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This dissertation is a narrative description of my teaching moves as I attempted to negotiate within my classroom both traditional print literacy and new literacies afforded by emerging technology. In this study, I sought to reconcile my rhetoric with my reality (Zeichner, 1999) by teaching students how to read and design multimodal compositions within the traditional framework and curriculum required by my school district. Students composed traditional memoirs and then participated in the synaesthesia process by remediating their memoirs using technology. Students were also asked to write a Statement of Goals and Choices (Shipka, 2011), reflecting on their own rhetorical and design choices.

To study the negotiation of multiple literacies in my classroom, I developed a study in which I sought to understand how I operationalized a Multiliteracies pedagogy and teaching multimodal composition; and how my students made sense of composing multimodally and their rhetorical and design choices in the composition process. To answer these questions, I drew from a phenomenographic research tradition, which aims at the “understanding of experiences” (Marton, 1981, p. 177). Participants included 21 of my ninth grade advanced English students, myself, and Elizabeth, a colleague. Data collected took the form of an interview, field notes, and student-created artifacts including their Remediated Memoir and Statement of Goals and Choices. All data were
analyzed using an open-ended protocol where *utterances of interest* were identified and organized into *categories of descriptions*, which served as themes which were further explored.

From this project, I discovered a profound shift in agency where my students’ voices were elevated while my role as teacher transformed more to that of facilitator. This research contributes to current discourse by presenting my teaching moves and representing students’ perspectives, where previously there has been little representation.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Teaching with technology, iPads in particular, is a lot like being a mother for the first time. An experience fraught with uncertainty, inevitable missteps, and blows to the self-esteem, but also filled with wonderment, fortitude, and the development of self-efficacy. Lucky for me, I experienced both at the same time. In January of 2013, my son turned three months old and my school district had just granted me a class set of iPads to incorporate into my teaching however I desired. This is also the same time I began working on my doctorate with the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). Each of these three significant events converged into my life at the same time; and, to quote Lea Thompson and the most unfortunate line of Red Dawn, “Things are different now” (Milius, 1984, 30:25). The convergence of these events required me to reconsider literacy instruction in my classroom. The study described here is how I expanded literacy instruction in my classroom to incorporate more forms of literacies beyond the traditional print-literacy curriculum while implementing technology into my teaching and my students’ learning.

iPad Academy

As part of my school district’s technology initiative, I was selected to participate in the Apple Foundations Training led by three separate consultants from Apple. After a semester of training, the district announced the purchase of six iPad carts with 30 devices in each, which were available for use. The iPad Academy, as it was called, was a pilot program charged with testing the use of iPads in a potential 1:1 environment, where all
students would eventually have an iPad to use in and out of school. Unable to say no to this opportunity, I applied, and my application was accepted.

The combination of the iPad Academy and CPED led me to a deep interest in the meaningful and purposeful integration of technology into the English classroom. Even before being granted the iPads, I considered myself a forward thinker and doer when it came to technology in the classroom. I, and my students, used Prezi, web quests, Edmodo, Ning, Twitter, and many, many other tools as vehicles for exploring issues and questions related to the curricular content. However, it was not until that spring when I received the iPads that I realized the degree to which my pedagogy would need to transform.

**Problem(s) of Practice**

At the beginning of the CPED program, my short list of possible problems of practice included: pre-service teacher education, in-service professional development, and the integration of iPads into the English classroom. Finally, I settled on the last option, but not without traveling down various paths, both dead-ends and thoroughfares. Until my third semester, I carefully avoided seriously considering the iPad Academy experience as a researchable area. I avoided it for fear of feeling trapped with one topic for three years and typecasting myself as the “technology teacher.” Being an English teacher, I have experienced an odd sort of professional isolation, stemming from the fact that because I seek to incorporate technology into my classroom means I think technology is the panacea for all literacy ailments. From texts such as Nicholas Carr’s *The Shallows* and Mark Bauerlein’s *The Dumbest Generation*, and personal communications with other teachers, technology integration in the classroom is viewed
narrow-mindedly as dangerous to the literary canon and traditional conceptualizations of literacy and literacy instruction. This could not be further from the truth.

Over the course of the last two years, I have come to view my pedagogical perspective as an issue of purpose. When considering new approaches to teaching, such as a Multiliteracies pedagogy I enacted — one in which I broadened the variety of texts my students read and design\(^1\) — I must be intentional, deliberate, and informed; viewing myself as an agent in its implementation. With any new initiative or reform in education, there is always pressure from outside the classroom (parents, colleagues, administrators, policy makers) for it to succeed. As a teacher who has experienced numerous reform initiatives including (but not limited to): Response to Intervention (RtI); differentiated instruction, inclusionary practices and co-teaching; and the iPad Academy pilot, I have experienced the rapid nature of their adoption, and subsequent let down, where oftentimes teacher input is not sought. As a result of this past experience, I was not accustomed to having agency and decision making power with how a particular initiative was implemented in my own classroom. With the iPad Academy Pilot, I had control over the outcome, but I had not given much thought to what the outcome would be. Usually, that is decided for me. Having this agency was indeed both exhilarating and frightening at the same time. Knowing where to begin and where I wanted to go was uncomfortable at first. My phobia of commitment and worries of being pegged the “technology teacher” were not as unsettling as the implications of disturbing my practice (Mason, 2002).

Through critical reflection (Brookfield, 1995), I discovered that I was teaching innocently

---

\(^1\) Arola, Sheppard, & Ball (2014), and Cope & Kalantzis (2000) use design to refer to the process of conceiving, creating, and publishing of texts. The use of this term design highlights the multifarious aspects and decisions in composing multimodal texts, including: emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, and proximity.
(Brookfield, 1995) – assuming I understood exactly the effect I was having on my students’ learning in the iPad Academy. Finally, experiencing an increased level of agency and control in my classroom, the perceived risks of this approach initially seemed intimidating, but turned out to be productive, necessary, and eventually welcomed.

**Early Challenges**

That first semester of iPad adoption, a myriad of issues arose, which caused it to get messy, an expected outcome when disturbing one’s practice (Mason, 2002). That first semester, I felt that I had taught more about the iPad than about English and literature. Although frustrating and distressing, these several challenges led me to my problem of practice.

Remaining flexible is one challenge I encountered early on, as early as the first day of implementation. This challenge involved a disconnect between my plans and the reality of the school’s network capacity. I initially intended to use the iPads in a shared model where each of my five sections of students would use the iPads in the classroom. The very first class period that first day, only 3 of 30 iPads were able to connect to the network, and that functionality did not improve throughout the day. After a complete day of disappointment and frustration, following the advice of a district technology trainer, I withdrew my initial expectations and decided to use the devices with one section of students, my advanced freshmen students. Because I chose this path, my students today are now able to take the device home with them, piloting a true 1:1 environment. If I had continued with the shared model, this would not have been possible. Even using the devices with one class, there was still very much a need for flexibility. Later in the first week of implementation, the Google Drive app was not functioning properly for
all students. Many issues arose with this app, such as the ability to share documents, and open documents shared with them; organizing their documents, issues that were not the same for each student. For the very first writing assignment we were doing in Google Drive, it took three days to get all of the issues resolved so that students could type their assignment and share it with me. As a result of that particular experience, and many other subsequently similar experiences, I found I was more effective as a teacher when I stopped making long-range lesson plans, because inevitably, they would be changed and changed again. I began to teach adaptively, which is when “teachers respond to learners at work” (Corno, 2008, p. 161). I learned to consider my teaching moves as responses to my students’ learning moves, ones that could not be planned weeks in advance. Because I was adopting (and adjusting) a new pedagogical approach, I felt like an English teacher again. Of course, this approach to teaching adaptively is continually improving and in a perpetual state of revision; but as a result, I have a more healthy and constructive pedagogical perspective.

The other, and more disconcerting challenge I encountered, and still encounter, involves the rate or degree to which my students and I are using the iPads in transformative and redefining ways. As previously mentioned, this new technology initiative required me to view myself as agentive in the implementation, which requires confidence. Confidence in being able to advocate for and decide the pace at which I and my students adopt new approaches, and understand the importance of learning from what was successful and what not successful in the classroom.
Although the integration of iPads into my instruction was voluntary, the pressure to keep moving up the SAMR (Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, Redefinition) (Puente, 2014) model of technology integration was, and is still is, palpable, with the goal being the Redefinition level at the top. After two years of implementation, I still felt that I was not moving as quickly as other teachers, or what was expected of me. I sensed that those who granted me the iPads wanted me to do more and quicker when I was not even sure if what I was currently doing was effective with students. I am frequently presented with new apps and tools that students can use to create videos and avatars to demonstrate their learning, when the curriculum I teach is focused on having students read and write, which leaves my students at the substitution level of the SAMR model. At the core of my struggle is envisioning how I can transform my teaching of reading and writing without losing what I, the district, the state, and nation value in teaching traditional print literacy. In other words, I wrestled with identifying the purpose of this technology in my English class if my students and I were only using the iPads at the substitution level, which made the device feel relatively unnecessary.

In the fall semester of 2013, when I began to circle around my problem of practice, I knew I wanted to better understand how to integrate iPad technology into my classroom, but I was focusing on the technology and not the content. In other words, I was thinking of my problem of practice as a technology issue and not a literacy issue (Leu, 2006). I began seeking ways to understand how to improve my teaching of writing and what that means in a 1:1 iPad class. Starting with what the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and NCTE’s Definition of 21st Century Literacies ask of teachers and
students, I came to the realization that it was more important for me to focus on the underlying theory that will guide this relatively new pedagogical approach.

**Singular to Plural**

Integrating iPads into my already developed sense of what it is to teach English caused me to feel ineffective—I was an iPad teacher teaching my students how to iPad, not an English teacher teaching my students English *using* the iPad. This led me to reflect and explore this desire to negotiate teaching traditional, print-focused forms of literacy with multimodal forms of literacy. Improving my teaching of writing in my iPad class meant understanding that there are ways of making meaning beyond print, ways made available by digital technology. This led me to the study of Multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 1996, 2000, 2005, 2009 and Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010) and New Literacies Studies (Gee, 2010; Jewitt, 2008; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006; and Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004), both of which focus on multiple forms of literacy.

Before I really started integrating technology into my teaching (approximately eight years ago), I conceived digital literacies in the singular, meaning the skills necessary to use technology. Kalantzis, Cope, and Cloonan (2010) presented an alternative, a Multiliteracies pedagogy, which is a more integrated approach aimed at teaching students how to develop “proficiency in a range of meaning-making modes: linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, spatial, and multimodal designs, with multimodal being a combination of the other modes” (p. 66). My original conceptions of a new type of literacy focused on the usage of technology, and not the process of making meaning through technology, such as in Multiliteracies. It is the negotiation between traditional literacy and the new Multiliteracies where I found myself situated.
**Rhetoric and Reality**

In an effort to better understand *New Literacies*, and *Multiliteracies*, and avoid “teaching innocently” (Brookfield, 1995), in this study I explore my teaching moves as I enacted a Multiliteracies pedagogy. “A pedagogy of Multiliteracies,” Kalantzis, Cope, and Cloonan (2010) contend, “requires that the role of agency in the meaning-making process be recognized, and in that recognition it seeks to create a more productive, relevant, innovative, creative, and even, perhaps, emancipatory pedagogy” (p. 72). A Multiliteracies pedagogy is not simply about teaching skills and competence; “it is aimed at creating a kind of person, and active designer of meaning, with a sensibility open to differences, change, and innovation” (Kalantzis, Cope and Cloonan, 2010, p. 72).

Additionally, I explore multimodality and its role in recognizing student agency in the meaning-making process. Multimodality, briefly, is the mixing of modes (linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, spatial) in the meaning-making process (Cope & Kalantzis, 1996, 2000, 2005, 2009). Multimodality will be explained in depth in the forthcoming chapter.

In enacting a Multiliteracies pedagogy, I am seeking to reconcile my rhetoric (Multiliteracies) with my reality (print-focused literacy curriculum, iPads) (Zeichner, 1999) by teaching my students to read and design multimodal compositions within the traditional framework and curriculum required by my school district. To address my problem of practice, I developed a study in which I sought to understand how my students and I interpret the process of designing and teaching, respectively, multimodal composition. The research questions include:

1. How do I operationalize Multiliteracies in my high school English classroom?
2. How do I operationalize teaching multimodal composition?

3. How do students make sense of their experience composing multimodally?

4. How do students make sense of their rhetorical and design choices?

**Significance of the Study**

First, very few studies exist that study teachers’ attempts at incorporating Multiliteracies and Multimodality into the classroom and even fewer studies exist that study student outcomes of these attempts. Second, very little literature exists about teaching a Multiliteracies approach with technology, and thus has the potential to contribute new knowledge to the field. There is a clear disconnect between literacy taught and valued in schools and literacy practices students engage in outside of the traditional classroom. This study attempts to bridge the two together, which has the potential to contribute new knowledge to the field of literacy teaching and learning.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

It is no longer sufficient to regard literacy in the classroom as being singular. Literacy must be regarded as plural, multiple, and diverse. “Making literacy plural signals that there is more than simply one model of literacy, there are many different literacies that shift with context, texts, and identities of people using literacy” (Rowsell & Walsh, 2011, p. 55). Innovations, trends, and new theoretical and pedagogical methods are not new in education and are most often accompanied by a call to action. In the literature presented in the following section, there are two types of calls—one a call for a change in pedagogical approaches, and the other a call for a centralized definition of the various extant literacies studies, and the terms used therein.

Change in Pedagogical Approaches

In 2001, Marc Prensky wrote “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants,” a now widely cited article, in which he defines the terms digital natives and digital immigrants. He defines digital natives as native speakers of a digital language involving computers, videogames, and the Internet, and digital immigrants as those not born into the digital world, “but have, at some later point in [their] lives, become fascinated by and adopted many or most aspects of the new technology” (Prensky, 2001, p. 1-2). One must be careful not to view students as belonging to either binary; however, Prensky makes an astute observation – digital native learners are different, therefore pedagogy should adapt and respond to the changing nature of how students think and learn. With the arrival of technology, and the increasing ubiquity of its implementation, “thinking patterns have
changed” (Prensky, 2001, p. 1); and because thinking patterns have changed, teachers’ pedagogical approaches must change accordingly.

This new pedagogical approach should strive to fuse together traditional (print-focused notions of literacy) and modern (multimodal) aspects of literacy and redefine the nature of learning, and teacher and student roles in the classroom. It is important to note that this is no small task, one likely to produce a myriad of challenges. Additionally, Yancey (2004) cautions:

If we continue to partition it [technology] off as just something technical, or outside the parameters governing composing, or limit it to the screen of the course management system, or think of it in terms of the bells and whistles and templates of the PowerPoint screen, students in our classes learn only to fill up those templates and fill in those electric boxes—which, in their ability to invite intellectual work, are the moral equivalent of the dots on a multiple choice test (p. 320).


Because new pedagogical approaches require teachers to reconceive teaching and learning, the roles of teacher and student also become transformed. In a Multiliteracies pedagogy, no longer are teachers the single source of literacy knowledge, but instead are
“orchestrators of literacy learning environments, where members of a classroom community exchange new literacies that each has discovered” (Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004, p. 1599), thus viewing students as agents in the making of meaning, and therefore, their learning.

In addition to shifting pedagogical approaches, some call for identifying a centralized definition about what it means to be literate, or multiliterate.

**Centralized Definition of Literacies**

Myriad terms and definitions exist when discussing emerging literacies in the digitized world, including, but not limited to: Multiliteracies, New Literacies Studies, and Digital Literacies. Similarities exist among these terms, sometimes with subtle differences. Authors such as Gee (2010) and Lauer (2012) view this variety as an opportunity to further explore literacy. In *New Digital Media and Learning as an Emerging Area and “Worked Examples” as One Way Forward*, Gee (2010) intentionally problematizes these terms in order to question whether a centralized definition can exist.

Each scholar, he offers, comes to the field with their own interests. For example, Gee arrived at his interest in new literacies studies by first exploring new literacy studies then progressing toward an interest in video games, which led him to new literacies studies. However, Gee (2010) acknowledges, not all scholars take the same route; perhaps others start “from media studies, media literacy, communication, technology, education, the learning sciences, or other areas” (p. 10). In “What’s in a Name? The Anatomy of Defining New/Media/Multi/Modal/Digital/Media Texts”, Lauer (2012) provides several
terms and definitions for various literacy practices, and suggests that the term used is dependent on a variety of factors including context and audience.

Settling on one definition may be counterproductive, or even impossible. *New Literacies* scholars Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack (2004) state that “Today, reading, reading instruction, and more broadly conceived notions of literacy instruction are being defined by change in even more profound ways as new technologies require new literacies to effectively exploit their potential” (p. 1570); therefore, literacy is a moving target (Gee, 2010). Second, a precise definition may be impossible because of the deictic nature of literacy. According to Leu et al. (2010), “new technologies regularly and repeatedly transform previous literacies, regularly redefining what it means to become literate” (p. 1592).

After identifying complications involving narrowing a definition of literacies, moving forward, I first provide a brief overview of *New Literacies Studies* and *Multiliteracies*, offering distinctions and similarities between the two theories.

**New Literacies and Multiliteracies: Distinctions**

**New Literacies Studies.**

Because of the broad nature of the concept, New Literacies is difficult to define. However, several authors and theorists have examined the field of New Literacies Studies (see Gee, 2010, 2011; Jewitt, 2008; Kellner, 2000; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006; Leu, 2002; Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004; and Rowsell & Walsh, 2011). Leu (2002) states, and Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack (2004) concur, that New Literacies includes “the skills, strategies, and insights necessary to successfully exploit the rapidly changing
The “new” in New Literacies Studies signals, “new approaches, new epistemologies, new methods, new theories, new contexts, and new identities for meaning-makers” (Rowsell & Walsh, 2011, p. 55). A central focus of New Literacies Studies is the deictic nature of literacy as a result of technological innovations, a central focus, which distinguishes itself from Multiliteracies. Rowsell and Walsh (2011) go on further to explain that “A fundamental part of ‘new’ literacies in literacy education considers not only that literacies are multiple, but also that they demand different modes” (p. 55), which is also a key component in Multiliteracies.

