diversity, and implementing cross-disciplinary and non-traditional pedagogical practices. The best practices for FYC courses outlined in the first two sections of this book find practical application in the final section, and I find the lessons and units very applicable within a variety of classrooms. This collection is a valuable asset for any FYC teacher, both new and seasoned, as it offers

innovative practices for writing instruction. Also, the book is a rich resource for secondary teachers who need to prepare students for college-level writing. The assignments put forth in this volume are easily accessible and lend themselves to variance within different classroom levels. Applying elements of cognitive and expressive rhetorical theories, the editors of this book construct a rich resource for teachers who seek purposeful and meaningful outcomes in student writing. The inclusion of the final section transforms abstract best practices into concrete applications, and the multimodality and multiplicity woven into the foundation of *Writing Pathways to Student Success* allows for the differentiation necessary to create accessible lessons and writing projects.

About the Author

Casey Sigerman is currently working on an MA in English at the University of Texas at San Antonio with an emphasis in Rhetoric and Composition. She also teaches English education at the secondary level, including English III and AP Language and Composition and works with grades 9-12 on college readiness and writing instruction.

This review was previously available on Pearson.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 107 – 110
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.08
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *What Democracy Looks Like: The Rhetoric of Social Movements and Counterpublics*

Edited by Christina R. Foust, Amy Pason, and Kate Zittlow Rogness. University of Alabama Press, 2017. $34.95, ISBN-13: 978-0817358938.

Jennifer Keizer
The University of Texas at San Antonio

This collection of essays challenges conventional frameworks of social movements and counterpublics. By putting the two fields of rhetoric and communications in conversation with one another around the topic of social change, Foust, Pason, and Zittlow Rogness expand the potential for academic study of the interconnection between movements and counterpublics. Typically, communication scholars have attended to movements, while rhetoric scholars labor with meanings of publics and counterpublics. This collection, *What Democracy Looks Like,* successfully bridges a research gap between the two fields to demonstrate why, how, and to what extent movements and counterpublics work together to affect social change. This collection is easily accessible to the new scholar and yet still compelling to the experienced social movement veteran.

The editors construct easy movement within the collection as readers encounter creative and forward-thinking themes that remain grounded in historical scholarship. One common thread running throughout the essays is the idea of flexibility and fluidity between movements and counterpublics as the book progresses through three clearly focused sections: problematizing the past research of social movements and counterpublics, distinguishing counterpublics and movements through case studies, and looking at new directions of rhetorical studies within these contexts. Another emerging theme is globalization and its impact on counterpublic

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

theory as each section provides at least one article addressing social change in a non-Western context.

The collection begins with a solid foundation in the history of social movement studies and counterpublic theory as Section I, "Problematizing the Past of Social Movement Rhetoric and Counterpublic Research," presents three articles that explore past scholarship and ponders the future role of rhetoric and movement studies. The editors set the framework for further conversation between the two fields and find common ground. The first article by Raymie E. McKerrow reviews the great debate between Simons and McGee of "movement" as a noun and "rhetoric" as a verb. By revisiting this debate, McKerrow recommends not a choice between the two but a pluralistic approach, where movements can be both phenomenon and meaning, providing potential to gain more insights into how social movements and rhetoric work together. As McKerrow complicates our view of social movements, asking us to move beyond traditional expectations of social movements, Daniel C Brouwer and Marie-Louise Paulesc push the conversation further by exploring the globalization of counterpublic theory. Though the authors see the potential benefits of using Western theory of counterpublics to name and theorize in non-Western settings, they also caution scholars to be cognizant of the possible harm, in that Anglo/European ideas of public spheres could "recolonize" communities by way of Western scholarship. Brouwer and Paulesc consider how "local" context and culture can aid in theorizing the effects of counterpublics. As rhetoric and communication studies continue to expand in a rich global sphere, the authors emphasize that scholars must remain open to diverse and culturally relevant approaches to social movement rhetoric.

