As NCTE Executive Director Emily Kirkpatrick shared in her September “Field Notes” column (see link below), NCTE members are actively contributing new ideas and insights on the ways education shapes the future for all students. NCTE is bringing this new energy to our organization!

We're happy to announce that NCTE is now ready to launch a new look and feel for our organization. The rebrand is reflective of our members and what all of you have been telling us NCTE is and should be. This is energizing and exciting work. At every step of the way, it has been inspired by and grounded in your stories, ideas, and input.

Every day, NCTE members are turning the page—making tomorrow greater than today, writing new chapters for students’ futures and, by extension, for NCTE. We're thrilled to be on this journey with you.

http://www.ncte.org/community/fieldnotes

WITH YOUR HELP, NCTE IS MOVING FORWARD.

WE INVITE YOU TO SEND YOUR THOUGHTS TO EMILY AT FIELDNOTES@NCTE.ORG

What do you want to know about or contribute to our new directions?

What issues and ideas do you think we should be focusing on?

How are the changes at NCTE affecting the work you do?
Mobile Technologies and the Writing Classroom: Resources for Teachers
Edited by Claire Lutkewitte
In this collection, Claire Lutkewitte and her contributors explore both writing for and about mobile technologies and writing with mobile technologies. Coming at a time when instructors are pressured to be professionally innovative but are rarely provided ideal circumstances in which to do so, this book offers (1) a starting point for instructors who haven’t yet used mobile technologies in the classroom, (2) fresh ideas to those who have and proof that they are not alone, and (3) a call of reassurance that we can do more with less.

$26.95 for NCTE/CCCC members, $35.95 for nonmembers.
eBooks: $23.95 for members, $31.95 for nonmembers.
http://bit.ly/MobileTechnologies

Making Hybrids Work: An Institutional Framework for Blending Online and Face-to-Face Instruction in Higher Education
By Joanna N. Paull and Jason Allen Snart
This book provides a resource for institutions of higher education to grow and sustain quality hybrid curricula, outlining an institutional framework by focusing on defining and advertising hybrids; developing, supporting, and assessing hybrid programs; and training faculty. To examine the reality rather than the hype of a hybrid curriculum, authors Joanna N. Paull and Jason Allen Snart look at several existing hybrid courses in a variety of disciplines, as well as explore the possibilities and limitations of teaching with technology.

$26.95 for NCTE/CCCC members, $35.95 for nonmembers.
eBooks: $23.95 for members, $31.95 for nonmembers.
Call for Manuscripts

Research in the Teaching of English is a multidisciplinary journal publishing significant, original research and scholarly essays that explore issues in the teaching and learning of literacy at all levels.

Manuscripts should be no longer than 10,000 words, inclusive of tables, figures, and references, and should be written in Times New Roman 12 pt. font or equivalent. Manuscripts can be submitted to the editors, Mary Juzwik and Ellen Cushman, at http://www.editorialmanager.com/rte.

Manuscripts will receive a masked review by established researchers. RTE articles follow the form outlined in the sixth edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. Manuscripts submitted to RTE should not be submitted to or under review with another journal, and all reported data that involve human participants should be collected and analyzed under appropriate ethical standards. Manuscripts should be accompanied by a cover letter that includes each author’s name, institutional affiliation, home and work telephone numbers, mailing address, fax number, and email address. Email is our preferred way of maintaining contact with authors.

Information for Graduate Students

To assist and promote the development of early-career researchers, NCTE has instituted student membership and subscription rates. A student membership is $25 per year, and a student subscription is $12.50 for a full volume (4 issues) of RTE. We encourage you to share this information with all research-oriented educators currently enrolled in university programs at any level.
Editors’ Introduction

Writing and Its Development across Lifespans and in Transnational Contexts

Heather Falconer
Northeastern University

Ellen Cushman
Northeastern University

Mary M. Juzwik
Michigan State University

Mandie B. Dunn
Michigan State University

This volume year has featured research and scholarship across four traditional categories of English language arts: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. In 51.1, articles considered identity issues of readers and writers as they unfolded in classroom pedagogy and curriculum; in 51.2, articles examined peer review in writing, extensive versus intensive (i.e., “close reading”) approaches to literature instruction, and collaborative discussion practices of multilingual students. Authors also contended with the moral mandates for English education around issues of gender and sexual diversity in preservice teacher education and the governmentality logics of standards documents, thus pushing conversations about the purposes of English teaching in a diverse twenty-first-century world. We also remembered the legacy of Arthur Applebee, who contributed much to shaping the configuration of English language arts in the twenty-first century. The present issue speaks primarily to research and possibilities for the teaching and practice of writing across the lifespan, unfolding transnational and materialist conceptions of the English language arts in classrooms, communities, and cultures. If the volume year focus on classroom-based studies of the English language arts offers a kind of “return to our roots” for RTE, so, then, does the focus of this issue on writing return the journal to its roots as one, if not the, key outlet for theoretically rich, empirically grounded, and provocative scholarship on writing and its instruction.