**Multiliteracies.**

*Multiliteracies* is the result of a meeting in New London, New Hampshire, in September of 1994, with several professionals—appropriately named The New London Group—who had worked with one another in various contexts. The group met for one week and jointly authored the paper “A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures,” which was published in the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1996. The group met to discuss the nature of literacy—and literacy teaching—in a landscape of rapidly changing local diversity and global connectedness (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

Since its inception, Multiliteracies has been in a continual state of revision with Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis corresponding with the original members of the New London Group and their diverse research interests and professional endeavors. Despite distance in geography and time, Multiliteracies has evolved into an “international pedagogic agenda for the redesign of the educational and social landscape” (Jewitt, 2008, p. 245). Central to Multiliteracies is a focus on social change and views schools, teachers,
and students in agentive roles in the meaning-making process; and within “this explicit agenda for social change, the pedagogical aim of Multiliteracies is to attend to the multiple and multimodal texts and wide range of literacy practices that students are engaged with” (Jewitt, 2008, p. 245). Briefly, multimodality—a concept to be further developed and explained in coming sections—is the capacity to mix modes (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010); and multimodal composition is the process (and product) of how writers and designers combine the multiple ways of communicating in order to make meaning (Arola, Sheppard, & Ball, 2014).

New Literacies and Multiliteracies: Similarities

Several scholars have identified commonalities among the various terms used to describe literacies (see Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Gee, 2010; Jewitt, 2008; Rowsell & Walsh, 2011). Jewitt (2008), in particular, offers two commonalities between Multiliteracies and New Literacies Studies: it is impossible to regard literacy as solely a linguistic endeavor; and the union of language, print literacy, and learning is over. Additional unifying characteristics of New Literacies and Multiliteracies are two-fold—both consider technological innovation and ubiquity a catalyst for the ever-changing nature of literacy; and as a result, both call for a broadened conception of literacy to reflect the changing nature of literacy and multiple forms of meaning-making.

I prefer to use the term Multiliteracies to refer to the predominant theory undergirding this line of inquiry for one fundamental reason. As stated in Chapter One, I am interested in reconciling my rhetoric with my reality (Zeichner, 1995). I am required to teach a curriculum solely focused on print literacy (my reality), yet want to address
Multimodality and new forms of meaning-making that technology affords (my rhetoric). In essence, I am interested in balancing the “old” literacy with new forms of literacy. While both New Literacies Studies and Multiliteracies are rooted in multimodality, New Literacies Studies seems to have as its central focus technology and the newer forms of meaning making it affords, whereas Multiliteracies has as its central focus “old” and new literacies—multimodality, specifically.

**Multiliteracies Explained**

Multiliteracies is grounded in a sociocultural perspective that views students in agentive roles and calls for a pedagogy that considers students’ individual lifeworlds and cultures in the various types of literacy existing and emerging as a result of technology. This new perspective is supported by two key arguments; the first of which involves the “increasing multiplicity and integration of significant modes of meaning-making” which means that “Meaning is made in ways that are increasingly multimodal—in which written-linguistic modes of meaning are part and parcel of visual, audio, and spatial patterns of meaning” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 5). The second argument “Relates to the realities of increasing local diversity and global connectedness” Considering both arguments, one must understand that “No longer do the pedagogies of a formal, standard, written national language have the utility they once possessed” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 6). Essentially, everything is different now. It is the first argument, involving the multiple modes of meaning making, that I wish to spend the remainder of this section expounding upon—an argument that is most applicable, and therefore, has the most potential to impact my teaching.
**Design.**

A Multiliteracies pedagogy and Multimodality are functions of design. With regard to design, two fundamental considerations emerge from the collective work of the New London Group and Cope & Kalantzis: viewing pedagogy and meaning making (Multimodality) as processes and products of design, which are the themes of the following two sections.

**Pedagogy as design.**

In an attempt to free itself from “negative associations for teachers of terms such as ‘grammar,’” The New London Group (2000) uses the term “design” to describe the multiple forms of meaning making (p. 20). They also decided upon the term “Design” for its versatility and ambiguity. The design of a text can either refer to the final product produced or the process of creating it. The best teachers, stress Cope and Kalantzis (2000), are continually designing and redesigning their teaching, an act of practice, which is a continuous process. Rather than seeing teachers as “bosses dictating what those in their charge should think and do,” Multiliteracies views teachers and managers “as designers of learning processes and environments” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 19). To emphasize that meaning making is an “active and dynamic process,” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 20), Multiliteracies treats any semiotic activity as an act of design involving three elements: Available Designs, Designing, and the Redesigned. Available Designs includes what resources the teacher, or meaning-maker, has found; Designing is the act of meaning, representing the world, or re-representing it to oneself or others; and the Redesigned is the result of Available Designs and Designing, or a “world transformed” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 12).
In rethinking literacy and what it means to be literate, the New London Group set out to investigate how the changing landscape of literacy affects teaching, and how education should appropriately respond. In 1994, when the New London Group first convened, the original four components of a Multiliteracies pedagogy were conceived. They included: Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing, and Transformed Practice. After “applying these ideas to curriculum realities over the past decade,” Cope and Kalantzis (2009, 2010) “reframed and translated” them to reflect the notion that teaching and learning are active and dynamic processes, rather than results of processes—they are known as: Experiencing, Conceptualising, Analyzing, and Applying.

It is important to note that although the descriptions of the revised pedagogical acts below are phrased to focus on the learner and what each act requires of the learner, the teacher is still an active participant in these processes. Additionally, Cope and Kalantzis (2009) are careful to note, “These pedagogical orientations of knowledge processes are not a pedagogy in the singular or a sequence to be followed. Rather, they are a map of the range of pedagogical moves that may prompt teachers to extend their pedagogical repertoires” (p. 19). To demonstrate how these four knowledge processes allow, and even encourage fluid movement between each other, Kalantzis and Cope (2009), citing Luke et al. (2003), use the term “weaving” to refer to the backwards and forwards movement across the pedagogical acts.

From a Multiliteracies perspective, Experiencing considers human cognition as situated and contextual, and also considers both in-school learning and out-of-school experience of learners. Experiencing takes two forms: Experiencing the Known and Experiencing the New. Experiencing the Known “involves or reflecting on our own
experiences, interests, perspectives, familiar forms of expression and ways of representing the world in one’s own understanding” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 17). Experiencing the New, on the other hand, “entails observing or reading the unfamiliar, immersion in new situations and texts, reading new texts or collecting new data” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 18). The learner “weaves” between the “known” and the “new,” which directs the learner into new areas (Kalantzis & Cope, 2005, 2009).

Conceptualising requires learners to be “active concept and theory makers”, “weave” between Experiencing and Conceptualising, and considers “specialized, disciplinary and deep knowledges based on the finely tuned distinctions of concept and theory typical of those developed by expert communities of practice” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 18). However, Conceptualising is not simply knowledge gleaned from a scholarly textbook, but “a knowledge process in which the learners become active conceptualisers, making the tacit explicit and generalizing from the particular” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 18). Like Experiencing, Conceptualizing takes two forms: Conceptualising by Naming and Conceptualising with Theory. The first form involves learners making distinctions between the similar and dissimilar, categorizing, and naming (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). The second form, Conceptualizing with Theory, requires learners to make generalizations, put key terms together into interpretive frameworks, and build mental models, abstract frameworks and transferable disciplinary schemas (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). In this knowledge process, the learner is no longer a passive participant set to receive knowledge, and the teacher is no longer the sole provider of knowledge—both roles becoming more active and blended in the learning process.
Analyzing involves critical thinking, and matching the others, takes two forms: Analyzing Functionality and Analyzing Critically. The former requires learners to “explore causes and effects, develop chains of reasoning and explain patterns in text” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 18). The latter requires learners to “interrogate the interests behind a meaning or an action, and their own processes of thinking” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 18).

Applying involves taking what learners have experienced, conceptualized, and analyzed and applying it to new situations and experiences. This final piece of a Multiliteracies pedagogy is divided into two forms, Applying Appropriately and Applying Creatively. The first form requires learners to apply knowledge and understandings to new situations and test their cogency; the second form involves making interventions in the world. Learners in this knowledge process will “do something that expresses or affects the world in new way, or that transfers their previous knowledge into a new setting” (Kalantzis & Cope, 2005; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 19). This is where a Multiliteracies pedagogy focuses on social change. “Weaving” in this final domain takes into account the previous three knowledge processes—what is experienced, conceptualized, and analyzed.

Meaning making as design.

The second theme involves viewing meaning making as design. According to Rowsell and Walsh (2011), Multimodality informs the making of meaning, and Multiliteracies is a pedagogical tool that facilitates Multimodality. From this perspective, Multimodality is the “What” and a Multiliteracies pedagogy, as previously discussed, is the “How.” Multiliteracies and Multimodality insist that learners, like teachers, view
themselves as active designers of meaning, whereas, “In the old literacy, learners were passive recipients or at best agents of reproduction of received, sanctioned, and authoritative representation forms (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 10). The following section will expand upon Multimodality, and the various modes of meaning.

**Multimodality**

Myriad terms exist to describe the many and multifarious types of texts technology affords, including new/multi/modal/digital/ media texts (Lauer, 2012, n.p.). However, for the purposes of my own inquiry within this field, the term “Multimodal” is most fitting. Lauer (2012) contends that what drives the usage of terms in this field depends on the context in which it is used. Following Lauer’s assertion, when communicating within the discourse of literacy, I use the terms Multimodality and Multiliteracies; however, when communicating outside this discourse, I choose to use “multimedia” and “multiple literacies” so as to make the subject more broadly accessible to readers.

**The Modes.**

Multimodality is a facet of literacy that is not new had has been extensively studied and theorized (See Arola, Sheppard, & Ball, 2014; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, 2009; Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010; Kress, 2001, 2009; Jewitt 2008; Shipka, 2011; Wysocki, 2004). From existing scholarship on multimodality, three key statements arise: modes are contextually driven; meaning derived from their use (and the modes themselves) are contingent upon other modes; and each mode has particular affordances and limits.
First, modes are contextually defined. Bezemer and Kress (2008) state that modes can be defined or set by a community, and the definition can depend on the particular community’s representational needs. For instance, for the ordinary user of writing, font can be part of that mode, but for a typesetter, font may very well be a mode on its own.

Second, modes, meanings created from their use, and the modes themselves, are contingent upon other modes. According to Jewitt (2008), modes are partial—“no one mode stands alone” (p. 247). When analyzing multimodal ensembles, one must take into account consideration for all modes used, not just each one individually (Jewitt, 2008). Shipka’s (2011) *Toward a Composition Made Whole* addresses Jewitt’s point, that the whole composition, and the modes used, must be considered. Shipka (2011) argues that not only does the final product, and the modes used, need to be considered, but also the process of composing the ensemble as well. The rhetorical choices a writer/designer (Arola, Sheppard, & Ball, 2014) makes, and choose not to make, are important to understand the ensemble as a whole. It is through viewing modes as being interrelated, contingent upon each other, and contextually defined that allows composers to understand how “New modes are created and existing modes are transformed” (Jewitt, 2008, p. 247).

Finally, modes have affordances, or strengths and weaknesses. According to Jewitt (2008) *modal affordance* is defined as “what is possible to express and represent easily” (p. 247). Each mode affords us opportunities that others may not. Arola, Sheppard, & Ball (2014) offer the example of the affordances of the visual mode and the linguistic mode. An artifact drawing on the visual mode allows a writer/designer to depict emotion with immediacy, whereas an artifact drawing on the linguistic mode can convey
more complex information while taking its time. Modes are considered to be available resources, and writer/designers will draw on these available modal resources when making meaning. A person may choose a particular mode, or combination of modes, because it is more comfortable for them, or it is their preferred method, or the task at hand calls for a specific mode or combination of modes.

Certain modes naturally work well together, according to Cope & Kalantzis (2009). For instance, spacing, layout, and typography in the visual mode are closely related to written language. Intonation, inflection, pitch, tempo, and pause in the audio mode are closely related to spoken language. In the decade since the New London Group convened and drafted their first publication, modal affordances have become clearer. Not only are there parallels across modes, but also limitations of modes. For instance, the movie made after a book will never be the same as the novel; the image cannot do the same as the description in a novel (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). “The parallelism [in multimodality] allows the same thing to be depicted in different modes, but the meaning is never quite the same (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 14).

Initially, the modalities of meaning, or design elements (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) included: Linguistic Design, Audio Design, Visual Design, Gestural Design, and Spatial Design. However, since its original conception in 1994, Cope and Kalantzis revised the list of modes or design elements by framing them as languages and representations—they now include:

- **Written Language**: writing (representing meaning to another) and reading (representing meaning to oneself)—handwriting, the printed page, the screen.
• **Oral Language:** live or recorded speech (representing meaning to another); listening (representing meaning to oneself).

• **Visual Representation:** still or moving image, sculpture, craft (representing meaning to another); view, vista, scene, perspective (representing meaning to oneself).

• **Audio Representation:** music, ambient sounds, noises, alerts (representing meaning to another); hearing, listening (representing meaning to oneself).

• **Tactile Representation:** touch, smell and taste: the representation to oneself of bodily sensations and feelings or representations to others which ‘touch’ them bodily. Forms of tactile representation include kinesthesia, physical contact, skin sensations (heat/cold, texture, and pressure), grasp, manipulable objects, artefacts cooking and eating, and aromas.

• **Gestural Representation:** movements of the hands and arms, expressions of the face, eye movements and gaze, demeanours of the body, gait, clothing and fashion, hair style, dance, action sequences (Scollon, 2001), timing, frequency, ceremony and ritual. Here gesture is understood broadly and metaphorically as a physical act of signing (as in ‘a gesture to…’), rather than the narrower literal meaning of hand and arm movement. Representation to oneself may take the form of feelings and emotions or rehearsing action sequences in one’s mind’s eye.
• *Spatial Representation*: proximity, spacing, layout, interpersonal distance, territoriality, architecture/building, streetscape, cityscape, landscape (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 12-13).

**Multimodality and Technology**

Texts are inherently multimodal, and have always been, (Arola Sheppard & Ball, 2014; Shipka, 2011; Kress, 2000; Wooten, 2006; and Wysocki, 2004). In her 2006 CCCC chair’s address, Judith Wooten questions the newness of multimodality literacy by asking, “‘What about literacy hasn’t been multimodal? Like forever?’” (p. 241). Gunther Kress and Anne Wysocki, among others, contend that “there is no such thing as a monomodal text as even print-linear alphabetic texts are provided meaning potentials based on the visual design of the page; the color, quality, and texture of paper the text is printed on; and so on” (Shipka, p. 12). In *Toward a Composition Made Whole*, Shipka (2011) offers an example from Wooten (2006) of a letter written in 1613 that includes text and four hundred pages of drawings. Additionally, in *Writer/Designer*, Arola, Sheppard, and Ball (2014) provide an example of a dissertation and explain how it is multimodal because of its considerations for font and paper color with particular margin sizes—all communicating meaning to the reader. As stated earlier, modes are contextually defined, such as in the example provided regarding the typesetter seeing font as its own distinct mode, while the writer of a dissertation using a word processing program would give small consideration to font and consider it part of an existing mode.

So, if texts have always been multimodal, then how does one explain multimodality’s increased recognition? Jody Shipka (2011) responds that within the
literacy discipline, we have “too often and too narrowly associated multimodality with computer technologies and the production of digitized texts” (p. 12). Moje (2009) states that multimodality is not new, but what is new is that because of an increase in access to digitized texts we have begun paying more attention to multimodality and “calling into question the dominance of print as a communicative and/or expressive form” (352).

Furthermore, the ubiquity of digital technologies in schools is increasing, and many schools respond by rushing to adopt new technologies without really considering the ways the technologies can transform knowledge and pedagogy. What typically occurs, then, according to Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan (2010), is students use the technologies to replace previous ones, and the literacy practices and pedagogy behind them have not changed in any significant way. In “A Multiliteracies Perspective on the New Literacies,” they offer an example of students using blogs or a word processor to type their papers instead of handwriting them. They continue by stating, “Schools have collected together new resources, teachers have learned new strategies, and students have engaged in new types of activity… But often they are not that new in the sense that they are instructional or epistemological breakthroughs” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 63). The digitization of the written word, such as the creation of blogs or typed papers, may not have initially transformed pedagogy or practice, but it did change how students viewed and responded to the revision process. From my own experience, students have been much more willing to significantly revise their writing when they are not required to rewrite the entire piece over. This may have caused students to see writing more of an iterative process with less finality to their drafts, instead of seeing their writing as complete once it is written down.
Despite existing complications with integrating Multiliteracies and multimodality, “print-based literacy practices are still dominant in schools,” and “young people are participating, composing, meaning making in online digital spaces, experiences that are ‘transforming students’ expectations of, and orientations toward texts, literacy, and pedagogy” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 62). It has become even more imperative that multimodality, and its relationship to technology, be seriously addressed within curriculum and pedagogy because in order to participate in today’s society, “young people need to become capable and competent users of both print and other forms of meaning enabled by new technologies” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 61-62).

It is through Semiotic Remediation Practice and Synaesthesia that I aim to avoid the pitfalls and address the imperative stated above.

**Semiotic Remediation Practice and Synaesthesia**

It is important for a writer/designer (Arola, Sheppard, & Ball, 2014) to understand how each mode contributes to meaning making and representation, and how combinations of them can create unique meanings. To really understand the affordances of each mode, and the combinations as well, one must consider semiotic remediation practice, which involves understanding how performances are represented and reused across multiple modes of meaning making. More specifically, a writer/designer must practice synaesthesia, defined as the “process of shifting between modes and re-representing the same thing from one mode to another” (p. 67) that is “integral to representation” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 13), which is what I ask of my students in this research study.
Existing Scholarship

Teachers’ perspectives of Multiliteracies pedagogy.