The conversation moves from a global to a domestic discussion in the four chapters of section II, "Distinguishing and Performing Counterpublics and Movements through Case Studies." This section engages diverse topics: from the "Occupy Our Homes" movement to anti-abortion picketers to SlutWalks and, lastly, to examining movement within rhetorical criticisms such as the collective Against Equality. The authors in this section are connected by a shared theme of conceiving movements and counterpublics on a continuum of phenomenon-meaning. Amy Pason explores this idea in chapter three as she posits that both the *verb* and the *subject* functions of movements and counterpublics can coexist. This complication of terms offers of new lens of study that doesn't require an "either/or" binary. In chapter 5, Catherine Helen Palczewski and Kelsey Harr-Lagin write a provocative essay that removes the standard counterpublic-versus-establishment struggle. Through examining the two divergent and contentious rhetorical collectives of anti-abortion picketers and abortion clinics, both of which have been labeled as publics and

counterpublics respectively, the authors create a sophisticated argument of counterpublic-public divisions. Counterpublics, such as their examples, can become entangled in a power struggle outside of the public debate. This battle for power and disruption of the other creates intriguing discourse between the counterpublics that offers new insights into motives and moves toward social change.

Social change in the context of diversification of social movement rhetoric comes to fruition in section III, "New Directions for Studying Social Movements and Counterpublics Rhetorically." Scholars in border studies will appreciate Bernadette Marie Calafell and Dawn Marie D. McIntosh's essay, "Latina/o Vernacular Discourse." The authors demonstrate how performance movements and vernacular rhetorics can work to disrupt social perceptions as seen in Gómez Pena's work as a performance artist who uses visual and physical tactics to subvert dominant ideologies. By using his body as a location of resistance, Pena illustrates how Latino/a bodies are already labeled as sites of *other* and therefore ignored. This chapter emphasizes the usefulness of counterpublics in making social change and theorizes that the vernacular can be used as a modality for the counterpublic, once again showing the concept's fluidity and flexibility.

Despite the global focus of this book and attempts to push the boundaries of social change theory, one area that needs more development is the inclusion of non-Western scholars. I applaud the efforts of the editors to think beyond the Western context when discussing movements and counterpublics, but they tended to rely on Western scholars to assess, problematize, and question applications of these theories in a global milieu. I believe non-Western scholars would expand our privilege-centered discourse on social change via their culturally unique frameworks of movements and counterpublics.

Overall, this collection of essays successfully enlarges the scholarship on counterpublics and social movement by examining the mutability and elasticity of social movement rhetoric. Foust, Pason, and Zittlow Rogness wisely ground this collection in an historical perspective as they present a contemporary look at rhetoric and social movements. In their goal to enjoin the conversation between the two camps of movement and counterpublics, the editors created a solid framework for future scholarship that can approach social change rhetoric through diverse settings. They also demonstrate that we can find common ground between counterpublics and social movements. The boundaries between these two areas of scholarship prove more permeable and flexible than we may have thought.

About the Author

Jennifer Keizer is currently pursuing her M.A. in English at the University of Texas at San Antonio, with specific focus in the areas of Rhetoric and Composition and Linguistics. As a Teaching Assistant II, she is an instructor of Freshman Composition in UTSA's Writing Program. Jennifer is an Army Veteran and holds a B.A. in English and Spanish from South Dakota State University.

This review was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 111 – 114
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.09
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *Poetry Wars: Verse and Politics in the American Revolution and Early Republic*

By Colin Wells. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 2017. 342 pp. $55.00. ISBN 978-0-8122-4965-1.

Jamie Crosswhite
University of Texas at San Antonio

Within the first twenty pages of *Poetry Wars: Verse and Politics in the American Revolution and Early Republic*, Colin Wells makes a bold and far-reaching claim. He asserts that the aim of his text is to demonstrate the importance of political poetry as it is woven throughout the story of the American Revolution and the consequent construction of the federal government and initial party systems. Though studies of America's conception and the Revolutionary War are ubiquitous, *Poetry Wars* undertakes the unique task of organizing the "dynamic story of how political identities were formed amid shifting rhetorical strategies in response to rival arguments and unfolding events" (18). Though the poetic form is too often ignored, Wells argues for the rhetorical importance of poetry which was widely circulated throughout the print public sphere of the late eighteenth century. While taking on a monumental task in addressing a rather vast and substantial historical window, Wells does excellent work not only in his primary claim, but also in revealing a space where women and minorities were given room to speak within a cultural creation dominated by a primarily white patriarchy.