Silvia Noguerón-Liu & Jamie Jordan Hogan ask of digital storytelling practices: How do transnational ties imbue immigrant adults’ and adolescents’ emerging understandings of their current and previous homelands? Angie Zapata and Selena Van Horn wonder how material intra-actions emerge in two young, Mexican-American learners’ process of developing, writing, and producing picture books. Angela Rounsaville’s article considers how genres are “inherited, made, and moved by writers” (p. 320) within the context of global migration. The Forum essays both, quite directly, take up the question of development of the English language arts. H. Bernard Hall extends beyond writing to consider how expanding conceptions of hip-hop culture and pedagogy can facilitate the rhetorical awareness and higher-order thinking of students. Charles Bazerman, Arthur N. Applebee, Virginia W. Berninger, Deborah Brandt, Steve Graham, Paul Kei Matsuda, Sandra Murphy,
Deborah Wells Rowe, and Mary Schleppegrell ask what the long view on writing development can reveal about this multidimensional process that continues across the lifespan.

Answering these questions with data gathered across a range of methodological approaches, the articles develop three themes important to creating robust understandings of writing in a twenty-first-century global society. First, transnationalism is of concern to all three research study authors, as each honors the reality that whether one is an immigrant, a member of Generation 1.5, or a third culture kid, ties to cultural origins are important aspects of identity and expression that should be respected (within and beyond classroom contexts). Second, all three research articles highlight the multimodality and materiality of writing. Both Zapata and Van Horn’s and Noguerón-Liu and Hogan’s articles explore culturally reflexive approaches to writing within the classroom. The authors consider the (re)appropriation of ideas and materials for the expression of students’ lived experiences within the context of storytelling. Rounsaville offers another lens for viewing the materiality of literacies with a focus on genres that are “inherited, made, and moved” by writers in transnational contexts. That the materiality of writing is so central to English language arts development is echoed again in the Forum articles, which suggest ways that linguistic and material resources can influence learning and development within classrooms and across the lifespan.

Finally, the articles, taken together, illuminate methodological innovations for studying writing within and beyond English language arts classrooms as transnationally, materially, and multimodally situated activity. From Noguerón-Liu and Hogan’s cross-case methodology drawing upon testimonios and social semiotics, to Zapata and Van Horn’s onto-epistemological methodology facilitating their retrospective analysis of data collected in a yearlong, larger-scale study, to Rounsaville’s 6-year critical case study, each article points to the types of methodological innovation necessary to study the practice and development of writing in a diverse, global society. Hall’s essay draws out one implication of material and multimodal conceptions of writing, arguing for pedagogical and methodological innovation of the current conceptions of hip-hop pedagogy in English language arts. In the final Forum paper, a disciplinarily diverse group of senior scholars offers a kind of “state-of-the-art” summary of research on writing development across the lifespan.

Silvia Noguerón-Liu and Jamie Jordan Hogan’s “Remembering Michoacán: Digital Representations of the Homeland by Immigrant Adults and Adolescents” examines the different ways individual students visually represent the Michoacán region of Mexico in digital storytelling, and how that representation reconciles with popular representation of the region as “dangerous.” Through a cross-case study approach drawing on transnationalism theory and the genre of testimonios, Noguerón-Liu and Hogan ask, “How do transnational ties shape and inform immigrant adults’ and adolescents’ understandings of their homelands?” The authors compare evidence drawn from two different sites within the same school district in a southern US city. They profile two participants at the first site, a digital literacy program for immigrant adults, and two at a second site, a digital storytelling...
program for middle school students. The first site's data collection took place over the course of three semester-long workshops aimed at parents of elementary-age students; the second site's data collection lasted 8 weeks during spring 2014. Both groups were asked to create digital picture books, though the adults were asked to create for their children and the youths were asked to create for themselves. All participants had ties to the Mexican region of Michoacán. Using a cross-case methodology, the authors compare the composing processes of two adult women at the first site with two adolescent youth at the second.