Several practitioner-researchers have documented their attempts at infusing Multiliteracies within their pedagogy and classrooms. In “A Springboard Rather Than a Bridge”, Graham and Benson (2010), two professors at West Virginia University, describe how they address new literacies and multimodality with their pre-service teaching students. The authors suggest that literature on new literacies accentuates theory over classroom application and offer two examples of practical applications. Graham and Benson (2010) introduce the concepts to their students using the New London Group’s (2000) original definitions of the modes of meaning making (linguistic, audio, spatial visual, gestural, and multimodal), and the multiple design modes in a Multiliteracies pedagogy (Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing, and Transformed Practice), but each assign a different learning task.

Graham situated her assignment in a reading in the content area course. Students were asked to choose a television show to analyze along the multiple design modes and use the Internet to locate additional resources about the episode. Students in Graham’s class were able to develop new understandings of the modes by analyzing them in a familiar medium.

Benson situated her assignment in a secondary literature methods course. Students were asked to create a media instruction plan for their future classrooms, which included a philosophy and practical applications. Among the products, students created units to teach genre conventions and audience awareness, and they were able to design instruction that reached across the curriculum instead of in a separate media unit.
Graham’s assignment helped students build awareness of the modes, but struggled with being able to analyze their significance. Benson experienced something similar to Graham in that her students were able to think beyond the print mode, but she had not directly taught any multimodal theory in class. The authors acknowledge that their two learning tasks are not perfect assignments for multimodality instruction, but offer them as a springboard into encouraging pre-service teachers to think beyond print and understand that non-print texts will not do what print texts do.

In “Multimodality Pedagogies: A Multiliteracies Approach,” Cloonan (2008) describes an exploratory group, multi-case study in which she sought to investigate teacher learning and pedagogical choices as they attempted to integrate multimodal schema into their pedagogy. Based on work from the New London Group (1996, 2000), the author defines multimodal schema as the six modes of meaning making (linguistic, audio, visual, gestural, spatial, and multimodal, which is any combination of the other modes). Although the author does not employ the pedagogical knowledge processes schema, or the four pedagogical orientations of a Multiliteracies pedagogy, she does define it and refers readers to literature that does employ this schema (Cloonan, 2008).

Through various types of data including videotaped lessons, teacher interviews, collaborative viewing and reflection of taped lessons, and reflection on data and findings, Cloonan demonstrates how four teachers—Rachel, Kim, Meredith, and Pip—move from literacy teaching that favors print to literacy teaching that incorporates multiple modes of meaning. (Pip’s case is also described in more detail in Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010).
At the beginning of the research study, all four teachers acknowledged a surface level understanding of Multiliteracies and multimodality, some hearing of it, but not completely understanding it. Through this process of participatory action research, the four teachers found themselves in uncharted territory relying on knowledge from other disciplines and expertise to expand their pedagogical abilities. In the shift from teaching only print literacy to teaching Multiliteracies, the teachers ultimately found that they were using modes of meaning making in ways fundamental to the teaching of literacy, modes that previously would have been used as an afterthought or auxiliary, to the curriculum.

In chapter 5 of *Toward a Composition Made Whole*, Shipka (2011) describes a framework for how she assesses her students’ multimodal compositions. In this chapter, Shipka (2011) argues for the importance of requiring that students communicate the purposes and potentials for their multimodal compositions. Wysocki (2004) suggests teachers use strategies of “generous reading”, which “acknowledges that texts we receive from others can look and function differently from those to which we’ve been accustomed, and this is where generosity too must enter, so that we approach different-looking texts with the assumption not that mistakes were made but that choices were made and are being tried out and on” (p. 23). Using this concept, Shipka (2011), requires her students to compose a detailed *Statement of Goals and Choices*, in which they “detail how, why, and under what conditions they made their rhetorical, technological, and methodological choices” in their compositions (p. 113). Below is the list of core questions Shipka requires her students to address in their Statement of Goals and Choices:
1. What, specifically, is this piece trying to accomplish—above and beyond satisfying the basic requirements of the assignment? In other words, what work does, or might, this piece do? For whom? In what contexts?

2. What specific rhetorical, material, methodological, generic, and technological choices did you make in service of accomplishing the goal(s) articulated above? Catalog, as well, choices that you might not have consciously made, those that were made for you when you opted to work with certain genres, materials, and technologies.

3. Why did you end up pursuing this plan as opposed to the others you considered? How did the various choices listed above allow you to accomplish things that other sets or combinations would not have? (Shipka, 2011, p. 114).

**Student Outcomes**

**Multimodal counternarratives.**

In “‘Just Like I Have Felt’: Multimodal Counternarratives in Youth-Produced Digital Media” Curwood and Gibbons (2010) describe the multimodal microanalysis of Tommy, one of Curwood’s students. Multimodal microanalysis is a tool originally developed by Gibbons to study video data in youth media arts organizations. However, Curwood and Gibbons thought this would be ideal to use to analyze Tommy’s digital poem because it focuses on multiple modes and allows for detailed analysis of the “microdetails” of a text.
Curwood describes the dominance of white, European male authors and master narratives in her English curriculum, and was seeking to incorporate and discuss counternarratives as well. After reading Walt Whitman’s “I Hear America Singing” and Langston Hughes’ “I, Too, Sing America”, students were asked to write a text poem in response to the question, “What is your America like?” Tommy chose to compose this poem in a digital, multimodal format. Tommy’s poem is the subject of this article’s analysis.

Master narratives and counternarratives were the subject of focus for this literacy tasks in Curwood’s class. Curwood and Gibbons (2010), citing Hilde Lindemann Nelson (2001), define master narratives as archetypal stories that serve as summaries of socially shared understanding, and “function to reinforce potentially oppressive cultural ideologies and maintain the status quo’’ (p. 63). Counternarratives on the other hand, serve as “narratives that resist oppressive identities and ‘attempt to replace it with one that commands respect’” (p. 60). By writing these narratives, the composers can regain moral agency and humanity. Furthermore, multimodal counternarratives are the ways in which authors use multiple modes to push back against oppressive master narratives.

The second part of this article walks the reader through a multimodal microanalysis of Tommy’s poem, “I, Too, Sing America”. There are three phases of a multimodal microanalysis. Phase One involves transcribing the composition. This involves using a spreadsheet that includes screenshots of the digital poem at two-second intervals. The authors chose two-second intervals so as to break down the text in small increments, but large enough increments to show movement in the text.
Phase Two involves narrativizing the transcription “in order to gain a sense of which modes are salient” (Curwood and Gibbons, 2010, p. 67). The narrative is an attempt to make sense of Tommy’s modal choices. Phase Three involves analyzing modal patterns, which means analyzing the patterns mode-by-mode “looking for the presence or absence of each mode, its content, and its connections to the other modes in the poem” (p. 68-69). What is interesting with the phases of multimodal microanalysis is that it does not include Tommy in the analysis. There is no mention if the authors shared their analysis with Tommy and gained his input and insight into his thoughts on his own composition. Getting Tommy’s input may have eliminated some speculation and illuminated on some important aspects of the digital poem.

The inclusion of Curwood and Gibbons’ (2010) analysis of Tommy’s multimodal poetry project is a quintessential example of the lack of representation of students’ voices in the study of teachers’ practice and the study of multimodality in the classroom. The authors do not report on Tommy’s perspective of his own composing, nor his interpretation of the microanalysis. The realization that Tommy’s voice was missing made me decide to include my students’ experience and interpretations, instead of just my own.

Curwood and Gibbons found that by conducting a multimodal microanalysis of his poem, that Tommy uses digital media in four key ways: remixing stories and traditions, mixing modes, using functional load to foreground identity, and creating dialogic space for his audience. From a research perspective, Curwood and Gibbons’ microanalysis method inspired to identify other methods to analyzing student multimodal
work, which led me to Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) multimodal analysis framework; a framework in which I grounded my teaching.

Additionally, the authors conclude that Tommy’s digital poem (and the assignment) demonstrate three movements in education: technology integration, critical pedagogy, and literacy and identity studies. Finally, the authors conclude that youth can create counternarratives to highlight and resist master narratives that may marginalize them and gain agency in pushing against the cultural ideologies dominating master narratives. This means that capitalizing on students’ voices through this type of project can help students become more aware of themselves and the world that surrounds them. In other words, students can become aware of their social futures (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

**Muffie’s project.**

In *Toward a Composition Made Whole*, Shipka (2011) describes several of her students’ experiences in participating in remediated semiotic practice, which involves understanding how semiotic performances are represented and reused across multiple modes of meaning making; however, this section will focus on one student—Muffie.

Students in Shipka’s class were asked to play the role of historian and create a text that details something about who they were or did in the class. Muffie is a reluctant writer whose fear of writing is palpable. Muffie chose to major in dance because she thought that would accompany the least amount of writing, and actually avoided taking a composition class until her senior year. For this assignment, Muffie asked a friend who was not a member of the class to videotape an earlier class session. After that, she collected nine members of her dance program and recreated the class session in a live, in-
class dance performance of that videotaped earlier class session to the C & C Music Factory’s song *Gonna Make You Sweat (Everybody Dance Now).*

Viewing just Muffie’s final product, one would find it relatively simple to identify the multimodal aspects of the text, and notice that there was little to no writing involved. However, from a series of metacognitive tasks and interviews with Muffie, Shipka (2011) was able to identify that throughout the whole composition process, Muffie was rarely working on one literacy task at a time. A focus on Muffie’s process allowed Shipka to look closer and *attend differently* than one might with a traditional text using the written word. While writing was not included the final product, Shipka (2011) found that it was employed as a way of helping Muffie to fulfill some of her broader goals and objectives. Writing was used “not only as a way to help her think, organize, and remember but also a way to coordinate activity and an array of semiotic resources” (Shipka, 2011, p. 82). Shipka (2011) concludes, “Our discipline needs to examine both kinds of writing” and it needs to “investigate the various kinds of writing that occur around—and surround—writing-as-a-thing” (p. 82).

In this chapter, Shipka (2011) is careful to note that although Muffie’s project conveyed meaning without use of the written word in the final product, it does not mean that she as a teacher does not believe in the value of traditional literacy and writing. My own philosophical beliefs of literacy align with Shipka’s statement in that I still value the skill of being able to effectively communicate an argument or idea using the written word, but I also value other forms of meaning making as well and am seeking to enact those values into my teaching. This belief is what led me to start the Remediated Memoir Project with a traditional memoir, not only because it was required by the district, but
because I genuinely wanted my students to be successful in storytelling. I initially questioned whether I should have started with asking students to share their memoirs using technology, and skip the first step; but I decided against it. Aside from the previously mentioned reasons, I wanted students to see firsthand how their writing can change from one medium to another.

Curwood and Gibbons’ (2010) and Shipka’s (2011) texts are two examples of multimodal analyses of students’ multimodal compositions. I imagine more exist; however, the literature I discovered was limited to just these two examples. Because much of the existing literature and research focuses on the pedagogical side of Multiliteracies and multimodal composing, there is a clear lack of representation from the student perspective. The research I conducted and describe in succeeding chapters aim to contribute to this under researched area.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

As technology becomes more ubiquitous, more varied forms of meaning making become possible. In order to participate in today's society, "young people need to become capable and competent users of both print and other forms of meaning enabled by new technologies" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 61-62). Additionally, with the arrival of technology, and the increasing ubiquity of its implementation, "thinking patterns have changed" (Prensky, 2001, p. 1); and because thinking patterns have changed, teachers' pedagogical approaches must change as well. In the realm of writing, teachers are now experiencing what Lunsford, Fishman, & Liew (2013) describe as "the digital imperative" where, "The future of writing -- based on a global collaborative text, where all writing has the potential to become public -- informs our classrooms and forms a new, 'digital' imperative, one that asks how we can reshape our pedagogy with new uses of the technologies that are changing our personal and professional lives" (p. 489).

In this study, I sought to understand how I can effectively teach the required curriculum focused on print literacy, and enact a Multiliteracies pedagogy while integrating technology into my classroom. This research is an attempt to reconcile my rhetoric (Multiliteracies) with my reality (print-focused curriculum, iPads) (Zeichner, 1995). I was interested in understanding my students’ perceptions about their own rhetorical and design choices as they composed multimodal texts. Specifically, in this study, I sought to understand the following:
1. How do I operationalize Multiliteracies in my high school English classroom?

2. How do I operationalize teaching multimodal composition?

3. How do students make sense of their experience composing multimodally?

4. How do students make sense of their rhetorical and design choices?

**Methods**

**Research Design**

Because I wanted to understand my experience and my students’ experiences, self-study and phenomenographical research methodological approaches were most appropriate. This section includes descriptions of self-study and phenomenographical research methodologies; the research participants, context, and setting; and means of data collection and analysis.

**Self-Study**

Self-study is an educational research methodology that gained notoriety and standing as a legitimate research methodology through the Self-Study Special Interest Group (or SIG) formed in 1992, by members of the American Educational Research Association including: Hamilton, Pinnegar, Loughran, LaBoskey, Russell, Knowles, Bullough, Cole, Northfield, and Korthagen. Their aim was to reinvent teacher education with the continuous “interrogating [of] one’s practice” (Cochran-Smith & Donnell, 2006, p. 506). Self-study derives from the postmodernist belief that it is not possible to divorce the “self” from research or practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 40). According to
Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009), self-study is a genre of practitioner inquiry, which is an umbrella term for various educational research modes including others such as teacher research, action research, and participatory action research. Drawing on biographical, autobiographical, and narrative forms of data collection and analysis, self-study shares common characteristics with other modes such as the role of practitioner as researcher, the professional context as site for study, and blurred boundaries between inquiry and practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Although self-study typically involves research conducted by academics of teacher education, it has been used within K-12 school settings as well.

Self-study has been criticized because of the personalized, subjective nature of studying one’s own teaching practice. Uniting the initial members of the SIG “was the core belief and ethical commitment that if researchers in colleges of education are to study the development of teachers they should publicly declare their own role in that development” rendering the self-study approach in the development of teachers and teacher education necessary, even common sense (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 14). According to Bullough and Pinnegar (2001), teacher educators should study their own practice “since one’s practice is, as Charles Taylor (1981) suggests, who we are,” making it “a simple truth, that to study a practice is simultaneously to study self: a study of self-in-relation to other” (p. 14). The “other” in the case of this inquiry is Multiliteracies and multimodality.

In self-study research, significance, grounding, and authority serve as criteria for quality (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). In addition to being necessary in the development of teaching and teacher education, self-study poses additional benefits and potential
positive outcomes that increase its significance in the educational research community. The blended, and perhaps complicated, roles of practitioner and researcher can serve as an advantage and “potential window into rich and enhanced insights about practice” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 47). This blended role required me to achieve and maintain a balance between my teaching practice and myself. To achieve this balance, I needed to consider both equally. Evoking Ross Mooney’s (1957) landmark text “The Researcher Himself”, Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) state that self-study “does not focus on the self per se but on the space between self and the practice engaged in” (p. 15). This balance not only involved myself and Multiliteracies and pedagogy, but in the data as well—“what data have been gathered (from self and other) and presented” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 15). In combining self-study with phenomenography (to be discussed in the following section), I was able to achieve the balance between my practice, myself, and the data collected. Questions that drive practitioner inquiry, and more specifically self-study, derive from neither theory nor practice alone, but in the intersection of the two (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). In other words, in order to establish quality in self-study the research must be grounded in a methodological tradition, which consequently leads to the establishment of authority. The study is grounded in and borrows methods from phenomenography, a methodological research tradition originating from Ference Marton’s work in Sweden in 1981 that aims at understanding how others experience and interpret a phenomenon, a methodology to be introduced in the following section. Because self-study is a study of practice “at the intersection of self and other… its methods are borrowed” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 15). According to Bullough and Pinnegar (2001), if I can show that I have followed with care the recognized conventions
and methods of phenomenography, the borrowed methodology, then I can assert the quality of my claims, and assert authority (p. 15).

Practitioner inquiry, and more specifically self-study, validates the practitioner’s knowledge and emerging theoretical frameworks; and teachers who adopt an inquiry stance, according to Cochran-Smith & Lytle (2009), “take action based on interpretations, which engender new experiences, which, in turn, shape the conceptual landscape” (p. 331). In other words, practitioner inquiry has the potential to inform a teacher’s local context while also contributing to a larger body of knowledge, which was the aim of this research.

If I wanted to better understand Multiliteracies, and myself as a practitioner enacting Multiliteracies and multimodality, a methodology that delves into the personal aspects of my inquiry seemed most appropriate. Still, I had to acknowledge that what I taught, and how I interpreted that experience, may not be what my students learned, and they may not have interpreted the experience the same way I intended for them. Therefore, to address this possible discrepancy, not only did I study my interpretation of this experience, but I investigated my students’ interpretations of this experience as well, which necessitated a phenomenographical approach.

**Phenomenography**

Phenomenography is a research methodology in education first employed by Ference Marton in 1981 (Svensson, 1997) that “aims at description, analysis, and understanding of experiences” (Marton, 1981, p. 177). More specifically, it is an empirical and “quite pragmatic” (Hasselgren & Beach, 1997, p. 192) research tradition aimed at studying people’s conceptions of phenomena. There exists, according to Marton
two distinct perspectives of the world: the first-order perspective, which is when “we orient ourselves towards the world and make statements about it,” and the second-order perspective, which is when “we orient ourselves towards people’s ideas about the world… and we make statements about people’s ideas about the world” (Marton, 1981, p. 178). Phenomenography, specifically, involves the second order perspective. Marton (1981) has two reasons in arguing for this second-order perspective. The first involves considering that “the different ways in which people experience, interpret, understand, apprehend, perceive, or conceptualize various aspects of reality is sufficiently interesting in itself” and the second involves understanding that “the descriptions we arrive at from the second-order perspective are autonomous in the sense that they cannot be derived from descriptions arrived at from the first-order perspective” (p. 178).

The typical data collection method in phenomenology is interviewing; however, Marton (1986), citing himself (1984), states, “the products of people’s work can be studied as sedimentations of the ways they think about their world” (Marton, 1986, p. 42), which is a component of the means of data collection.