After establishing the rich context for a particularly thriving print public sphere shaped between 1765-1815 and introducing the distinct opportunity for intersection amid "poetic form and political discourse," Wells begins his text with a focus on prerevolutionary poets (colonial) and proclamations (British) in his chapter "The Poetics of Resistance". Addressing printed material as early as the 1720's, the bulk of

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

Well's analysis within this section is grounded in the early 1770's, illustrating how colonial American writers responded to the Coercive/Intolerable Acts of British Parliament. Through carefully chosen verses juxtaposed to the formal documents they were satirizing, and followed by the direct historical outcomes, Wells effectively highlights the power poetry had to sway the public to either act directly or alter their ideological standing. Each of the subsequent chapters is structured through a similar scaffolding in which Wells sets up the historical context and the immediate political climate, and then shifts to specific poetic case or cases which challenged the political documents and collective ideology within that particular phase of revolutionary history; he concludes each section with a quick overview of the outcomes ensued as a result of his aptly termed "poetic warfare".

Following the extensive development of poetic resistance, Wells shifts to a more specified argument in "War and Literary War," unpacking the literary "warfare" waged between Loyalists and Patriots through song, mimicry, and the culmination of John Trumbull's mock epic *M'Fingal*. This section concludes with a withdraw of Loyalist publications from the printed public sphere, thus shifting to a more private realm. Through this monumental change, comes "Poetry and Conspiracy" which continues through the remainder of the war and into the defining of political parties and efforts to outline democracy within a new republic. Chapters four and six, "The Language of Liberty" and "Mirror Images" explore similar yarns surrounding the French Revolution and the possibility of a pattern of continued political movements following the example of America's successful rebellion and established democracy. However, these points of intersection and hope of echoing revolutionary success became problematic with the continued violence and moral complexities developing throughout the French Revolution; American poets struggled to contend with clear portrayals of their French counterpart. Within the section entitled "The Voice of the People," Wells illustrates many early American poets' initial hesitancy in critiquing members of the new federal administration; however, such risks were ultimately taken to expose John Adams, Alexander Hamilton and others thought to be working against the ideologies of a new republic. Through the concluding chapter, "The Triumph of Democracy," Wells examines the struggles between Republican and Federalists ideology through their poetry, and the meaning of Jefferson's presidency, and the end of the first party system, all of which were battled through poetic means.

Undoubtedly, the success of *Poetry Wars* as a scholarly endeavor is that it exemplifies the real power poetry held in altering American Revolutionary history, not just as a medium to relay events or communicate belief(s), but as a functioning tool in altering historical precedence. Political poetry successfully functioned to neutralize

power, and to adversely create a "sphere of public authority" in which public opinion crafted real change. Though Wells does not shape his text through feminist theory or claim feminist readings as a dominate scholastic advancement, his threads on female narratives including analysis of "The Female Patriots" and "Daughters of Liberty in America" speaks boldly to prior readings of women's roles within this historical moment and their voices and understanding of self within this male centered era. Similarly, Wells opens up a space for discussion of the role of differing ethnicities and cultural nuances played in shaping an early America, especially in regard to the policy and politics of Native American treatment, and how Native peoples are addressed through poetic rendition. Both gender and race are touched on tentatively, but advantageously within this work as well as clear success in solidifying the power of poetry in early American politics.

Because this text undertakes such a layered and complex historical moment, some of the historical digressions and anecdotes are dense with allusions and antiquated detail, making the content rich for historical scholars. There are times too, when literary allusions, theory, and terminology pervade as a means to unpack the carefully chosen verses used for illustration throughout; making this work an engaging and informative read for literary scholars, also. The political poems selected for the center of this publication, however, are not printed in their entirety, but only named by author, title, and accompanied by a few highly selected lines appearing to facilitate the argument; one seeking to use this work as an instructional piece on poetry and/or poetic theory will need to locate the full poetic selections outside this publication for they are not provided.

Poetry Wars is a multifaceted work that speaks across scholarly boundaries to effectively reveal a rhetorical and artistic authority overlooked by American scholars across genres. It is well written and thoughtful. And though Wells envisions his work as speaking directly to literary and historical studies, his text is additionally an exemplar publication for rhetorical examination, and a starting point for further gender and race study within the early American imaginary. Those who wish to engage with some of the earliest written advancements posited towards American nation making and the national narrative will find several points of departure within this multidimensional composition; it speaks directly to Jürgen Habermas's theory of the public sphere, the power of print culture, and the complexities of literature to shape action, an excellent read for anyone interested in the complexities of early America.