Their “findings show how practices like travel, digital media consumption, and family communication shaped all participants’ topic choice. Yet, the focus of their writing differed, based on their understandings of place and their roles in family networks” (p. 276). The young participants used the space to revisit memories of their lived experiences, while the adult participants used the activity to “purposefully engage in media consumption (videos) that kept them informed about religious and political practices in their hometowns, which seemed relevant in their transnational social fields” (p. 277). Further, the two adults both used the activity as a mode of cultural knowledge transmission to their own children (one focusing on religious practices, the other on natural history and the environment), while both adolescents focused on concerns of family and the instability/unsafety of the region (due to crime and drug cartels).

The authors found that searching for visual media from Internet sources proved a valuable heuristic for eliciting conversations about both the composition process and the subjects of the composition. This was not without complication, however, due to the fact that Internet searches on a location with a history of violence often privilege the negative and obscure the positive. Yet, whether individuals searched virtually or in print for imagery and inspiration, the composing process served as an opportunity for all participants to revisit memories and cultural/social practices. This process of composing became significant, as all participants bore witness to their experiences in Michoacán, which extended far beyond the stereotypical, negative representations. As the authors observe, “Together, these pieces illuminate the complex identity work of immigrants when they represent their interconnected lives in two nations: as distant and caring observers of violence back home, and as devout believers of transnational deities and legends” (p. 284).

The next article, “Because I’m Smooth’: Material Intra-actions and Text Productions of Young, Latino Picture Book Makers,” by Angie Zapata and Selena Van Horn, presents rich descriptions to provide “strategic sketches” of the data sampled, and takes a “thinking with theory” approach. Zapata and Van Horn offer insight into “how agency is distributed between human and nonhuman materials and what is simultaneously materially and discursively produced” (p. 291). They ask, “How did material intra-actions emerge for two young, Mexican-American picture book makers (inquiring into process)? How were these students’ social, cultural, and material worlds produced with/through their final picture book productions (inquiring into product)?” (p. 292). They follow the creative process/product of two 9-year-old Latino students (“Trinidad” and “Efrain”) in constructing picture
books. They offer an examination of multimodality and materiality, investigating the ways that individuals interact with materials across time and space. With the classroom teacher (“Mrs. Prado”), the research team designed and refined a 6-week “picture book study of culturally and linguistically diverse literature.” Researchers conducted pre- and post-curriculum annotated picture book interviews, as well as stimulated recall interviews during the artifact production. They also used photographs and videos to document the “material processes and products in this classroom.” Finally, daily field notes, debriefings, and analytic memos were also part of the corpus of data included in the analysis.

Zapata and Van Horn argue that the two focal students “felt the freedom to live out material becomings and perform social, cultural, and material realities in the process” (p. 310). Trinidad, through experimentation with the manipulation of pastel on paper, was able to become an expert in the use of the medium, both in his own eyes and in the eyes of his classmates. It provided him with a “particular illustration style” (p. 302) that resulted in a “smooth” aesthetic all his own. Efrain, likewise, was able to establish himself as an expert in the manipulation of paper through origami, and to express his personal life experiences by creating a picture book on a significant life event. By experimenting and playing with scrap paper, Efrain learned how to create do-rags that could be used as elements in his picture book composition. Bringing his experience with origami, being a brother, and being a beatboxer to the composing process, Efrain created a picture book that became “a concrete product of material, pedagogical, personal, and cultural forces and flows colliding together” (p. 307).

The authors pose their “findings” as richly textured “sketches” of Trinidad’s and Efrain’s composing processes and products to suggest the “theoretical and pedagogical openings [that] grow understandings of multimodal composing processes and to consider these understandings’ implications for all writers who come to the task of multimodal composition with rich personal, cultural, and literate lives” (p. 310). Their findings open more questions and insights into the ways that crafting multimodal texts can help meet “the intellectual and affective demand of the moment” (p. 311). Their findings also help to demonstrate how the materiality of multimodal literacies shapes the development of writers in classroom settings as these literacies are rooted in assemblages of intra-activity fueled by the motivations and desires of learners and their teachers.