Several critiques of phenomenography exist. These criticisms mainly involve the reporting of the results and the methods used to arrive at said results. Phenomenographical research is explorative in nature and is not accompanied by prescribed methods, nor predefined categories, themes, or codes for qualitative data analysis, which is seen as suspect and problematic in traditional, quantitative, and even qualitative, research. However, Marton (1986) argues that this is the necessary and fundamental nature of phenomenography. He states, “…we cannot specify exact techniques for phenomenographic research. It takes some discovery to find out the
qualitatively different ways in which people experience or conceptualize specific phenomena” (p. 42). He continues, “There are no algorithms for such discoveries” (p. 42).

Participants, context, and setting

I conducted research within my own classroom and with my own students. Participants included all 21 (14 female and 7 male) of the 24 students enrolled in my advanced freshman English class. This study took place at Pleasant View High School, a suburban high school in the Midwest. At the time of this study, student body enrollment for the 2014-2015 school year was 1538, with 412 seniors, 374 juniors, 384 sophomores, and 368 freshmen. The student body was composed of 75.7% white, 10.9% Black or African American, 8.5% Hispanic, 2.8% Asian, 1.8%, and 0.3% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The ethnic makeup of the participant population included approximately 82% white, 5% Hispanic, 5% Black or African American, and 5% Asian. Forty percent of the participant population was identified as being a High Ability Learner (HAL), while no students were identified as being in Special Education. Data collection for this study took place within my classroom. Each class period met for approximately 50 minutes, and the study lasted five weeks.

In August at the beginning of the school year, each student was issued an iPad Air and charger. Each device was enabled with an Internet filter while at school, and a second filter while at home, so certain sites deemed inappropriate for student use were blocked at school and at home, regardless of the Wi-Fi networks students were using. Additionally, students are required to have their own Apple IDs, whether it was theirs or their parents’.
This allowed students to download any applications, eBooks, or music they wanted. Of course, the device filtered applications deemed inappropriate by the district. The school district owned the iPads, which meant each device with the case and charger were returned at the end of the school year. At this study’s inception, I had two years’ experience integrating this device into classroom, and my students had one semester of participating in the iPad Academy.

**Access to the school site**

In order for research to be conducted, approval was required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects. An IRB protocol application was completed and accepted (see Appendix B and C for informed consent and assent forms). Additionally, it was required that the school district in which the study will take place approved the research study, which was approved by the Executive Director for Teaching and Learning (see Appendix D). The Executive Director for Teaching and Learning and the Director of Technology for the district both expressed interest in this study being conducted in my iPad Academy class.

**Consent and assent**

Parents were consented before students were assented, both of which occurred before research began. Elizabeth (pseudonym used), a colleague, emailed the parents of the potential student participants explaining the study and asked whether they will consent to have their child participate in the study. The email included an attached IRB Parent Consent letter (see Appendix B). Students were instructed to bring the parental consent letter back to school, and Elizabeth explained the research study to students and asked whether they would assent to participate (see Appendix C). Elizabeth was chosen
for the person to obtain consent and assent because she did not have a perceived role of influence over my students. While Elizabeth was introducing and explaining the research study, I was present in the room. Elizabeth was charged with keeping both the parental consent and student assent letters and signatures until after the final grades for the semester were posted, so as to avoid any undue or unintentional coercion perceived by students. Throughout the research study, and thereafter, I did not know which students and parents consented and assented until the end of the semester. In a self-authored biography, Elizabeth describes herself as:

A district technology trainer and connected lifelong learner who is passionate about transforming teaching and learning, creating paperless classrooms, project based learning, creativity in the classroom, and mobile learning. She is an Apple Foundations Trainer for Bellevue Public Schools and provides training and in-service on Apple Foundations Courses to teachers in the district. In addition, she leads workshops on Google Apps and teaches online courses for a state college in the School of Education. She is a positive change agent and is currently working with the district iPad Academy initiative, where she coaches teachers to use iPads for creativity and innovation in the classroom (Elizabeth, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

Procedures

The Remediated Memoir Unit

To address the research questions guiding this inquiry, I developed a study lasting approximately five weeks in which I sought to understand how my students and I understood and interpreted the process of designing and teaching, respectively,
multimodal composition (See Appendix E for unit plan). In the district curriculum, students were required to write a personal narrative in which they answered the prompt, “Write a story about a significant event from your life with reflection on the life-lesson you’ve learned from it woven into your story.” I asked students to write to this prompt after having read Elie Wiesel’s memoir Night. The reading took place during week one, which coincided with the students’ Spring Break. During week two students explored, through discussion and their own writing, features of narrative and memoir writing, including dialogue and a reflective standpoint. Week three students composed their district-required personal narrative based on the aforementioned prompt. In this same week, I introduced the Remediated Memoir project and reviewed elements of the rhetorical situation: the intended audience, purpose for composing, context in which text is to be read, authorship, and genre to which the text belongs, as they pertained to this project. Week four was spent introducing and discussing the elements of design: emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, and proximity (Arola, Sheppard, & Ball, 2014). Students also began working on their Remediated Memoir by planning out their projects using a storyboard (see Appendix G), sharing with their peers and receiving feedback before moving forward. This meant that I asked students to “remediate” their memoirs using their iPads. Semiotic remediation practice, or remediation, involved understanding how semiotic performances are represented and reused across multiple modes of meaning making. More specifically, students participated in synaesthesia, which is “the process of shifting between modes and re-representing the same thing from one mode to another” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Clunan, 2010, p. 67). Week five was
dedicated to working on the Remediated Memoir project, sharing with peers, giving and receiving feedback; and finally, composing the Statement of Goals and Choices.

**Data Sources, Means of Data Collection, and Means of Data Analysis**

Data was collected in the weeks following students’ writing of a traditional print memoir and derived from multiple sources including student-created artifacts, field notes, and an interview. Data sources were aligned to each of the four research questions as seen in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Data Sources in Relation to Research Questions and Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How do I operationalize Multiliteracies in my high school English classroom? | • interview  
• field notes | • myself  
• Elizabeth (interviewer) |
| How do I operationalize teaching multimodal composition? | • interview  
• field notes | • myself  
• Elizabeth (interviewer) |
| How do students make sense of their experience composing multimodally? | • Remediated Memoir  
• Statement of Goals and Choices | • Student participants |
| How do students make sense of their rhetorical and design choices? | • Remediated Memoir  
• Statement of Goals and Choices | • Student participants |

The first two questions centered on understanding my perspectives as I operationalized Multiliteracies and multimodality in my own high school English classroom, while the
second two questions focus on understanding how my students made sense of their experience composing multimodally while considering their own rhetorical and design choices throughout the process.

**Interview**

According to Cochran-Smith & Lytle (2009), an outside perspective is impossible in self-study, but Heaton and Swidler (2012) assert that practitioner-researchers studying their own practice must “take advantage of the fact that the practitioner is part of the phenomena” yet at the same time “find ways to be at once present in the inquiry and a witness outside of the inquiry” (p. 92). Because of this unique challenge, I asked Elizabeth to interview me for approximately one hour at the end of the five-week unit in which I incorporated multimodality and Multiliteracies (See Appendix E for interview questions). The interview was audio-recorded and I used Atlas, a downloadable program, to mark utterances of interest and organize them by categories of descriptions. A post-interview allowed me to reflect and discuss my thoughts and interpretations of the Remediated Memoir unit after it was complete.

Elizabeth was familiar with me as a teacher, yet relatively unfamiliar with the direction my problem of practice had taken me and was an optimal person to conduct the interview. According to Elizabeth, she was “familiar with the English curriculum objectives and how to combine innovative technology with pedagogy, but multimodality and Multiliteracies are new to [her]” (Elizabeth, personal communication, February 15, 2015). She also believed that multimodal composition in the English classroom had the potential to allow students to demonstrate competency in multiple forms of literacy aside from the predominant mode, written language.
According to Marton (1986) and Roulston (2010) interviewing is the primary method of data collection in phenomenography, preferably with one or two unstructured, open-ended questions that allows the subjects to “choose the dimensions of the questions to answer,” dimensions which are “an important source of data” because it reveals what the subject deems relevant (Marton, 1986, p. 42). Although there is no prescribed method for data analysis of interviews, there are a few guiding steps. Interviews are generally transcribed; and from the transcriptions, the researcher selects and marks utterances of interest, which are narrowed down into data pools, or categories of descriptions. A strength of this method is that the analysis is individualized to the researcher’s interpretations and as the data is analyzed and placed into data pools, it can be responsive to the participant and the content. One criticism of phenomenography is that the definitions of categories can be subjective, “but the definitions for categories are tested against the data, adjusted, retested, and adjusted again. There is, however, a decreasing rate of change, and eventually the whole system of meanings is stabilized” (Marton, 1986, p. 43). As I worked through the interview data, I found this last statement to be accurate.

Field notes

Throughout the Remediated Memoir unit, I composed field notes a total of eight times, which included observations and insight into my lessons. Field notes, according to Fetterman (2010), are the “rawest kind of writing” from daily observation (p. 114). If the field notes are done close enough to the event being studied, it can provide a rich description and provide observation and insight into the event (Fetterman, 2010). A major challenge with this form of data collection was setting aside time directly after the event.
to ensure “clarity, concision, and completeness”; and because field notes produce a mass of data, and memory fades quickly, “too long a delay sacrifices the rich immediacy of concurrent notes” (p. 117). In order to accomplish this form of data collection, I had a consistent form for composing the field notes, employed shorthand, symbols and mnemonic devices to minimize the time commitment. I set aside time, approximately 20 minutes, during my fourth-period plan time, approximately one hour after my second period iPad Academy class to complete the field notes. In addition, to ensure that the notes did not contain mostly conjecture, I kept speculations, cues, lists, and personal diary-type comments in a separate category (Fetterman, 2010). (See Appendix H for field notes template) Only I had access to these field notes.

After composing the first entry in the field notes and before I composed subsequent entries, I reviewed what was written prior to familiarize myself with what I observed and any interpretations and initial analysis I may have gleaned from the documented experience. I also reviewed the field notes throughout the entire study before participating in the post-interview with Elizabeth.

I analyzed the field notes using the same protocol as the interview transcription. I selected and marked utterances of interest, which were narrowed into data pools, or categories of descriptions. The results of this data analysis were used to support and confirm the data analysis from the interview.

**Student-created artifacts**

Student artifacts derived from two related sources: each student participant’s Remediated Memoir and their Statement of Goals and Choices (Shipka, 2011).

*The Remediated Memoir*
The Remediated Memoir took many forms, which was decided upon by each individual student. After writing their traditional print memoir, and receiving feedback from their instructor, students remediated it using any technology at their disposal on their district-provided iPad. Some formats for the remediated memoir included a digital comic book using the app Comic Life, an iMovie, an animated story using the app Explain Everything, or an e-book using the app Kid in Story. These were not the only ones students could have chosen from; because students were allowed to download their own apps, the list of possibilities expanded.

The Remediated Memoir provided another lens leading to a deeper understanding of my students’ experiences and was used to support findings from the students’ Statement of Goals and Choices. When analyzing the Statements of Goals and Choices, I used concepts and the same language of Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) framework for analyzing multimodal compositions. In Writer/Designer: A Guide to Making Multimodal Projects, Arola, Sheppard, and Ball guide readers through the process of analyzing multimodal projects. Fundamental to this framework is that when analyzing this type of project, one must consider the rhetorical and design choices that support the rhetorical situation, which was incorporated into my lessons, Statement of Goals and Choices reflection assignment, and the assessment rubric. Rhetoric is traditionally conceived as the use of available means of persuasion; and the authors extend that definition to include the agentive quality of the text, one that “effectively persuade[s] an audience toward change” (p. 21). The rhetorical situation, then, is the “set of circumstances in which an author creates a text” (p. 21). According to Arola, Sheppard, and Ball (2014), when composers are creating a text, they pay attention to four factors:
their intended audience, their purpose for communicating, the context in which their text will be read, and the genre they choose for their text. The process of thinking through a text through this perspective is called rhetorical analysis. Much like in rhetorical analysis traditionally taught in English classes, there are five considerations including: audience, purpose, context, author, and genre.

The second half of the framework involves analyzing an author’s design choices, whose purpose is to support the rhetorical situation. While they may initially seem to focus on visual aspects of a composition, all design elements can actually be applied to any multimodal text using any combination of The New London Group’s (2000) originally conceived modes (linguistic, visual, aural, spatial, and gestural). These five key design concepts include: emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, and proximity.

Statement of Goals and Choices

The second artifact was each student’s Statement of Goals of Choices (Shipka, 2011). Shipka (2011) in Toward a Composition Made Whole and Cope and Kalantzis (2000) in Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures argue for the importance of students understanding how they are agentive in their own meaning making. Specifically, Shipka (2011) argues “for the importance of requiring that students assume responsibility for describing, evaluating, and sharing with others the purposes and potentials of their work” (p. 112). In navigating Multiliteracies and multimodal composition in the classroom, meaning-making can take various forms, which necessitates the assessor—in this case, the teacher—employing what Wysocki (2004) calls “strategies for generous reading,” which requires teachers to acknowledge that we may not be familiar with some of the texts students create, “so that we approach different
looking texts with the assumption not that mistakes were made but that choices were made and are being tried out and on” (p. 23).

Shipka’s (2011) Statement of Goals and Choices—a document in which students “detail how, why, and under what conditions they made their rhetorical, technological, and methodological choices” (Shipka, 2011, p. 113)—is how I was able to analyze how students made sense of their experience composing multimodally and how they made sense of their rhetorical and design choices in their remediated memoirs. The Statement of Goals and Choices, then, assisted me in understanding the student’s rhetorical and design choices as they progressed through the process of composing multimodally, choices which may not have been clear from the final product—the remediated memoir—by itself. In this research study, the Statement of Goals and Choices was more revealing than the remediated memoir.

Adapted from Shipka (2011) to include more accessible language for high school freshman and tailored to my instruction on rhetoric and design, below are the three questions students were required to address in their detailed Statement of Goals and Choices.

1. What is your purpose in composing this piece (beyond the fact that it is a course requirement)? For whom? What is this piece trying to accomplish (beyond the basic requirements outline in the task description?) In what context do you imagine this piece being “read”?
2. What specific rhetorical, technological, and design choices did you make in order to accomplish the goal(s) articulated in question number one?

3. Why did you end up pursuing this plan as opposed to the others you came up with? How did the various choices listed above allow you to accomplish things that other sets of combinations of rhetorical, technological, and design choices would not have?

As stated earlier, the typical data source in phenomenography is interviewing; however, student-produced artifacts can, and have been used as data sources. Because of the open-ended nature of the three questions in the Statement of Goals and Choices previously introduced, the Statement of Goals and Choices can be seen as a type of interview as well. Phenomenographical interviewing, much like the three questions in the Statement of Goals and Choices, typically uses open-ended questions “in order to let the subjects choose the dimensions of the question they want to answer” (Marton, 1986, p. 42). Furthermore, “The dimensions they choose are an important source of data because they reveal an aspect of the individual’s relevance structure” (Marton, 1986, p. 42). Therefore, essentially, the Statement of Goals and Choices was a student-created artifact that I viewed as a form of interviewing, in written form. As a result of this similarity, the analysis protocol of the Statement of Goals and Choices was the same as it was for the interview and field notes previously discussed.
CHAPTER 4

HOW DO I OPERATIONALIZE MULTILITERACIES IN MY ENGLISH CLASSROOM?

In the spring of 2014 I took a class on Digital Literacies, which ended up being the turning point in my doctoral journey. “It poured,” is how my adviser characterized it in my comprehensive oral exam (G. Trainin, personal communication, November 14, 2014). I had not yet been able to identify a specific problem of practice. I knew it would center on technology integration in the English classroom, but beyond that, I felt stalled. This class was the catalyst that propelled me into Multiliteracies and New Literacies Studies; and Cope and Kalantzis’s (2000) *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures* was the chemical. When developing the remediated memoir unit I knew each lesson’s objectives needed to be purposeful and build upon each other (modeling Pearson and Gallagher’s (1983) Gradual Release of Responsibility) so I relied on Cope and Kalantzis’s text to anchor and guide my planning.

I wanted to understand how I made sense of a Multiliteracies pedagogy in my classroom. To answer this question, I asked a friend and colleague, Elizabeth, to interview me at the end of the remediated memoir project. Elizabeth was familiar with my classroom and my teaching, but relatively unfamiliar with this project, which is the reason I chose her. Articulating to another person what I accomplished in my classroom allowed me to view how I operationalized Multiliteracies from a relative outside perspective. It also allowed me to put distance between myself and what I was doing in my classroom so I could reflect on these events more objectively without waiting too long, making the details of our conversation too vague. Keeping fidelity with
phenomenographic research tradition, I identified *utterances of interest* (Marton, 1986) from the interview then organized them into categories of descriptions. From the data, patterns emerged that are consistent with the four knowledge processes of a Multiliteracies pedagogy (Kalantzis and Cope, 2009), and my instructional moves within these processes led (as I expected it would) to a rebalancing of student agency.

According to Cope and Kalantzis (2009) and Kalantzis, Cope, and Cloonan (2010), a pedagogy of Multiliteracies requires four “dimensions of pedagogy”, or four “ways of knowing” (2010, p. 73) be activated, including *experiencing*, *conceptualizing*, *analyzing*, and *applying*. These knowledge processes are not to be viewed in isolation of each other or as a sequence to be followed, but as a “map of the range of pedagogical moves that may prompt teachers to extend their pedagogical repertoires” (2010, p. 73). Each dimension was present in my teaching and iterative of each other. Although these dimensions are not, according to the authors, to be viewed or implemented as individual steps in a series, I will describe them as they appear in *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures*.