About the Author

Jamie Crosswhite is a doctoral candidate within the English department at the University of Texas, San Antonio. Her current research is in feminist visual rhetoric and the environment, rhetorical narratives, and critical regionalism. Recent publications include a chapter in the upcoming MLA volume, *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Karen Tei Yamashita,* and a short analysis of Cormac McCarthy's *The Road.*

This review was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 115 – 119
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.10
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *The Desire for Literacy: Writing in the Lives of Adult Learners*

By Lauren Rosenberg. Conference on College Composition and Communication/ National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Illinois, 2015. ISBN-13:978-0814110812

Corey Greathouse
Austin Community College

In *The Desire for Literacy: Writing in the Lives of Adult Learners*, Lauren Rosenberg offers readers insight to the journey of four adult learners, participants at the Read/Write/Now Adult Learning Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, as they strive to obtain literacy. Their desire for literacy does not stem from the desire to acquire new job opportunities; instead, they are motivated by their desire for self-improvement. Three of the study participants—George, Lee Anne, and Chief—are retirees over the age of sixty. Violeta, the fourth and youngest study participant, is a single mother of six who receives public assistance. The four participants share their experiences in gaining literacy over the course of Rosenberg's four-year study. Rosenberg applies a critical lens to her participants' experiences seeking to answer several important questions: How is the nonliterate community devalued as knowledgeable citizens with the ability to think critically for themselves and about the world around them? What motivates adults in the nonliterate community to become literate? How and why have the voices of the nonliterate communities continued to be silenced in a country where nonliteracy in adults remains a concern? Rosenberg answers these questions and many more, keeping in mind her intended readership: those who shape current literacy programs, curricula, and potentially influence public policy.

Rosenberg organizes *The Desire for Literacy* into six chapters. Although she introduces the nature of her study, methodology, and the four study participants in

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

chapter one, "Resisting Nonliteracy: Adult Learners Restory Their Narratives," Rosenberg focuses primarily on establishing an ideological basis for her work, situated in scholarship that advocates for adult literacy and their ideologies. In referencing scholars, including Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Krista Ratcliff, Frantz Fanon, and Paulo Freire, Rosenberg lays the groundwork for understanding the position in which the dominant/literate society places the nonliterate community, the importance of allowing the nonliterate to tell their own stories, and the reality that nonliterate lives do not mean a lack of knowledge. Rosenberg constructs an empirical basis for her own credibility. At the same time, what makes Rosenberg's references to the various scholars a bit unconventional is that she juxtaposes the scholarly voices with those four study participants, each of whom Rosenberg positions as a theorist of literacy in his/her own right. While she is careful in her word choice, Rosenberg clearly wants readers to understand that people in the nonliterate community are very capable of critically viewing and assessing the world around them, despite their deficits in literacy.

In chapters two and three, "Speaking from 'the Silent, Silenced Center': Just Because You Can't Read Doesn't Mean That You Don't Know" and "Contemplating Literacy: 'A Door Now Open,'" Rosenberg shifts the focus of the primary voice of her participants. Focusing on Ratcliff's *rhetorical listening*, a form of listening that emphasizes close listening and sustained attention, Rosenberg chooses to print the voices of her four participants is standard text, while using italics for her voice, thus positioning herself in typography as the "Other" who "stands under" the words of her participants as those words "wash over" her (26). Rosenberg acts as a witness, becoming the audience to the nonliterate community. In this overt strategy of repositioning their voices as dominant, Rosenberg creates a space for George, Violeta, Chief, and Lee Ann, pseudonyms given to her four participants, to retell their stories, beginning with their unsuccessful attempts at literacy acquisition as young people to their more recent experiences with people in the dominant, literate sector of our society. In addition to their histories and experiences with nonliteracy in the outside world, Rosenberg also spotlights their motivations to attend the Read/Write/Now Literacy Center. Initially, none of the study participants are interested in passing their GED or obtaining a specific educational goal (although Chief and Violeta mention new educational goals as they make gains in their literacy).