Angela Rounsaville’s article, “Genre Repertoires from Below: How One Writer Built and Moved a Writing Life across Generations, Borders, and Communities,” extends the multimodal and material perspectives of writing and its development across transnational contexts. Through a grounded approach, examining artifacts from across a lifespan and ongoing interviews, Rounsaville offers a theoretical construct for “making a writer’s self-defined genre repertoire traceable, with special salience for migrant and transnational writers” (p. 319). Rounsaville presents a critical case study to examine a “transnational youth’s genre practice and codified frameworks that obscure those actions” (p. 322). For 6 years, the author tracked “Clara” from college student to working professional (as an ESL teacher).
Data collection throughout this time included literacy interviews, in-school and out-of-school writing, discourse-based interviews on selected writings, and modified stimulated recall interviews. Asking how “the transnational inheres in and motivate[s] local literacies” (p. 318) within a “lifespan context—mediated by family, language, literacy, and migration” (p. 318), Rounsaville examines “how Clara built and mobilized a writing life to coordinate cross-border links and support movement across texts written and encountered at home, school, and work” (p. 318).

By tracing her experiences of reading and writing at home and at school, and eventually at work, readers see how Clara’s engagement with genre allowed her to assert her identity as an Argentinean and to maintain connections to “home” while living and learning in predominantly white, middle-class, English-speaking communities. This examination also offers a framework for tracing how genre repertoires emerge from an “emic perspective” and the use of genre mapping to depict that emergence. As Rounsaville notes, the “genre repertoire construct provides researchers, teachers, and students with a means to look across the lifespan for values, purposes, and actions assigned to writing both encountered and produced” (p. 335) and makes “visible how extracurricular and in-school literacy grow together in response to and in support of transnational writers’ everyday experiences” (p. 319). Viewing genres as both materially and socially constructed provides important insights into the development of reading and writing abilities in any setting, and Rounsaville’s unique approach offers insight into the ways in which the conventions of reading and writing travel with people across transnational flows. As she puts it, “Ultimately, genre repertoires are resources to support and provide dignity to students as they build a writing life across generations, borders, and communities” (p. 337).

The issue closes with further consideration of how writing emerges and develops in classrooms, in communities, and across the lifespan. In the first Forum piece, “Deeper than Rap: Expanding Conceptions of Hip-hop Culture and Pedagogy in the English Language Arts Classroom,” H. Bernard Hall argues that research into hip-hop based education (HHBE) in English classrooms “demands moving beyond making a case for hip-hop’s pedagogical merits and toward helping teachers put models of HHBE into action, given their various intersectional situations” (p. 342). Hall discusses both practical matters of implementation and philosophical concerns about the place and purpose of curricular innovations in hip-hop pedagogy, especially in the era of the Common Core State Standards in the United States. Through anecdotal narrative, Hall addresses common questions about the ways that HHBE can be used to facilitate higher-order thinking skills and rhetorical awareness. Providing valuable clarifications as to what HHBE is and is not (i.e., “deeper than rap”), Hall defines key terminology as he makes his case. He ends the piece by making a call for further theory-into-practice research, opening up HHBE to a wider demographic of practitioners, and understanding what is not working in addition to what is. These explorations take into consideration the thorny cultural politics of who can “authentically” provide HHBE. The end goal, he asserts, is to inspire all of those working in English education to explore the
ways in which HHBE can be used in all areas of the ELA classroom in school and university settings around the country—and, we would add, around the globe, as Richardson (2006) and Alim, Ibrahim, and Pennycook (2008) remind us—without co-opting or essentializing or homogenizing the diversity within diversity that hip-hop culture so richly offers. Hall’s point is especially crucial for an American context, as he reminds us that hip-hop culture has historically been about peace, love, having fun, and walking the walk—testifying how #BlackLivesMatter inside and outside the classroom.

The second Forum piece, “Taking the Long View on Writing Development,” offers another innovative perspective. In it, an esteemed group of scholars—led by Charles Bazerman and including the late Arthur N. Applebee, Virginia W. Berninger, Deborah Brandt, Steve Graham, Paul Kei Matsuda, Sandra Murphy, Deborah Wells Rowe, and Mary Schleppegrell—collaboratively take up the question of what can be said about writing development across the lifespan. These Forum authors have met regularly since 2012, with support from the Spencer Foundation, to examine perspectives on how writing develops in various populations over time. They have compiled eight guiding principles, which they articulate in this piece and elaborate in forthcoming articles published elsewhere. Bazerman et al. argue that, despite the rich research that has been conducted to date toward understanding the complexities of writing development, there has been “little done to create an integrated picture of writing development as a multidimensional process that continues across the lifespan” (p. 352). This fragmentation, they argue, is reinforced and perpetuated through edited collections synthesizing decades of research in writing development—and so, the onus is now on researchers to begin filling the gaps and building bridges. Even more, the onus is on English language arts teachers and educators across the lifespan to design curriculum and develop pedagogies that embrace what is known about the idiosyncratic ways writing development occurs—which the authors outline (as principles to understand) in the article.
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