**Experiencing**

By requiring students to practice synaesthesia and remediate their memoirs—something completely foreign to them—it was important that I construct and reinforce a bridge between the familiar and the new. My students are not experts at narrative writing, yet they have had considerable experience in previous years writing in this genre. As with anything new in the learning process, it is essential to connect the new with the familiar, but even more so when introducing new literacies, rather than just new content. Moreover, learning anything new and testing new knowledge and skills is accompanied
with a relative level of anxiety in students— in anyone, really. Because I was taking them out of their comfort zones, in the planning of this project, I anticipated my students would experience some anxiety; therefore, I planned to provide as many resources as possible for students throughout the process. Before I asked students to complete the Narrative Essay Essential Objective, I assigned them to write a one-page memoir of something that happened in their lives this past year. We would use that short memoir to practice crafting dialogue and incorporating a reflective standpoint. I brought in my own memoir I wrote the past summer to use as a mentor text from which students could draw examples. I used my piece to model dialogue and a reflective standpoint. Night also provided several rich examples as well. Once we analyzed my memoir and Night, students returned to their one-page memoirs to identify their use of this concept.

By using the traditional memoir as a starting place for the remediated memoir project, I engaged students in the Experiencing dimension. More specifically, I created opportunities for them to experience the known and the new, which involves the “reading [of] the unfamiliar, immersion in new situations and texts, [and] reading new texts” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 73). In order to create these experiences where students are exposed to familiar and new texts, I needed to have access to resources, which did not occur to me as being significant until now. In other words, I had to have already experienced the new to competently guide my students through the same process. In several instances, I failed to remember that I had experience composing traditional memoirs and remediated projects in the recent past. When I recalled I had access to these personal examples, I immediately made them available to my students and incorporated them into my lessons. In our interview, I told Elizabeth, “In my teaching career, I’m at
the point where I have this content that I can draw from that I might not know I have, but I have” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May, 18, 2015). Having resources to provide students is fundamental to engaging them in the Experiencing dimension, which I discovered takes time to develop.

**Conceptualizing**

Cope and Kalantzis (2000) describe conceptualizing as a “knowledge process in which the learners become active conceptualizers, making the tacit explicit and generalizing from the particular” (p. 74). I engaged students in conceptualizing through several lessons. In order for my students to grasp how communication changes through the remediation process, they would need a common language to describe what they were reading and seeing, and the choices the writer/designer made to get there. Kalantzis, Cope, and Clonan (2010) urgently call for “developing a metalanguage to teach about the design features (i.e. grammars) of other modes in addition to language” (p. 68). To satisfy this need, I drew from Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) multimodal analysis framework, and integrated these rhetorical and design concepts into my instruction. To develop an understanding of the analysis framework, I created a series of lessons that engaged students in the use of these concepts. My students were experienced and competent with the rhetorical elements; therefore, we spent minimal time reviewing. Instead, I asked students to write a one-page reflection in which they imagine how their rhetorical situation would change through the synaesthesia process (e.g., How will your intended audience change?). Next, to give my students an opportunity to practice using the design elements I required them to read “A Game of Shark and Minnow”, a multimodal story published by *The New York Times*, and analyze the text using the five
design elements (emphasis, contrast, alignment, proximity, and organization). After discussing as a class, we analyzed “Snow Fall” published by the same publisher. By relying on Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) multimodal analysis framework, students were able to articulate the author’s rhetorical and design choices. When it came time to write their reflective pieces, the Statement of Goals and Choices, many students used this same grammar when referring to their own decision making. Integrating Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) framework into the unit was a success because in both the analysis of professional and their own multimodal texts they were able to make the tacit explicit because they had a common “metalanguage” to guide them.

Analyzing

Infusing a “metalanguage” or grammar of rhetoric and design is the first step to having students analyze critically, which, according to Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan (2010), requires students to analyze their own and other’s perspectives, interests, and motives. They further define analyzing as a process in which, “learners interrogate the interests behind a meaning or an action, as well as their own processes of thinking” (p. 74). This is most readily seen in the lessons where I asked students to analyze “A Game of Shark and Minnow” and “Snowfall” using the multimodal analysis framework. In my interview with Elizabeth, I reflect on the effectiveness of these activities: “I think it really opened their eyes as to how those [an author’s choices] might seem like unconscious choices. Like what you make bigger and what you make smaller; and what color you use…” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May, 18, 2015). I continue, “To be able to be aware of them is really important. Because it sends a message, too” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May, 18, 2015). It is this awareness of our own thinking and
choices that led me to incorporate the Statement of Goals and Choices (Shipka, 2011) reflection into the project. In the Statement of Goals and Choices, students were given an opportunity to make their rhetorical and design choices explicit to me, the assessor, but also to themselves, allowing them to analyze their own thinking. This metacognitive activity ended up yielding the most enlightening data which is used in Chapters Six and Seven.

**Applying**

The final knowledge process is *applying*, in which “Learners do something that expresses or affects the world in new way[s], or that transfers their previous knowledge into a new setting” (p. 74). Applying is employed through students participating in the semiotic remediation and synaesthesia process. The remediated memoir is a new setting and text for students to express themselves in new ways. However, out of all four knowledge processes, I would have liked to utilize this more. The largest contributing factor to this was a lack of available time. This project occurred very late in the school year, which meant I had a finite amount of time to devote to it. When asked if in the future I would “amplify the audience” (Elizabeth, personal communication, May 18, 2015), I responded by saying I originally intended students to publish these on their blogs and extend the conversation through blog comments or on an individual publishing website such as Wattpad. Unfortunately, I did not have enough time to extend the activity beyond the classroom. I did encourage students to share their projects with their parents since the stories were personal and many involved family members.

**Rebalancing Agency**

“Coupled with the march to multimodality is a profound shift in the balance of agency” (Kalantzis, Cope, and Cloonan, 2008, p. 64)
Enacting a Multiliteracies pedagogy and engaging students in the four ways of knowing led to an increase in student agency, which the founders of Multiliteracies wittingly predicted. A Multiliteracies perspective views learners or meaning makers as designers and any “meaning-making activity as a matter of design” (Kalantzis, Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 70). Therefore, “A pedagogy of Multiliteracies requires that the role of agency in the meaning-making process be recognized, and in that recognition it seeks to create a more productive, relevant, innovative, creative, and even perhaps, emancipatory pedagogy” (p. 71). Placing my students in more agentive roles was intentional. However, after analyzing the data from my interview with Elizabeth, I realized then how prevalent and pervasive agency was throughout this whole experience. Allowing for more choice and freedom felt natural, even fundamental to this project. Several discoveries emerged from the interview data, which include discussions on the impact of increased agency and how, specifically, agency is evident throughout the entire remediated memoir project, from composition to assessment.

Agency’s Favorable (And Not So Favorable) Impact

In enacting a Multiliteracies pedagogy, agency was at the forefront of my planning. Introducing the unfamiliar into the classroom is frequently accompanied by anxiety, for both teacher and student. Thankfully, I had experience in trial and error process with my own teaching (with technology and without), which allowed me to focus on being clear, specific, and precise with my planning, expectations, and work with students. I was prepared for my students to be both anxious and reluctant to begin the remediated portion of this project. I could tell students were excited about this project, but when the day came for them to begin work on their iPads, I noticed that students had
“these little terrified looks-- these deer in headlights” looks that say, “I don’t know where
to begin” (B.Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). I identified that “one of
the challenges for students is that they had to figure out ‘Where do I start?’”
(B.Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). Two phrases I frequently used in
those initial days include, “‘You get to choose’” and “‘It’s open-ended’” (B.Campbell,
personal communication, May 18, 2015). Although I prepared myself for how students
would respond to the requirements of this project, I confessed to Elizabeth that I was still
somewhat surprised at “how much reassurance kids need when they are doing something
that is not prescribed, when it is completely up to them” (B.Campbell, personal
communication, May 18, 2015). In my experience, advanced students are less likely and
comfortable taking academic risks; they prefer to be told how to do something, and then
follow those instructions.

Choice had an adverse effect on certain students, but not all. While I imagine
students did not enjoy the anxiety that came with this open-ended project, I enjoyed
seeing students make decisions, articulate rationale for those decisions, and execute them.
Certain students surprised me in this project. Reagan, who had not been particularly
dedicated in English this school year, “really came out” as I described to Elizabeth
(B.Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). Her contributions to our class
analysis of “Snowfall” was “astute and fantastic” (B.Campbell, personal communication,
May 18, 2015). I proudly revealed that “I’ve never seen that before from her”
(B.Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). Because of her unexpected
interest and level of engagement, I spend a significant amount of time thinking about
Reagan and analyzing her remediated memoir in Chapter Seven.
“They’re Writers, Too. They Know.”

During the composing process, as short as it was, I wanted students to see themselves as writers and rely on each other for feedback and help before seeking my assistance. “They’re writers, too. They know” is a phrase I repeated to students several times (B. Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). Introducing new literacies skills, and enacting a Multiliteracies pedagogy is paramount to me. However, I also understood that, as Cope, Kalantzis, and Cloonan (2010) articulate it, “literacy teaching is not only about skills and competence; it is aimed at creating a kind of person, an active designer of meaning with a sensibility open to differences, change, and innovation” (p. 72). I wanted students to see themselves as writers, that they have the power and knowledge to make their own composition decisions without worrying about following a prescribed formula.

Having anticipated students’ potential anxiety levels, I expected students would have a great deal of questions for me. Knowing there was a limited amount of class time, and only one of me, one of the stipulations I put into place during the composition process is that if a student needed help or wanted to run an idea past me, they first needed to ask their group members. But I also told them, “if you can’t come to some sort of understanding, then you come to me” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). This significantly cut down the number of requests I was fielding, and in the end built strong connections between group members.

Facilitating the forming of peer groups was relatively easy. Students had been working in several different writing groups in weeks, even months prior to this project; therefore, I felt they had a good enough idea of the strengths of their classmates as writers.
to be able to choose their own groups. For the most part, students did choose their own peer groups, but with some, I encouraged groupings based on the tools students chose to use and their comfort level with them. I stressed to students that they should be forming a group that would be most helpful to them, which might not be their best friends. Some interesting and unexpected pairings materialized. One group was particularly memorable—Eve, Jackson, and Karen. Karen is very different from Eve and Jackson. In another project or even class, they would probably not be in the same group because they do not share similar interests. However, they were drawn together because they were all using Comic Life, and Eve and Jackson were observant enough to notice that Karen lacked experience with the app and took it upon themselves to form a group with her. Their feedback on Karen’s writing was constructive and well received. Encouraging students to group by tool allowed some students to take leadership roles, those who knew more about the tools than some of their peers. Anna, in particular, became my expert in Adobe Slate, an app that creates scrollable stories, a less complex version of “Snowfall.” At the time of this project, Adobe Slate was just released and instantly Anna became an expert in it, which not only allowed her to take ownership of her own project, but be a leader for her peers. Anna was eager to help, which cut down on the number of questions I needed to answer.

“The Sky’s the Limit”

First, I wanted students to feel comfortable breaking the rules. Early on in the unit, when students were asked to write a one-page memoir to practice dialogue writing, I presented them with information and general guidelines on how to write and format dialogue in narrative writing. After presenting “the rules,” I led a discussion on how
students could break those same rules, or make “stylistic decisions” so they could “mess with it a little bit” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). This mentality is also reflected on the rubric we co-constructed that I used to assess their projects.

Second, because students were comfortable using almost all of the apps downloaded throughout the year, if a student chose to use a tool they were unfamiliar with, he or she at least had the experience in testing out the app to figure out how to use it, which meant they became responsible for their own learning. Students experienced some anxiety with the open-ended nature of this project; and as a result, I found myself repeating to students, “The sky’s the limit.” and “Choose any tool.” (B. Campbell, personal communication, May 18, 2015). The first day students were asked to work on their remediated memoirs, I encouraged them to “mess around” -- a phrase I used frequently to describe the trial and error process of using their devices to learn --, and as a result, students experimented with a fair amount of apps before settling on the one(s) they would use.

Third, just as I did not place parameters on dialogue usage, I did not restrict students on the subject or medium of images they chose to use. In the past, when I have assigned multimodal projects with these students, typically, they have elected to use existing images from Google instead of using their own hand drawn images. Much to my surprise, students who used Comic Life chose to hand draw their pictures. Perhaps the personal nature of the remediated memoir is what motivated students to create their own images. In order to get students’ drawings into digital format, I used the copy machine to scan them as PDFs, used my laptop to export them as JPEG files, and emailed them to
students to save and use on their iPads. I suspect, however, there was a simpler, more efficient way to accomplish this, but this is the workflow I chose to use at the time.

**Crowdsourcing the Rubric**

Students were placed in stronger agentive roles throughout the whole remediated memoir unit; however, the co-construction of the rubric was the second most significant element of this project, with regard to a Multiliteracies pedagogy-- the first was the Statement of Goals and Choices. Knowing they would not simply earn a completion grade for this project motivated students to demonstrate genuine concern and provide keen insights and input into the rubric, where they might not otherwise have had the opportunity. I approached this with a general idea of what I expected from students’ projects, but also acknowledged that the rubric had limitations. Limitations my students helped me resolve. I wanted to know what the rubric was missing, what was unnecessary, and what needed to be changed for this to work. Truth be told, it was slightly uncomfortable as a teacher admitting I needed my students’ help, but students knew their projects inside and out more than I did. I admitted that I needed their input if this was going to be successful.

**Writing about Writing**

By this time in the school year, I was confident in my students’ ability to make decisions that would best fit their own writing process and product. I took that awareness further and required students to document and walk me through their decisions in the synaesthesia process in a reflection called the Statement of Goals and Choices (Shipka, 2011). I did this for two reasons. First, I wanted students to help me understand their choices. Oftentimes, with any communication, especially projects which require less than
familiar literacy practices, aspects of a piece become lost from what the author intends to its impact on the reader (or assessor in this case), a theme addressed in the next chapter. I planned to use this reflective writing as a point of reference for when I assessed the final products. If a color choice, transition, or omission of a detail was unclear to me, the Statement of Goals and Choices allowed me to seek better understanding of my students’ composition moves. Furthermore, with projects such as this, teachers must practice what Anne Wysocki (2004) calls “strategies for generous reading” where teachers acknowledge that texts can “look and function differently from those to which we are accustomed” and approach the assessment of such projects with “assumptions not that mistakes were made but that choices were made and are being tried out and on” (p. 23). This component has never been incorporated into any other multimodal project I have assigned before, and little research exists in this area, save for Shipka (2011).

Secondly, I believe, as Shipka (2011) does that it is imperative for students to be able to articulate their decisions in a piece and why they were made. Not only for me, the assessor, but for themselves, too. Just as Shipka (2011) states, it is important for students to “assume responsibility for describing, evaluating, and sharing with others the purposes and potentials of their work” (p. 112). By discussing (and assigning) the reflection in advance, I held students accountable for their work, forcing them to constantly make the connection between their identified purpose and the final product being designed-- instead of simply relying on default settings of the tools. Having had to write one myself, I knew I would have to effectively articulate what it is I wanted my piece to do, and document my process in getting there, which kept me focused on the end goal-- a cohesive piece that accomplished my purpose in a much different way.
Historically, teachers see themselves as the sole source of information in the classroom, and redistributing the decision making or “letting go” in the classroom does not occur naturally for all teachers. When the roles of both teacher and student are more balanced, each may find themselves in uncharted territory, which can cause a certain level of anxiety. In the beginning of the iPad Academy, I was uncomfortable giving up complete control of lesson design, instruction, and assessment; but I learned, albeit slowly, that my students are valuable assets to their own learning, and their abilities in this regard just need to be activated. I have also learned that anxiety in teaching and learning can be productive and a catalyst for change in the classroom. After integrating technology into my classroom, I have not only come to expect that productive anxiety, but now I even look forward to it. When I planned the remediated memoir unit, I was purposeful in its design by embedding more student choice, and required students to pay attention to their choices. And it felt relatively comfortable—sometimes even natural.
CHAPTER 5

HOW DO I OPERATIONALIZE TEACHING MULTIMODAL COMPOSITION?

In Chapter Four, I explored my planning and teaching moves as they led to a rebalancing of student agency. In this project, I also wanted to be aware of how I operationalized multimodal composition. To capture my specific teaching moves throughout the unit, not just in the planning stages, I composed a series of field notes detailing events and reflected on them as they connected to the objectives of the unit. Ideally, I would have liked to write every day, but wanted to be realistic about the amount of time I could feasibly devote to this, considering it was the end of the school year when grades were due. After conducting analysis using the same protocol as with the interview with Elizabeth, three themes emerged from the data.

Theme One: I create transparency by providing rationale of my teaching moves.

As I have advanced in my teaching career, more and more often I want students to see my decision making in action because, after all, my teaching moves directly affect them and their learning. In this unit, it was important for my students to understand why I was making certain instructional decisions and even decisions in my own writing. I came to realize that not only did my students benefit from an increased awareness of my thinking; but I became even more metacognitive in my approach to teaching.

At the beginning of every class, I spend time reviewing the objectives and agenda for the day’s lessons. On April 17, the fifteenth day of this unit, I briefly reviewed the daily agenda pointing out that I would be spending considerable time making sure
students understood what I was asking them to do with their original memoirs. I wanted to provide students an opportunity to *experience the new* (Kalantzis, Cope, and Cloonan, 2010) by sharing with them my own remediated teaching philosophy statement and two student examples from the past year. I rationalized with students that I was sharing my project with them because I wanted students to see and analyze the considerations I made while composing, but also to reassure them that I know what I am asking them to do—that I have done this before.

Before playing the video, I explained that while it was seven minutes long, the video was a truncated version of my written teaching philosophy. This was because I could not fit all of the original teaching philosophy into a video without making it too long and losing the audience’s attention as a result. Several students inquired about the amount of time I spent working on this—I suspect they were concerned they only had one week to compose theirs. I offered that I spent a few weeks working on the individual components and work shopping it with my peers and instruction. Finalizing the video took 10 straight hours to record, with a 10-minute break for lunch. I guessed that I had not yet quelled their anxiety because several students’ eyes widened and I heard a few audible gasps. Although this caused them to become anxious about their own compositions, I did not want them to be surprised at the amount of work their own projects would require.