Chapter four, "Literacy and Nonliteracy: Reflective Knowledge and Critical Consciousness," focuses less on the participants' narrative voices; rather it presents more details of some of her interviews with the participants, as well as of their polished pieces of writing. In addition to witnessing the writing progress made by George, Violeta, Chief, and Lee Ann, readers are also privy to Rosenberg's analysis of how each

of these participants is able to reflect on the world around them and, with a critical lens, analyze how they see literacy-based power operating around them. For instance, Rosenberg points out how George echoes scholars Paulo Freire and Elspeth Stuckey in his own explanation of how literacy can be used as a weapon against individuals in the nonliterate community. George explains that this form of social "violence" occurs when someone who is literate intentionally gives a nonliterate person something to read "to embarrass [the nonliterate person] around the other people" (93). George recognizes how this "power move" is meant to disempower those who are nonliterate. Despite his literacy status, Rosenberg demonstrates that George, as well as many other people who have not acquired literacy, is critically conscious of the world around him. Unfortunately, people like George are often labeled as being incapable of critical thought. Even more importantly, as Rosenberg points out, each participant's reflections and analyses support individual goals. While George silently acquires the skill set for a job without exposing his nonliteracy, Violeta copes with a life changed by a positive HIV diagnosis. Additionally, as Chief contemplates the actions he can take in using his literacy to share ideas with others, Lee Ann contemplates how reading, like driving, will allow her individual empowerment in accomplishing daily tasks. Such detailed descriptions of participants' range of literacies, analyses, and reflections illustrate an important lesson: the nonliterate community is very capable of critical cognitive abilities.

In chapter five, "What Writing Enables," Rosenberg explains how literacy, specifically writing, allows those who are considered nonliterate to find ways to express their knowledge to communities. Rosenberg examines the direct correlation between the confidence her participants gained as writers, and the likelihood of their writing moving from the private to more public domains. However, it is important to note, as Rosenberg reports on her participants individually, that not everyone's writing experiences looked the same. Rosenberg astutely demonstrates how some participants viewed writing as a means of community outreach, while others might only value writing for its daily practicality. Nevertheless, even this distinction of writing purposes among participants reinforces the ideology that individuals must be able to tell their own stories. These participants, neither pre- or post-literacy should not be assigned a single standard narrative by the literate community, as the typical narrative is built upon stereotypes of the nonliterate.

The concluding chapter, "The Transgressive Power of Writing," points to some essential concerns regarding adult literacy in the United States, underscoring the gains from literacy skill sets. Recognizing that many adult literacy programs and the related studies usually focus on GED outcomes (and associated funding), Rosenberg

advocates that adult literacy programs serve the individual goals of learners. She asserts that if we place an emphasis on writing as an active partner (rather than a secondary activity) to reading, then the transgressive potential of literacy is maximized. As a result, literacy instruction becomes one that directly addresses the needs of the people. In short, Rosenberg maintains her focus on strategies with outcomes focus on the community rather than the functional and employment concerns of the status quo.

Lauren Rosenberg does more that offer her perspective on adult literacy in *The Desire for Literacy: Writing in the Lives of Adult Learners*. She has accomplished an important contribution: giving voices to the voiceless by showcasing the voices of her participants. In earlier parts of the book, readers see that many of the participants' transcribed narratives and writing samples are unpolished. However, as the book progresses, writing samples improve and the voices become even more eloquent, thus illustrating the participants' progress during their time at the Read/Write/Now Adult Learning Center. Furthermore, the transcribed narratives allow readers to know the people within the narratives. The participants take center stage and expose the truths behind the social violence endured by the nonliterate class. The truths of George, Violeta, Chief, and Lee Ann's lived experiences are not overshadowed by the academic research: their presence is not secondary to those scholarly conversations on literacy. Rather, this monograph combines the empirical with the anecdotal in order to present a new view of adult literacy, providing a call-to-action for educators working to policies and curricula that drive Adult Basic Education programs.

About the Author

Corey D. Greathouse is a Ph.D. student at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Prior to beginning his studies at UTSA, he received his M.A. in Literature from Texas State University. Greathouse's research interests are in nineteenth century African American autobiography, first-year college composition studies, and African American linguistics. He currently works as an Assistant Professor of English at Austin Community College.

This review was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University. Articles are published under a Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs).

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 120 – 123
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.11
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing for a Socially Just Future*

By Asao Inoue. Parlor Press, 2015. 348 pp. ISBN: 978-1-60235-773-0.
Available at https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/inoue/

Christine Watson
Biola University

Experienced writing instructors are familiar with the all-too-common narrative students tell: they hate writing, or they enjoy writing, but not for academic purposes. In *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future,* Asao B. Inoue asserts that this narrative is a result of widespread racism present in hegemonic writing assessments. Also, Inoue argues that many current writing programs attempt to avoid racism altogether, an act he calls "complicity in disguise" (24). If his intended audience—writing instructors, WPAs, and graduate students—can see his argument as a pedagogical challenge, and not an indictment on teaching the academic discourse, then they may gain new awareness about the value of diverse discourses.