After the brief introduction to my remediated teaching philosophy, we transitioned into analyzing it. I originally did not plan to show it. Truth be told, I actually forgot about it until that day. Initially, I was not concerned or nervous about showing my project, but as we progressed through the evaluation and more students offered critiques,
I remembered how frustrating it was to compose it without dwelling on the small things I would have rather edited but did not have to time to do. After that, I was a little self-conscious and ready to take it down off of my website; but I was still pleased that I did show it, and I felt satisfied with the resulting discussion. After showing my remediated teaching philosophy statement and the discussion that followed, I concluded that whatever anxiety I was feeling was worth the risk because it seemed to have alleviated some anxiety in my students.

The first critique centered on the beginning of the video. “‘The text moves really fast,’ Karen offered,” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015) which made it difficult to read. I responded by saying that by the time I realized the text in the beginning moved too quickly, it was hour nine of the ten hours it took me to record the video. Another student commented that the text in the beginning was blurry, also making it difficult to read. I responded by agreeing and explained this was another thing I had to let go. Harper commented that throughout the entire piece I spoke too quickly (a consistent and irreparable trait of mine); and I responded by saying this was the slowest version I had. Jacob commented that some slides of text repeated themselves, identifying them as an error; however, I informed him that the repetition was purposeful, and not a mistake. I offered to the class that I also felt that my vocal quality “came off as stiff and nervous and less conversational than I wanted” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). However, I offered some advice that I repeat throughout the school year, “‘I believe writing is never done, it’s just due. So I had to turn it in at some point.’ Karen smiled when I said this” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015).
Our final activity on this day consisted of reading and analyzing two student examples from the previous year. I explained that the copies they were looking at had my comments on them so they could see how I assessed the projects last year. I was careful to explain that their project needed to be quality projects, and it would not be assessed on a completion basis. I brought this up because I was disappointed in many of the projects turned in last year, and reflected that it was partly due to a lack of clear objectives and expectations. We began by looking at Alana’s piece-- a story about how her attitude about life and school transformed as a result of being introduced to graphic novels. Regarding this piece, Jackson said the pictures were good, and Jacob commented that he liked how she used her pictures to give a clearer picture of what is going on. Additionally, Karen commented that the piece jumps around, to which I replied that between her written memoir and her remediated memoir, “‘she lost a lot a lot of content, which contributed to her lack of cohesion’” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). Reagan said the student’s piece did not have much of a beginning, and she does not explain what she means by her opening statement. Finally, Austin offered that he did not really understand what the title meant, and Reagan added that the author does not address or refer to her title in her piece. In response to students’ critiques of this example, I admitted that I no longer thought this was an outstanding example. I wanted students to know I agreed with their comments, and that I would have assessed it differently this year having had this conversation and the experience from the previous year. Honestly, I was a little embarrassed I originally gave such high praise to this project, especially when my freshman students offered such insightful and thoughtful critique in only a short conversation. Despite my feelings of embarrassment, however, I was grateful for the
conversation because I knew it would not only help them understand how the piece would be assessed, but it would also remind me to rely on the rubric to guide my feedback and assessment.

In the second student example, students noticed that the author included her Statement of Goals and Choices on the actual memoir and asked what it was. I explained that it was a written piece they will write last that takes me through their thinking and decision making as they remediated their memoirs. Several students still looked perplexed by my explanation, so I continued by stating that I composed one myself for my remediated teaching philosophy statement which can be found on my website along with an abridged version on my blog. The Statement of Goals and Choices, I continued, was a bit of a challenge, “possibly more challenging and more important than the actual piece because it involves thinking about our thinking” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). I concluded this discussion by assuring students this would be the last piece of the project.

On April 28, the 22nd day of the unit, the class and I co-constructed the rubric I would to assess their final products. By this point, students were halfway through their work on their remediated memoirs. I decided to wait to discuss the rubric until they were already started with their projects so we could try to customize the rubric to their specific needs. I prefaced this activity stating that one challenge in assessing projects such as these is that the products are so varied and different from each other, and yet the assessment must be consistent. The goal of this activity, I offered, was to make the rubric specific enough for their individual projects, yet general enough to apply to everyone’s project. As a class we did not create the rubric from scratch, but rather used my rubric as
a starting point for discussions and revisions. Using the projector and my laptop, I displayed the initial rubric on the large screen in the front of the room so every student could see. As we discussed and decided upon additions, deletions, and revisions, I edited the document in Google Docs. It was important, I explained, for me to make clear what I expected from the products, but also for students to feel as if their products will be assessed fairly and accurately, which is why we were co-constructing the assessment tool.

We began by discussing the design section because this was where students would focus the most on, and where the expectations would need to be carefully phrased. Within the conversation on design, we discussed the use of color, text, font size and style, quantity and quality of visuals, voice, and the layout of multimodal components (such as video, audio, images, text). In particular, voice was discussed and revised. The original rubric stated “Use of volume is frequently individualistic, expressive, and engaging;” however Sage became confused by this bullet point and asked, “‘Are you talking about how you are saying it?’” (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). “‘I think I’m talking about voice, inflection.’” Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015), I replied after a moment’s pause. To make this requirement clearer, we revised it to read, “Use of audio voice is frequently individualistic, expressive, and engaging.” In this discussion I offered that I was trying to make sure students were avoiding monotone or didactic tones of voice, similar to my own tone in my remediated teaching philosophy statement. Additionally, I clarified that an audio component is not required, and this bullet point may not apply to all students’ projects.

Handwriting also came up. In past experiences, when students hand-wrote text, it was usually hastily completed and had a tendency to be visually unappealing. To preempt
this concern, I asked students if this is something I even needed to add. I was not sure if it would even apply to the students’ projects, but that I wanted students to “‘avoid having sloppy handwriting’” (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). It was decided that this could be addressed in the second bullet point that states, “Use of text/font, size/style, & placement is purposeful and meaningful.” However, Reagan suggested that in the design section I also address the importance of layout when writing comics. This never occurred to me until this moment as being a concern or consideration that I as the reader and assessor should pay attention to. Brenden added that Japanese comics are confusing to read because they are backwards, which we agreed could affect the reading of the text. Kate agreed saying, “If I’m reading your comic and I can’t understand it, it automatically turns me off.” Based on this transition in the conversation, we added, “Layout of various features is clear and easy to understand” as the final bullet point in the design section of the rubric.

The final rationale I provided during this activity involved how to address and discuss any discrepancies between what I expected and what the student composed that may arise, or any areas that were more nuanced and needed a disclaimer or further discussion. Several times throughout the remainder of the lesson, I commented that the Statement of Goals and Choices is “the place to explain choices that may not be clear to me” Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). I wanted students to know that the reflection is just as important, if not more important, than the final product. Because this was uncharted territory for us, the opportunity for students to rationalize their choices, just as I did in my teaching, is paramount to understanding intent and assessing its impact.
This series of rationales for the Statement of Goals and Choices began with a discussion on cliffhanger endings in a memoir. Johnathan asked about including a bullet point that allowed for a cliffhanger ending for stylistic purposes. Several students interjected that because a memoir is a past story, there should be some sort of resolution and a cliffhanger ending would not be fitting. Brielle disagreed by saying her memoir has a slight drop-off ending. Consequently, “We agreed as a class that we wouldn’t put this as a bullet point with the understanding that if there is a cliffhanger ending, the author should and will address it in the Statement of Goals and Choices” (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). Next, Harper asked if there should be a length requirement or maximum on the rubric. Harper was creating an iMovie and was concerned about her video meeting the requirements. “That would be difficult to do,” Kate interjected, ‘because there are so many projects one can do’” (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). Based on Kate’s feedback, I decided not to include a stipulation on length in the rubric, but said I’d include comments on length on their Statement of Goals and Choices because “‘length impacts your story’” (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015).

My mentioning the importance of reflection and the Statement of Goals and Choices may have seemed unnecessarily redundant, but I genuinely wanted students to understand the importance of reflection, especially in a piece very different from what they are accustomed to writing in English. I wanted to stress that the reflection was an opportunity to explain their thinking and composing moves, but also to address any obvious, or even obscure, discrepancies between what is expected and what is produced. I stressed, “‘You are communicating to me what you are trying to do, and when communicating [as in the remediated memoir], some things become lost, and so we must
reconcile those through your reflection and conversations’’ (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015). I then transitioned into addressing the assessment of the remediated memoirs by saying that students could talk (as in actually speaking) to me about these things, too. “‘It’s not me grading and you not being able to address my comments.’” “‘It’s more of a negotiation than a one-way grading thing’” I added (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015).

My students did not come to my class with all the literacies they needed, and was my responsibility to teach new literacies and reinforce old literacies. From my experience, I have come to understand that when asking students to experience the new, I need to make my teaching moves and instructional decisions as transparent as possible so students can understand the “why” of what I am asking them to do. Creating transparency helped me align my teaching with the curricular objectives. The thinking is: if I can explain it, then I know it. Although it seemed risky as I first started letting students see my thinking, not wanting to disrupt the teacher-student hierarchical long-established relationship; it repositioned me as more of a facilitator than keeper of knowledge, which in turn placed students in more agentive roles.

**Theme Two: I teach in response to my students and myself at work.**

Early on in the implementation of iPads into my classroom I noticed my lesson plans changing by the day, even by the minute. I interpreted this as responding to students through in-the-moment reflection and after the lesson. In the planning stages of this project, anticipating that I would be adapting my lessons as I went along, I loosely mapped out the unit, selecting certain days for certain lessons. As shown in Table 1 (also
in Chapter Three), I planned to address several concepts in the unit including the use of
dialogue and reflective standpoint, and analyze examples of past students’ remediated
memoirs. I was careful not to restrict myself to a lock-step schedule because I knew it
would inevitably change. There was one day in particular where before and in the middle
of a lesson I thought on my feet, shifted directions, and spontaneously added components.
Although I only discuss one day, this theme, unlike the first, consistently surfaced
throughout the entire unit. (I also recall it happening more than I was able to document in
field notes.)

On April 6, the sixth day of the unit, I planned for students to review study
questions for chapters one, three, and five of Night, discuss the preface of the 2006
translation, and participate in a discussion activity called Quaker Read. As homework,
students were to think of a memory from last year and be ready to write about it
tomorrow.

This was the first day back from Spring Break where I required students to read
the novel over break, and then take a test the day they returned. I did not even get through
the first day of lessons without changing the lesson plans. Before school started that day,
I decided to postpone the exam until tomorrow, and instead planned for us to review
specific questions from the study guide. The original purpose of testing students was to
ensure they completed the reading; however, after reflecting, I felt it was more important
to review the guide and discuss questions germane to the memoir project. This form of
assessment would, I concluded, would yield more reliable and authentic results while at
the same time connecting the text to the memoir project. The study questions focused on
select chapters because these sections had topics I wished to address with regard to
memoir writing. We did not review each question like I originally planned, only a handful that addressed writing elements and devices such as characterization, tone, reflective standpoint, and engaging the reader by creating suspense. While reviewing the study guide, we discussed at length what a reflective standpoint is and how Elie Wiesel, the author of Night, uses it to describe and relay an event while at the same time providing insight into its personal significance. With the passage of time, our perspective changes, I offered to students, and then all of a sudden I remembered the memoir I wrote for the Nebraska Writing Project the preceding summer, and mentioned it to my students. “I told students I would bring it in for them to read later this week” (Campbell, field notes, April 6, 2015). I was both energized by this sudden realization, and confused as to why, until this moment, I had not considered including it in the lessons. Despite this brief lapse in memory, I am pleased with the resulting discussion.

In the Future Action section of my field notes for this date, I wrote, “Bring in my own memoir. Possibly have an activity planned around the reading of it. It might be good for them [students] to examine what is good/needs work with it, too” (Campbell, field notes, April 6, 2015). The next day, students read and analyzed the reflective standpoint I used in my memoir “The Shirt and The Belt”; and after, I led a small group activity and whole class discussion on how and where Wiesel incorporates a reflective standpoint in his novel. During this lesson, when referring to my memoir, I heard one student say, “Wow, this is really good!” and another student say, “Does ours have to be this long?” Although these compliments served as a collateral benefit for me; more important was this seemingly insignificant epiphany in the middle of teaching led to a rich and
spontaneous learning opportunity for my students, helping me achieve my lesson objectives.

The third item on the Running Agenda was the Quaker Read, a reading and discussion strategy where students identify a personally significant passage and through discussion, the class connects the passages. Just as I did with the novel exam planned for this day, I omitted the Quaker Read because reviewing the questions pertaining to memoir writing was more important to ground or anchor memoir writing to the text. I added “If time...” before this item (anticipating the possibility that I may not get to it), and later added, “Didn’t get time to do this today. I probably will not do this activity” (Campbell, field notes, April 6, 2015).

In my undergraduate teaching courses, I was taught and reminded multiple times that teachers need to be flexible in the classroom. Lesson plans will change, not go the way we want them to, and may even crash and burn. What is important, I remember being told, is to respond and adapt, and accept that it will not always be perfect. The unexpected insertions and responses to my students made it easier to make my thinking more transparent, which resulted in more deep understanding for my students.

**Theme Three: I create opportunities for students to explore the relationship between intent and impact.**

One of the essential objectives of this project was to help concretize for students the relationship between an author’s purpose and its actual effect on the reader. In other words, I wanted students to be able to clearly see that if they want to achieve a desired outcome—especially multimodal compositions—then students as authors and composers
need to be purposeful in how they communicate texts and stories, rather than viewing communicating through multiple modes as a series of random choices made with shallow intentions. Just like an author of a novel uses words to achieve intent and purpose, composers of multimodal texts such as The New York Times’ “A Game of Shark and Minnow” and “Snowfall” use multiple modes to convey purpose. Choices the authors of these texts made were premeditated, and carefully planned and executed.

Two salient observations emerged from my field notes: students were able to identify in my writing and my former students’ a disconnect between what the author intended and the effect or impact it had on the reader, and moments where there was a successful connection between intent and impact.

**Disconnects**

When reading through my field notes for April 17, what surfaced again and again is a demonstration of how an author was actually unsuccessful at achieving what he or she intended. The critiques students offered of my remediated teaching philosophy particularly involved aspects of time and vocal quality. For instance, Harper commented that in my piece, I spoke very quickly. I did not intend for the piece to read as quickly as it did, but I responded by saying this was the slowest version I had (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). In many social situations, especially when I am in front of a group of people, I tend to speak quickly, always have; and it is just something I have yet been able to correct with much success. This prompted me to draw students’ attention to the many pauses and how I felt my voice came off as “didactic and monotone” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). I explained that I came off as stiff, nervous, and less conversational than I wanted. In order to ensure I included everything I wanted into my
statement, I read from a script, which I added, is the cause of my seemingly lifeless tone of voice. Oftentimes, I believe, we do not think about our voice as being instrumental in conveying meaning, and we end up sounding very different in a recording than what we think we actually sound like. In my piece, the way I said something was just as important as what I said, something I did not give much consideration to until now.

There was also a disconnect in my vocal quality, but with my visuals and my time management. Karen suggested the text in my video moved fast, and at times too fast to read completely. I explained by the time I realized the text (along with my narration) moved too quickly, I was nine hours into the final recording and compiling of the project, and I had to turn it in at some point (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). Additionally, because I recorded the iPad animation with my second iPad, the text, Reagan commented, was difficult to read. I agreed that the reader could not read the text, “which is another thing I had to let go” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). The two glaring disconnects between what I intended and the impact my piece had on the reader are a result of time constraints to complete the project, which I suspect my students experienced as well.

While these texts yielded good analysis, only one text, and our analysis, will be discussed here. When discussing Alana’s piece, Austin offered he “didn’t really understand the title [“My 180”]” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). Reagan added she “doesn’t address or refer to her title in her piece” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). While I understood the title as Alana intended-- to describe how graphic novels and drawing helped improve her disposition toward school and learning-- her peers did not. Perhaps this could have been an element she spent more time with considering her anticipated audience consists of people her own age. Furthermore, Alana’s piece
(according to Karen) jumps around-- meaning the storyline is not cohesive and clear. I explained, “Between her written memoir and her remediated memoir, she lost a lot of content, which contributed to her lack of cohesion” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). This idea was addressed when Jacob commented on Alana’s use of images stating that it gave “a more clear picture of what is going on” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). I believe Jacob was actually commenting on the quality of the images, which were intricately and expertly hand drawn, instead of their success in communicating large portions of the written memoir. Suspecting Jacob may have missed Karen’s point, I added that “when you create a more visual piece, the images have to be more impactful” to be successful in replacing text, “and the author has to be choosier” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015). Another contributing factor to the lack of cohesion and fluency in Alana’s piece is her placement of a reflective standpoint-- the part in the memoir where she addresses or speaks to the moment’s significance to her. I pointed out that Alana’s reflective standpoint is evident only at the beginning and end of her story, and not throughout the piece, making it more obvious and direct, “which contributes to the piece seeming choppy” (Campbell, field notes, April 17, 2015).

What is particularly compelling is the direction we as a class took with our discussion of the example remediated projects. Many, of the comments about them were negative critiques and little, if any, of the comments were positive. However, comments on “Snowfall” were all positive in nature with no negative comments. A discussion exploring this question will follow the upcoming section.

Connections
On April 21, I planned for students to analyze *The New York Times* and John Branch’s “Snowfall” using Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) multimodal analysis framework. This text is what fueled my interest in multimodal composition and new literacies and incorporating them into my English classroom, so I wanted to include it as part of this study. To begin using the framework, and the five design choices authors of multimodal pieces make, we first briefly practiced analyzing *New York Times*’ “A Game of Shark and Minnow,” which was published almost a year after “Snowfall”. Similar to what we would eventually do with “Snowfall”, the class identified the author’s use of organization, alignment, and proximity to tell his story. We only actually discussed alignment and proximity. I was going to save organization for last, but when we came to it, I felt we had already discussed elements of organization, and I was unsure how to proceed, so we moved on. Before that, however, we identified the author’s choices of alignment. Students identified textual elements as being justified to the left. When asked why, one student replied it was because the image is on the right. Austin added that having the text justified to the left “shows how we read, left to right” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). Reagan continued saying it would be “awkward if it were on the right” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). Although this piece is unique and very few like it exist, students felt the author continued to use traditional styles of alignment. With regard to proximity, we concluded as a class that the proximity between elements of the story were considerably noticeable, which helped the reader take time to experience each element (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). Here is where I took a moment to assure students that while it may seem like we are nitpicking this web text, this is the point of an
analysis, “we are paying attention to choices because it communicates something” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015).