Inoue uses the data of underperformance by students of color on standardized tests in chapter one as his main evidence for the problem. He claims that Standard Edited American English's (SEAE's) dominance in the academy at the expense of other local discourses contributes to systemic racism. Using the term *racial habitus*, he argues that because language is closely associated with race, privileging SEAD, the "white dominant discourse," in assessment practice perpetuates racial inequalities. He further contends that many well-meaning systems, and the people within them, subordinate diverse populations by offering "sentimental education" (62) marked by a type of patronizing, parental obligation to conform all forms of diverse discourse to a white-washed version of English.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

In chapter two, Inoue proposes an antiracist assessment practice that favors labor over traditional merit, one where students learn to problematize their own writing as well as others'. Students assess in a community of peers, taking into consideration their interconnectedness and racial *habitus*, which ultimately promotes a more ethical, sustainable assessment ecology. Inoue argues that these ecologies become "more than" (90) the sum of their parts, as students learn to question the very meaning of judgments used in assessments. He proposes that the assessments, themselves, need liberating from the confinements of hegemonic structures. He outlines seven major elements of the assessment ecology: power, parts, purpose, people, processes, products, and places, and he give special attention to the communal *process* of making rubrics (which sometimes becomes a *part*, and sometimes a *place*) in the ecology. Inoue asserts that practitioners who focus strategically on these pedagogical elements can achieve an interconnected ecology of antiracist writing assessment.

Inoue argues in chapter three that subjectivity and inconsistencies exist inside traditional grading practices, and alternatively proposes the use of grading contracts which emphasize student labor over the quality of writing. These contracts, along with writing rubrics, are carefully designed in collaboration with students in an attempt to reorient them toward "labor to learn, not labor to earn" (193). Through the use of negotiated rubrics (which encourage disagreement and tension), peer writing groups, and reflective practice, Inoue presents examples of how students problematize their ideas and often experience frustration within the "borderlands" of writing (209). He proposes that these existential conflicts lead to a healthy questioning of power structures, critical awareness, and ultimately, antiracist attitudes.

Inoue claims in chapter four that students who attempt to create perfect documents experience fairly insignificant learning in the process. Instead, students who interact with peers as readers, reflect and begin to problematize their ideas and their discourse learn more. He notes that it takes time and effort for instructors to de-center themselves as experts, and to foster a kind of healthy conflict and interconnectedness between students which leads to critical consciousness in writing. These processes are salient because, as Inoue further asserts, classes which claim to teach writing cannot do so unless instructors share control with students in spaces where "local diversities, dominant discourses, and hegemonic structures of norming and racing clash and shock . . . one another" (282).

Inoue's reflective forms of assessment are useful, as is his contribution to the ongoing discussion of problematic hierarchies in higher education. His argument about the damaging effects of unintentional racism in assessment serves as an

important reminder for writing instructors entrenched in the process of grading. Inoue's claims echo the prior arguments of Freire, hooks, Anzaldúa, and others who concern themselves with marginalized populations in education. In a time when students of color are entering the academy at a higher rate than ever, his commitment to questioning a hierarchical system of assessment, and shedding light on its limitations is provocative and timely. In addition, his seemingly radical notions about assessment practice as a means to combat social injustice are balanced with both compelling placement exam data and experience. Though his methods appear unconventional, specific examples of student reflections ground his abstract notions about existential dilemma, and the ecology of systems that "inter-are" (p. 103). And in the process of seeking antiracist assessments, Inoue offers a method of abstraction and mindfulness which scholars have shown is needed for transfer of knowledge (see, for example Alder-Kassner and Wardle 2015; Perkins and Salomon, 1992). Inoue's experience with Hmong and Latino students at his own university inform his research, which is less about defining categories and more about the complexity of these diverse populations striving to thrive inside longstanding hierarchical systems.

On the one hand, it is difficult to imagine students, many of whom have not settled on a major, deciding the extent to which they will liberate themselves by approximating the dominant discourse—or not. Because of students' inexperience in the academy, it would seem that handing control over to them in the way Inoue proposes may be risky, if not unwise. Were it not for Inoue's consistent reflections on his own pedagogy, both its triumphs and its failures, the abstract nature of his research might read as unattainable at best, and inaccessible at worst. However, Inoue demonstrates the kind of methodological awareness he expects of his students by questioning his own pedagogical process incorporating retrospective reflections throughout his book. He practices the critical consciousness of problematizing drafts by situating the reality of student writing next to what could be. In addition, Inoue uses student work as thick description not only to illustrate students' transformative journeys into a liberating racial *habitus*, but also to show escalating moments of critical consciousness.

In the final chapter of the book, Inoue explains his personal experience of racial *habitus* by narrating his childhood adventures of writing stories on a typewriter during school vacations. He lived these experiences in relative poverty, facing overt racism, yet also, enjoying the unusual interconnected community. Inoue's nostalgic memories of making stories together with his identical twin brother illustrate the notion of a communal ecology, even in the midst of adversity. The story of his boyhood writing, not unlike his research claims seems idealized, even romanticized,

for they both describe spaces where racial identities are valued, and writers assess features of writing together. Here, Inoue's approach embodies the writing process he proposes, which is often lost in the classroom setting. As practitioners, if his methods unsettle us, then perhaps we are exactly where he might want us: in the borderlands of literacy, a place where real learning takes place.

Works Cited

Alder-Kassner, L., Wardle, E. (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1992). Transfer of learning. *International encyclopedia of education*, *2*, 6452-6457.

About the Author

Christine Watson teaches in Biola University's English Writing Program and is currently working on her doctorate in higher education at Azusa Pacific University. She researches the challenges faced by historically underserved student populations, as well as instructional design models exploring how writing practices transfer across disciplinary boundaries. She has also served as assistant co-director of the writing program and coordinates its annual high impact practice, the Celebration of Student Writing.

This review was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. 11, No. 1 (August 2018): 124 – 127
DOI: 10.37514/OPW-J.2018.11.1.12
ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)
https://wac.colostate.edu/openwords/

Review of *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*

By Manuel Castells. Polity Press, 2015. 328 pp. $11.21. ISBN: 978-0745695761.

Asmaa Mansour
The University of Texas at San Antonio

As I compose this review, hundreds of social movements have just erupted, and others have continued since the first publication of this book in 2012. Now in its second edition, this book by Manuel Castells Oliván, a Spanish researcher of the information society, communication, and globalization and a professor of sociology at UC Berkeley, does not only trace social movements and revolutions across borders in 2011 but also provides assessment of these movements (two years after their eruption) and adds insightful analyses of different social movements that took place between 2013-2014. Castells attempts to find commonalities between these movements, answers what triggers them, and sheds light on the important role of digital technologies (namely, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter…etc.) in affecting change—whether this change happens in the minds of people, whether tangible, or whether desirable or not. What is unique in this book is its emphasis on the internet, not as a material instrument but as powerful communication tool that facilitates and diffuses social movements.

Organized chronologically rather than topically, Castells's book analyzes the Arab Uprising, Icelandic revolution, the *Indignadas* movement in Spain, Occupy Wall Street in the United States that took place in 2011. Castells, then devotes two chapters to discuss social movements that took place between 2012-2014 such as: the Turkish movement, the demonstrations in Brazil, The Student Movement in Chile, the Mexican Movement #YoSoy132, as well as Five Stars Movement in Italy. For Castells, it is all started in Tunisia and Iceland, then diffused to Egypt, Yemen, Libya, Syria, Spain, and the United States. While Egypt took it cues from Tunisia, Spain took it cues form Iceland; and ultimately, New Yorkers took their cues from Egypt and Spain.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

What connects all these people together, according to Castells, is their "feeling" of disgust of dictatorship, and political and economic corruption.