Because we skipped organization with “A Game of Shark and Minnow”, we moved on to the next activity, which was to analyze “Snowfall” in small groups. Once students were in small groups and assigned a page of the online story, they were asked to discuss all three elements on their given page. Reagan’s group engaged in an insightful discussion, of which I chose to spend the majority of my time listening. Reagan’s group was given the page “Blur of White” and drew attention to the written text, saying it did not take up the entire web page, which made it seem “like an easier read, more enjoyable” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). I replied, “Margins are important” in achieving eye-appealing texts. Texts with smaller margins can have an overwhelming effect on readers, one that John Branch seems to have successfully avoided.

This group also addressed proximity by drawing attention to the gray text that appears and disappears on the right-hand side explaining the specifics of what was happening. I asked students, “Where are your eyes being asked to attend?” To which they replied, “Right where the text is”. Reagan and Morgan agreed that the short gray sentences “lets the reader know it is not as important” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). Continuing the group’s answer, Talia stated that the reader has the “choice to attend to the text, it’s secondary, helpful if needed” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). It seems, I offered, as if the designers of this text still want readers to attend to images first, “but readers are given more choice” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015) than with the simulations and videos on the same page. While the images were still larger than other elements, the videos were still kept relatively small. When asked why this
could be, Reagan observed that making the videos smaller than other elements “Does not detract from the text as much as videos will” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015).

The final component up for discussion was the audio files of Rob Castillo and Megan Michelson’s calls to 911 requesting help. Reagan identified the audio files as being right next to the dialogue of the two skiers’ calls for help, and this “helps the reader understand the emotions of the situation” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015).

Because we spent considerable time with Reagan’s group, we only had a few minutes to devote to another page, “Descend Begins”, with Jenna’s group. Jenna chose to bring her laptop with her to connect to the projector cart; she felt it would be easier to present having the text up on the screen. She began by stating that the body of the written text was aligned to the left. She then pointed out the pictures are bigger than the text (especially the banner of the skiers’ portraits at the top of the page). Making the images larger than the text “gently nudges the reader to them,” I added, unlike the simulations, which start automatically. “Descend Begins” is especially unique because there is a section where on the left is a written narrative of each skier group’s path down the mountain; and on the right is a visual simulation that, as the reader scrolls through the narrative, recreates the skier's path. The simulation is set to synchronize with the user’s scrolling movements. This unique feature prompted me to explain that they (the students) do not experience literature (fiction or non-fiction) like this in the classroom, especially with automated elements (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015), which is why we are taking the time to study this particular page. In the small group discussions, I had a chance to speak with another group who also experienced an automatic simulation (in “To the Peak” section) and felt they “had to watch the video once [without reading the
text], and then watch it a second time to pay attention to the written text” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). During small group discussions, this particular group who analyzed “To the Peak” mentioned that the simulation or video demonstrating the timeline and anatomy of the avalanche parallels a graphic novel or a movie with subtitles (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). The parallel lies within the experience-- the fact that the reader may need to reread, or re-view sections of the composition paying attention to one mode at a time in order to understand what is being said. This was not a literacy skill I had anticipated addressing with this multimodal composition, but one that seems very necessary to incorporate into instruction in the future.

As an extension of the lessons on April 21 (and the 22nd), I asked students to choose a website they visited often and take a screenshot of it using their iPads. Students were then to import the screenshot into another app called Thinglink, which allows students to make their “images come alive with private video, notes, or even music from YouTube” (“ThingLink,” 2015). Using ThingLink, students created an interactive image where they explored and analyzed the website designers’ use of Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) design elements (alignment, proximity, organization, emphasis, and contrast). From there, they shared this image with me via email so I could assess their level of understanding. ThingLink allows users to “communicate in new ways” (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). The objective of the assignment was for students to demonstrate they understood the concepts addressed in the lessons, and communicate in multimodal ways while doing so.

As the bell rang, the last thing I instructed students was to pay attention to the use of proximity in their websites, specifically the relationship it created with the other
components of the text. I asked them to pay attention to elements that occurred automatically, instead of having to click a button. “Because that means something,” I concluded (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). Upon reflection of this day’s lessons, I wrote in my field notes that “All elements are interrelated, so was it counterproductive to split them up with different lessons? [re: Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) design elements] (Campbell, field notes, April 21, 2015). I asked this because as we analyzed “Snowfall”, students connected their discussion and analysis of organization, proximity, and alignment to the other two elements, emphasis and contrast. It was almost as if we could not address the first three elements without touching on the last two. I was concerned about students experiencing cognitive overload with these newer concepts, which is why I split the elements in two days’ worth of lessons. In the future, I would most likely combine the elements into one day. If I want students to pay attention to the relationships between elements, and author’s intent and impact, a comprehensive study of all five elements may be a more effective way to approach this.

**Conclusion**

I was impressed with my students’ ability to identify and articulate the rhetorical and design choices in several examples, and explore the relationship between these choices and the effect it was intended to (and did) have on the reader. In Chapter Six, I explore this relationship focusing on my students’ understanding of the relationship they created in their memoirs and articulated in their Statement of Goals and Choices.

One aspect left to explore is why did we give positive feedback to the writers of “A Game of Shark and Minnow” and “Snowfall”, but not to ourselves? Is it because they are professional writers (with several editors) who already know how to achieve their
desired impact on readers? Most likely. Is it also because we are inexperienced multimodal composers (without several editors)? That, too, is likely. However, given the access my students had to technology, and their experience with communicating multimodally thus far just in my classroom, not even including what they did in their own free time, a more accurate conclusion is that it is not a lack of experience per se, but a lack of exposure to instruction and direct attention being paid to multimodal composition in the English classroom. Traditional print literacy is still predominant, and in many curricula, the sole literacy taught in kindergarten through twelfth grade. With more direct approaches and intentional inclusion into curriculum, students will become more proficient and competent multimodal composers. This will be, and is (as I have experienced) a challenge to fit into the already packed curriculum teachers are charged with enacting.
CHAPTER 6

HOW DO STUDENTS MAKE SENSE OF COMPOSING MULTIMODALLY?

Studying and reflecting on my own practice has proven valuable and yielded edifying discoveries, but it was equally important for me to understand how students experienced and interpreted their own multimodal composition processes. In order to effectively enact a Multiliteracies pedagogy, I needed their perspective as well. To see their thinking, I looked to their Statements of Goals and Choices and their remediated memoirs. Three themes emerged from the data: Productive Anxiety and Disabling Anxiety, Intent Gap, and Wishes and Apologies.

Productive Anxiety and Disabling Anxiety

Even as many students were excitedly planning their storyboards, a handful of students, it seems, were not as enthusiastic about the intellectual endeavor that lay ahead. Despite my excitement and anticipation for executing multimodal composition, my extensive experience in technology integration cautioned me to expect that some students would be less than enthusiastic. I witnessed one student struggle in real-time and was able to intervene periodically, and another student struggled unbeknownst to me. In their Statement of Goals and Choices and through discussions in class, several students expressed anxiety and uncertainty on how to begin and how to proceed with the project, yet they differed in their response to the stress. Some described their anxiety as being productive in helping them achieve their composition goals and takeaways from the project, and some describe their anxiety as near paralyzing.
Intent Gap

Part of the stress students reported could be the result of the considerable time I spent impressing upon students the significance in considering their own intentions and the impact those intentions will have on their reader(s). As part of this project, students analyzed two multimodal compositions, “A Game of Shark and Minnow” and “Snowfall” paying attention to how rhetorical and design choices affected them as readers. I was confident many students came to understand this relationship. I am not sure, however, that all students understood it. The gap between what students wanted their pieces to do and the actual effect it had varies from student to student-- some were more successful in this area than others.

Wishes and Apologies

Many students expressed regrets and wishes for their projects, so much so that I found they were apologizing for their work. Specific regrets and wishes are rooted in the perception that not enough time was provided to complete the project. I was not surprised by what students identified in their Statement of Goals Choices. Having done this myself, I expressed the same concerns for my own project-- a lack of time (both allocated from the instructor and my own lack of time management). After analyzing Statements of Goals and Choices, I still questioned: Did I give them enough time, or did they procrastinate? Or both?
Harper was a highly involved and motivated student in English. I very much enjoyed having her in class. Her remediated memoir is a story from when she was three years old and let Emily, her four-year-old best friend and neighbor, cut her hair. She titled it “the no good, very bad afternoon.” Harper used a total of six apps to create her video, using iMovie to assemble all of the pieces.

From the beginning of this project, Harper expressed apprehension and even anxiety about making her remediated memoir worthy. To say she was stressed would be an understatement. Usually social and willing to help others in class, Harper became reclusive and fell behind in her project. It took Harper much longer than her peers to complete her storyboard and her final video. In her Statement of Goals and Choices, she reported that she did not start working on her storyboard until Tuesday (the second day) and did not finish it until Friday (p. 3), while all of her peers completed their storyboards by Wednesday. I became worried at her lack of progress in starting her remediation because her behavior was atypical. I remember asking her several times after the storyboard was due to see it. Even during the remediation process, I remember thinking: *She must not be working on this at home. If she was, it would have been done on time.* I decided not to push her too hard and see how she fared on her own. Since she was a highly motivated student, I gave her some space to challenge herself. Harper typically performed exceptionally well and with confidence when the format and process is routine.
and comfortable to her. Yet when I gave her an unlimited number of options and paths, it paralyzed her.

*Productive and Disabling Anxiety*

While students were participating in peer reviews, providing feedback and pushing each other to see their projects in new ways, Harper was out in the hallway or in the journalism room using a computer to work on her iMovie. She was not at a place where she was ready to show her memoir to others. This is highly unusual for Harper— it was natural for her to share her work with others, and let me use it as an example for the rest of the class. However, this was an unfamiliar type of composing and she was feeling insecure about her work and wanted it to be perfect. She reports in her Statement of Goals and Choices, “My finished product will never officially be completed. There is always something I can do better or add to a project like this” (Harper, May 2015, p. 1). I think she was aiming for perfection, but according to her reflection, perfection does not seem to be attainable. This desire for what she thinks is perfection is not unique, however. This is an experience all too familiar to me. I know how easy it can be to get caught up in details, revising, and re-recording to get the multimodal ensemble to a point where I am not embarrassed to show it to others. I am not sure I am there with my remediated teaching philosophy yet, however. Showing it to my students made my insecurities resurface. Perhaps Harper was like me, having no definition of perfection, only the absence of a threat of embarrassment. In my own Statement of Goals and Choices, I articulated (and relayed that knowledge to my students), that at some point, you have to stop revising and just turn the project in. From very early on, I observed Harper’s issue regarding time. It took her considerable time to move past the planning
stage and into the creation stage. “The process and planning it took to complete the remediated memoir was exceptionally lengthy. It involved a lot of precision, along with using my time wisely and responsibly” Harper writes in her Statement of Goals and Choices (May 2015, p. 1). However, she self-reports her lack of time management, “Even though I wasn’t always on task when I had to be, I did get the job done. It honestly was frustrating and I didn’t hold myself accountable” (p. 1). On the outset, I interpreted Harper’s anxiety as being debilitating, but in analyzing her final video, her anxiety seems to have been a productive catalyst. Yes, it did take her longer to finish, but she also had more moving parts than any other student in the class.

After reading her Statement of Goals and Choices, her lack of swift progress in the remediation process might not only be because she lacked time management, but the intricacy of her project. Out of all my students, Harper used the largest number of tools, and in intensely creative ways. Relative to her peers, it may seem as if she lacked time management, but from my perspective her project just required more time than other students. If I had set aside more time for the composing process, it is probable that Harper would have experienced less anxiety, and felt more confident throughout the whole process.

Apologies

In addition to self-reporting her issues with time, she apologizes for her work admitting, “There is always something I can do to [make it] better or add to a project like this” and “Although, it may not be to its full potential I feel that it [‘] s enough to show my story (p. 3). I believe Harper apologized for her work because she feels she did not do as well as she expected. Multimodal composition was clearly foreign to her and perhaps
she assumed I would mention her lack of management with her final piece. Harper’s apologies could be defensive pessimism-- a preemptive strike-- if she acknowledged her piece’s inadequacies, it allowed her to save face. I can thoroughly empathize with this. Sharing our work, especially personal stories, is difficult and makes us vulnerable, and a natural reaction, in my case anyway, is to make apologies for what it lacks. When I spontaneously shared my memoir and asked students to critique it, I began the lesson by first highlighting what I thought were the text’s inadequacies. My students were the ones that caught me apologizing before I recognized it myself.

**Jacob**

Jacob was a student who struggled in advanced English all year long. Less mature than his peers, he frequently played games on his iPad instead of listening, participating, or working in class. Early on in the school year, I observed this behavior and made it a point to notice and monitor his behavior in class to ensure he was on task, and as the school year progressed, I withdrew this intervention. By doing this, I was trying to point out to Jacob, and his parents, that because he did not pay attention in class, finished tasks almost automatically, and did not reflect on whether he met the expectations of the assignment, he missed the point of most lessons. He did not demonstrate he learned what he should have when he is clearly capable. I hypothesized that he was recommended for advanced English, rather than a general English course, because his good behavior and manners were confused with academic achievement. Throughout the school year, Jacob consistently scored a C or below on most projects, especially when it involved writing. His performance in this unit was no different. Using the same approach to tasks in ninth
grade as I imagine he did in middle school, he frequently finished tasks, large or small, much quicker than his peers, and rarely considered my feedback in his revisions. Going into this project, I knew it would be a challenge for him; but most likely, he would not and did not use this new medium to perform better.

**Intent Gap**

A sizeable gap-- canyon, really-- existed between what Jacob wanted his piece to accomplish, and what it actually did, which is exactly what I addressed with him on a previous project five months prior to the remediated memoir project. As a practice, exploratory project in preparation for this one, I asked students to create a literary analysis video analyzing *The Book Thief*. I required several components be included and stressed the importance of quality and having a clear purpose for design decisions. Jacob recorded a rather lengthy video of himself reading his literary analysis graphic organizer as if it were a script, instead of visually representing each piece of the graphic organizer as articulated in the assignment’s requirements. I provided extensive feedback compelling Jacob to see the relationship between what he was intending (or even what the assignment required) and what he actually produced. The gap between intent and impact was deeply concerning because it means he missed the point of the assignment.

In May when Jacob turned in his remediated memoir it was a seven minute video of himself reading his original written memoir, the one he threw “together in 30 seconds” (Jacob, May 2015, p. 1). In his Statement of Goals and Choices, he wrote that he created a video of himself reading his memoir so readers could hear the author’s voice, making it a more authentic experience. What is problematic, however, is that Jacob did not revise his original memoir, despite detailed feedback and pressure from his parents to do better.
Second, he recorded the video in his family's car; the scenery, camera angle, nor any other visual features, do not change throughout the entire video. While Jacob was trying to achieve this authentic experience for his reader, his execution entirely missed his intentions, and in turn distracted his reader from the story. Because I intervened in January with *The Book Thief* project and with the written memoir, I believed Jacob should have composed a much more effective and creative remediated memoir. Perhaps Jacob either simply did not understand how to proceed with his remediated memoir, or he did not feel compelled to put forth any more effort than he already had. If I have a student like Jacob in the future, I would spend more time trying to understand his motives for how he approaches projects such as these. If the issue was a genuine lack of understanding, a one-on-one lesson demonstrating how an author can successfully achieve his or her intentions, along with non-examples, may benefit a student like Jacob.

**Brielle**

Brielle was gifted academic writer; she always performed well on essays assigned in class. She also enjoyed writing for pleasure including keeping a personal journal, writing poetry, and short fictional stories. I was never privy to her personal writing she did outside of class, but often observed her writing these pieces in my class. Knowing she was a great writer for me in English, I was excited to see her remediated memoir, expecting her to do equally well. Reading her Statement of Goals and Choices (before watching her memoir),
I could tell Brielle cared about her project, took her time, and really enjoyed the project. After watching her video, I noticed several disconnects between her perception of her composition process and my own perception of it.

Brielle’s remediated memoir took the form similar to a silent movie about when her younger brother joined the family and her unenthused childish reaction. She hand drew her pictures and dialogue then inserted each image on separate slides in Explain Everything. This app allowed her to export her project as a video; however, when she recorded each slide in Explain Everything, she did so in her math teacher’s classroom and forgot to mute the sound. In the background her teacher and fellow classmate’s voices can clearly be heard.

*Productive Anxiety*

Admitting this task was entirely foreign to her; she embraced it viewing it as a new challenge, something to be conquered. She writes, “At first the task felt impossible, but somehow I managed to complete the project up until this point” (May 2015, p. 1). When she came up with idea for her traditional memoir, her “fingers were flying across” her keyboard (p. 1). She turned it in with confidence and “a great big pat on the back” (p. 1), until I threw a curveball at her-- the remediated memoir. Brielle spent a few days to figure a plan for how she would remediate her memoir into her final project. This was typical for Brielle-- to take an extra day or two thinking and brainstorming. I was not worried about her lack of progress like I was with Harper’s. Her anxiety did not last, however. Eventually, she arrived at her plan to create a video comic using her own hand drawn images and Explain Everything. She concludes her Statement of Goals and Choices by reflecting, “This whole process was a great experience and probably one of
the most in depth one I have ever done” (p. 3). Reading that final statement, I could not have been more satisfied, until I actually saw her final project.

Intent Gap

Identical to Jacob, there was a wide gap between what Brielle intended for her piece and what she actually produced. Her goal for her remediated memoir was not to “unlock some deep and philosophical questions about the true nature of sibling rivalry…” but to give me “a laugh between projects” (Brielle, May 2015, p. 2). She did not want to take herself too seriously, she writes (p. 1). I wish she would have taken herself, and this project, more seriously. Her silent movie contained no narration or background music, but the sounds of her math teacher and fellow classmate’s voices. I did not understand why she left the background audio in the video. It clearly was a decision that lacked purpose and connection to her story, and completely distracts the reader from what should be the focus of the video, her story. I can only conclude that she either knew of the issue with the audio and did nothing to remedy it, or she was not aware because she did not watch her video before submitting it. With either scenario, her remediated memoir and Statement of Goals and Choices demonstrates a disconnect between her intent and its impact on the reader, and shows a lack of understanding of the importance of this relationship.