The strongest chapter, in my opinion, is "The Egyptian Revolution" because it is the only chapter that helps us see Castells's "theory of power" in practice. Based on Castells's book *Communication Power* (2009), this theory proposes that for every power (manipulation, coercion, violence), there is a counterpower (a challenge of these powers). And since counterpower is created in people's minds and channeled through interaction, and social and digital networks, governments strive to limit or eradicate these networks. This is exactly what happened during the Egyptian revolution. We learn about the "counterpower" of the internet in the Egyptian revolution that started with Asmaa Mahfouz's vlog on her Facebook page, encouraging Egyptians to protest against police brutality. We also learn about Egyptians' online activism that helped expose the government's violence in an "unedited form" (60). Yet, according to Castells, what makes the Egyptian revolution exceptional is not its reliance on the internet alone but on its use of what Castells calls "multimodal networks of power" that include but not limited to mobile phones, television, Friday mosques gatherings, and the occupation of a public space like Tahrir Square. All these counterpowers cannot but hinder the government's power (whether economic power, military power, or religious power) to stop the revolution or even to block social media websites and censor media inside Egypt.

The following chapters build on Castells's concept of social diffusion. For instance, "A Rhizomatic Revolution: *Indignadas* in Spain" stresses that *Indignadas* movement is mainly inspired by Iceland's example as well as the Arab Uprising's. Drawing on Isidora Chacon's concept of rhizomatic revolutions, Castells highlights that the *Indignadas* movement and its call for real democracy, spread like a rhizome—thanks to the internet. In his footnote, Castells defines rhizome, according to Wikipedia, as "a characteristically horizontal stem of a plant that is unusually found underground, often sending out roots from its nodes…" (150). Similarly, *Indignadas* movement, for Castells, is rhizomatic because it is a "horizontal" movement, with no center, no goals, and no leaders. Despite the vague results of this movement, Castells strongly agrees that the "process is the product" (147).

In "Occupy Wall Street: Harvesting the Salt of the Earth" Castells again tells us about the "outrage" (that was "in the air") that found its way to Facebook, Twitter, Livestreams, and YouTube videos; and, ultimately led people to come together and occupy Wall Street. The most interesting aspect in this chapter is Castells's analogy between Gandhi's "salt of the earth" and the protestors' march to occupy Wall Street. While Gandhi marches to the ocean to collect salt and challenges the British empire,

the protestors march "peacefully" to challenge political and financial institutions in America—despite the seemingly vague results of the movement. For Castells, the movement proved to be slow, but it went far, like a rhizome.

Though often criticized for its naïve or utopian vision of social movements and revolutions, Castells's book does help us understand that all the change we see today in the world was sparked, first and foremost, by utopian visions. Castells succeeds both in mapping different social movements across time and space and in providing evidence to show that people's "powerlessness" always turned into "empowerment" through the use of the internet (72). Also, the book proves to be based on Castells's own "personal" observation and analysis, as he claims in the beginning of the book. Some of these observations are: the internet does not "cause" revolutions but rather functions as an empowerment for activists to lead revolutions, regardless of the outcomes; and, once revolutions find their way to the internet, there is no going back**.** By the end of this book, readers realize the power of "the counterpower"—the internet—that cannot be controlled, limited, or eradicated.

The overarching thread that ties all the chapters of the book together is the concept of the diffusion of social movements. Clarity, however, could have been added to this concept to avoid confusion. Anyone who has studied linguistics will find the term diffusion loaded with different meanings. Linguistically speaking, the notion of diffusion of social movements implies that there is an "invisible hand" behind this diffusion across borders. But, if the diffusion stems from the use of the internet, then I think it would be wrong to compare the internet with an "invisible hand" because the internet is a visible, tangible, "real" hand. On the other hand, scholars who have studied rhetoric will find it very interesting to read this book because it implicitly equates social movements and revolutions to rhetoric, a phenomenon happening across time and space, an unfinished product, or an emotion/a feeling of hope and outrage translated into action through the employment of the internet. The book ends on a powerful note, an advice to the world, or maybe an articulation of Castells's hope for "re-learning how to live together. In real democracy" (316). All indications show that this book, no doubt, is worth reading. Castells writes in a language that everyone can understand, and he ends his chapters with notes and numerous sources for us to check for more information. This book is also a substantial addition to those who work in the field of communication and political science.

About the Author

Asmaa Mansour is a third year PhD student in English at the University of Texas at San Antonio. She examines third world literature by women, taking a cross-cultural, feminist, postcolonial approach. She specializes in Latina literature and Arabic literature (in translation) by women.

This review was previously available on Pearson.

Open Words: Access and English Studies is an open-access, peer-review scholarly journal, published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University.

ISSN: 2690-3911 (Print) 2690-392X (Online)

OPEN WORDS: ACCESS AND ENGLISH STUDIES

wac.colostate.edu/openwords