Wishes and Apologies

Brielle does not express any wishes for her project, nor does she apologize for any of her choices. I do not expect students to apologize for their work (the opposite, in fact), but would have liked her to speak to any challenges she had composing her piece. Brielle is a very competent writer of traditional texts, which may have contributed to her
elevated confidence in her remediated piece. Multimodal composition is a very different experience than writing traditional monomodal texts. From this experience, I have learned that students who are confident and competent in traditional writing may still struggle with multimodal composition. Strength in one literacy does not necessarily transfer into another-- Multiliteracies, in this case. Brielle was absent for two days the week students were working on their remediated memoirs and participating in peer revision groups. While she was in class, she did not ask for help, and denied she needed any when I offered. Had she participated in a peer revision group, I firmly believe her peers would have given her the same feedback I gave her on her final product-- that her recording was more distracting than helpful in achieving her desired purpose. Should I have a student similar to Brielle in the future, I will be more firm about checking on progress, regardless if they deny my help or not.

Joslyn

Joslyn was a quiet, reserved student who completed most of her work in English with acceptable quality. She generally earned Bs on most assignments and tests, but she could have easily earned As. There were times where she would allow her upbeat, goofy personality to appear through her guarded exterior; but for the most part, she saved it for her few close friends in class. Even though she was a capable student, she allowed her lack of confidence to hold her back in all of her classes, and this project was no different. Joslyn rarely asked questions, and instead asked her neighbors. Although I encouraged this behavior in my class, I wished she would have let me know when she needed clarification. Even though I observed Joslyn asking her neighbors questions, which I
interpreted as a sign her needs were being met and was getting the clarification she needed, I still went over to her desk to check up on her and offer my help. Each time I did this, she declined, so I assumed she had a grasp for the project. Or did I just not notice that she needed help? If this is the case, I wonder if this is because she was fulfilling my already established expectations for how she would perform; she did not disrupt my expectations like Harper did, which could be why I was more involved with Harper’s progress than Joslyn’s.

I suppose my classroom is organized in a very different way than what she is accustomed to. The desks in my classroom are organized into two semicircles to encourage conversation and collaboration in the classroom, which also means that without rows, it is difficult to blend in and hide behind other students—something I imagine Joslyn has appreciated in her previous classes. What I did not anticipate, however, is how a student can hide in plain sight by relying on neighbors for assistance, or at least giving the appearance of doing so. Joslyn chose to write about her decision to play percussion in the fifth grade, the remarkable year in a few surrounding districts when you choose your musical fate. While this moment may have been significant to Joslyn, the way she represented it gave it a lackluster feel making it particularly underwhelming. Joslyn could have been conflicted with her feelings about the band director’s comments subscribing her to a stereotype. Joslyn was undecided on which instrument to play, and the band director

Figure 3: “Why I Started Percussion”
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suggested she play percussion because “Red heads are normally good at percussion because it’s about hitting things and keeping beat. They’re feisty so they are normally good at hitting” (Josylyn, 2015, p. 7) I think the real story here is her band director’s comments and how she went with his suggestion. In her piece, she essentially fails at answering her own question: Why did I start percussion? Perhaps if I had noticed this in the moment, I could have coached her into reflecting on this event and to find the real story lying within this event.

_Disabling Anxiety_

Despite her reserved nature and occasional failure to complete outside work, she was still very capable of producing a quality memoir, one that could be shown to future students as an example. This is why her final project utterly confounded me. Why would she think using stick figures is justifiable when I provided extensive instruction, examples and analyses, and what I thought was plenty of work time? Initially, I thought her explanation was a lame attempt at justifying her laziness; but now, I am not so sure. Instead of being lazy or apathetic, perhaps she was pushing back against the assignment. Early in her Statement of Goals and Choices, she writes, “I wasn’t excited to start this project because I knew it was going to be a difficult process” (Joslyn, May 2015, p. 1). From the outset, Joslyn let her apprehension rule her composition process and restrict her from putting forth much effort into the final project. Later on, she wrote, “This project was a [lot] more challenging one that made you really think. Getting it perfect to the way you want it isn’t the easiest thing to do” (p. 3). I agree perfection is obviously not easy, impossible really; but I would argue that Joslyn did not attempt to strive for even an average demonstration of understanding of what it means to write and design a
multimodal memoir. Despite the level of difficulty in this project, and considering Joslyn’s potential, she should have performed much better.

Furthermore, Joslyn’s remediated memoir exhibits her lack of experience and a certain level of discomfort with this type of project. Students have very few, if any, experiences with multimodal composition, and when doing these types of projects, students are met with obstacles which causes anxiety and uncertainty. This could be Joslyn’s way of resisting the assignment as an act of self-preservation or an inability to rationalize her composition process. Having experienced and participated in multimodal composition, I can identify with the discomfort and inclination to apologize for my work, especially when I am feeling particularly vulnerable and exposed, or find myself in uncharted territory.

*Intent Gap*

“I used stick figures instead of drawing out an entire person because I wanted this to show that you don’t need to be an artist or have an artist to write a book” (Joslyn, May 2015, p. 1). *You may not need to be one to write a book, but it is certainly required to publish one, or even earn a decent grade on this assignment* I thought incredulously to myself as I assessed Joslyn’s eBook. Joslyn’s remediated memoir exhibits a prototypical disconnect between intent and impact. She says she decided to use stick figures to make it a more accessible text to a younger audience. I would argue, however, that many, if not all, children’s books include exceptionally appealing illustrations drawn by gifted artists and do not include stick figures. So is this a case where Joslyn did not understand the impact her intentions would have on her reader? Did she not understand that her stick figures would distract and disengage, even turn off her readers? Did she not pay attention
when we explored this relationship in the previous lessons? She did pay attention to the lessons, I remember. She also understood the impact stick figures would have on her piece and her reader. As a result, I choose to acknowledge this for what it is--resistance. Resistance to the assignment, and also resistance perhaps to being in high school. To many high school-aged students, especially freshmen, being different and excelling beyond peers is undesirable, and blending in is the objective. This describes Joslyn’s behavior in all of her classes, and is seen in her lifeless, lukewarm memoir. She did just barely enough so as not to draw attention to herself as being inadequate or outstanding. If apathy or fear of being noticed are the cause for tepid work such as Joslyn’s, then I am not sure I would change my lessons or approach to her, aside from insisting she accept my help regardless if she requests it.

Can Anxiety Be Productive?

Harper, Brielle, and Joslyn experienced varying levels of anxiety, some observable in the moment, some not until at the very end of the unit; and some more debilitating than others. Despite its disabling capabilities, anxiety can still be a productive catalyst in the writing process. Something I frequently tell my students is, “If you are not uncomfortable with the material, even a little, then you aren’t learning; you are just reviewing.” It is in the area between the familiar and the unfamiliar that learning happens, and students need to be told that it is okay to feel nervous or unsure about what they are learning. It means they are really thinking about what their writing moves. Moreover, while anxiety can be productive in the classroom, it is also something teachers need to be cognizant of and be ready to respond to each student accordingly and appropriately. I
knew pushing Harper to move faster and putting pressure on her about the due dates would have had the opposite effect on her motivation, so I allowed her a little more leeway because I trusted her knowing she cared about the project enough to spend considerable more time on it. She did not just want to finish it, she wanted it to be good, which I cannot fault her for. Previously, with traditional writing projects, students have not been required to put much cognitive effort into their composition moves; it was a simpler time. Students have been operating on autopilot, relying on their default settings; and when faced with multimodal composition, few can just glide through. Not all students who expressed anxiety or apprehension became disabled by it like Harper or Joslyn, however.

Another student, Haley (who I will only briefly mention here) experienced anxiety that was productive in that it caused her see herself as a writer who makes choices and can effectively communicate multimodally; and she was successful at it. Setting herself apart from Joslyn and Harper and embracing a growth mindset, she writes, “Remediating a memoir is not easy, but this project has completely changed the way I look at projects and assignments… Now, I’ve learned how to analyze and create projects and assignments in a way that improves the project’s… appeal” (p. 3). Others, I wish would have experienced productive anxiety. Jacob never expressed a concern for this type of composing, which was a red flag for me. He already struggled with writing traditional academic and narrative texts, and I knew he would need to spend considerable more time and energy on his project than others. Perhaps a little anxiety and feelings of uncertainty could have been a catalyst to improve.

Intent Gap
Several students’ objectives for their pieces went unfulfilled. Additionally, many students were successful at achieving their desired impact, or even articulating it in the Statement of Goals and Choices; but it is the tenuous unsuccessful cases that I found most compelling. As compelling as they are, it is still my mission to help students see how their rhetorical and design choices are integral to achieving their purpose in multimodal texts. The more I conduct this unit, the more examples I will have to show future students what good examples look like, both remediated texts and the Statement of Goals and Choices. I wish I would have had better examples than the two I provided for this group of students, and also spent more time demonstrating successful and failed attempts in this regard. For both students and teachers alike, experience and practice will be crucial to integrating multimodal composition and metacognitive tasks into the traditional English classroom.

**Wishes and Apologies**

Many students expressed issues with the time allotted to them for their remediated texts. They were given a week of in-class time and access to their peers for feedback. I stressed the importance of working on this at home as well-- that it would (and should) take them more than the five fifty-minute class periods to complete. One possibility is that these students did not use their time wisely and lacked time management, like Harper admits. Multimodal composition requires much more time for planning and designing than traditional writing. It is more intensive. The remediated memoir project pushed on the creative process, which did not allow them to be indifferent and procrastinate, as Joslyn and Jacob’s memoirs reveal. Another possibility is that I really did not give them enough time in class to design and execute their remediated texts. I wonder, however, if I
had given them more time, would the products of certain students have been better?

Would other students have been more satisfied and apologized less?

I believe I understand why students invalidated their work. On the contrary, I still wonder why some students, such as Jacob or Brielle, did not. I could have given them an excuse not to see their writing through a critical lens. Throughout that week of designing and revising, to alleviate certain student’s uncertainty, I advised that they may become fixated on perfection, in which case, they needed to remember that their pieces may never be done, just due. I wonder if by saying this, I actually gave them an excuse not to think critically of themselves as writers, and write about it. Another explanation, one more concerning, is students were unable to recognize their own piece’s flaws and faults and articulate them in the Statement of Goals and Choices. Multimodal composition, and metacognitive writing such as the Statement of Goals and Choices, are not seen in the district’s English curricula, meaning my students were vastly inexperienced in either literacy task in an academic setting. It is likely, even, that my students have never been given the opportunity, nor been required to pay attention to their composition moves, let alone articulate and defend them. Moreover, it is typical, myself included, for teachers to become confused as to how to assess such projects, so more often than not, students receive completion grades, despite the quality of work produced. Therefore, they may not have had the background knowledge to even recognize deficiencies in their work.

Looking Ahead

When I do this project again, I might hold interviews with the students in person, instead of just requiring the Statement of Goals and Choices to be written. If I planned on assessing the projects after the interview, and not during, I would probably even record
the interviews. During the interview, students could walk me through their piece, giving me the opportunity to engage with the student surrounding their text and allow me to ask follow-up questions for clarification. One of the purposes of the Statement of Goals and Choices was for me to be able to see their thinking; but if it is not written well, as was the case with several, then it becomes difficult to assess and analyze the projects themselves. Even though the Statement of Goals and Choices was very illuminating, I was still left with a lot of questions. This is because students articulated their composition moves in writing, something they had not yet been asked to do, about a project foreign to them. It can be quite difficult, as I have experienced, to articulate those moves, especially if you are not sure about them yet. For this reason, I would still require the reflection writing because this type of metacognitive meta-writing, while challenging, helps make the unfamiliar familiar.
CHAPTER 7

HOW DO STUDENTS MAKE SENSE OF THEIR RHETORICAL
AND DESIGN CHOICES?

Introduction

The most illuminating text in this project has been the Statement of Goals and Choices, allowing me to arrive at an understanding of how students make sense of their own composition moves. Never before have I had opportunity to picture a student’s decision making in the writing process as he or she makes sense of them. Each of the students discussed in the next two chapters offered insights into my own teaching and allowed me reflect and better understand myself as a teacher. As the main objective of this project, I wanted students to see themselves as active meaning makers who carefully considered their choices as being instrumental in achieving their intentions. Before students began remediating their own memoirs, I paid careful attention making sure students had enough exposure and experience investigating the link between an author’s rhetorical and design moves in attempts to achieve a desired effect. As a class, we examined Elie Wiesel’s Night for use of dialogue and reflective standpoint while considering how Wiesel’s choices helped him achieve an authentic retelling of his hellish nightmare imprisoned in several concentration camps across Europe. We did the same for my own memoir. Knowing that students needed experience with analyzing rhetorical and design choices in multimodal texts, I designed lessons around “Snow Fall” and “A Game of Shark and Minnow”, with an application assessment using their favorite, most visited website and the app ThingLink. My goal was to give students as much exposure and
practice with exploring this relationship as possible in the finite amount of time to complete the unit. From what I documented in my field notes (April 17, 20, and 21), I was impressed with the level of participation and the depth of students’ comments and how they were careful to use the rhetorical and design elements from the framework in their discussions.

In their Statements of Goals and Choices, many students demonstrated genuine consideration for the relationship between what effect they intended to create and the choices they made to execute these intentions. Author’s purpose and audience were consistently addressed throughout the students’ reflections. Most significant to their understanding of their composition moves, however, is a consideration for how the genre of their remediated memoirs, the layout and organization of components, and the use of color can be leveraged to achieve a desired effect. Analysis answering the previous research question addressed the gap between students’ purpose and the product. However, it only serves as a preamble to a more in-depth analysis of students’ specific choices. In this section, I argue that students can articulate a definitive link between intent and impact; specifically, how considerations for genre, layout, and color choices aide in achieving a desired effect. The degree of success was not as consistent, however, which I explore as well.

**Reagan**

Reagan seemed to have enjoyed this entire unit. She was not exceptionally motivated in English. Generally, she did just enough to earn a C or sometimes higher, although I thought she was capable of much more. A major contributor to our analysis of
“Snow Fall” and “A Game of Shark and Minnow”, I remember being surprised and excited she found something that motivated her. Reagan chose to tell the story of when she tripped and hit her eyebrow on a glass table, requiring 14 stitches, hence the title of her piece: “My Fourteen Stitches.” Having required stitches for the first time in my life—after slicing the tip of my thumb with a paper cutter on the third day of school—and enduring three stitches and more Lidocaine shots than anyone need endure, I can now empathize with the confusion, and more importantly, the pain, that accompanies getting stitches. At least I was 32 years old when I sustained my injury, and not a child-like Reagan. Although she chose to omit the gory details of her injury, my own experience helped me imagine the amount of blood she must have shed if she required 14 stitches, on her head, nonetheless.

In her Statement of Goals and Choices, Reagan demonstrates an understanding of how her rhetorical and design choices can be used and manipulated to serve her desired purpose. Also, she was able to clearly articulate these decisions, which made assessing her piece nearly effortless. I did not spend class time this year teaching students how to read, write, or even analyze graphic novels, which led me to believe her own interest in reading this genre is perhaps what contributed to her investment and success in this project. Also, the open-ended format of this assignment seemed to allow Reagan to perform much better than on standard assignments. Giving Reagan choice of genre and format changed her motivation. After reading and analyzing her Statement of Goals and Choices, I can say that Reagan paid relatively equal attention to her choices with regard to genre, layout, and color. A complex understanding of genre in Reagan is evident
throughout the entire unit, and is addressed in previous research questions, but also deserves some attention here.

**Genre**

Early in this unit, before the synaesthesia of her written memoir, Reagan demonstrated a thorough understanding of genre. When we analyzed *The New York Times’* “Snow Fall” for its rhetorical and design elements, out of all the students in my class, Reagan participated the most, connecting the genre—a nonfiction retelling in the form of a web text—to various elements of the text, including organization and layout, and the use of color. Her final remediated memoir and Statement of Goals and Choices is no different, demonstrating that same solid understanding of genre.

Like many of her peers who used Comic Life, Reagan chose to hand draw her images, making them appear more like an artist’s sketches, rather than use already produced images from the internet. Rationalizing this decision, she writes, “I could’ve gotten stock pictures…, but I think that the situation that I was writing about was too specific for a series of stock photos…” (Reagan, May 2015, p. 1). She also used a variety of...
perspectives in her drawings including close-ups and low-level angles, and a variety of panel sizes.

Reagan understood, as well, that parts of her original memoir would inevitably change in the synaesthesia process. Specifically, because she chose to compose a comic book, she felt her ending needed to change. Expressing her wishes for her project, she writes,

The decision to end my story where it did was another difficult one. I wanted to illustrate more if [sic] the aftermath, the fact that I couldn’t run during recess for a month, and the cool looks I got from my classmates when I walked in with stitches, but I realized there was no easy stopping point once I got off onto that tangent (Reagan, May 2015, p. 3).

I interpreted this to mean she was worried that additional smaller narratives would distract the reader from the main story in her memoir. Her decision to remove the shorter “tangents” as she calls them, was a thoughtful choice. Perhaps, even, Reagan was considering my instruction that memoirs are focused moments in our lives, and, therefore, should be manageable in size and details. In the past when I have required narrative writing, several students were more inclined to choose stories that span large segments
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of time, which can cause students to recount memories in a way that lacks depth and specificity. Instead of keeping her original ending, she reflects that “I[t] was much more simple to end with rules since I started with rules; brushing my teeth every night before I got to bed” (p. 3), which also demonstrates an understanding of the importance of closure in a story, regardless of medium.

For the majority of her remediated memoir, Reagan used voice overs, rectangular boxes at the bottom of some panels, however, twice she specifically used voice overs to convey a reflective standpoint. The first instance is when she is frustrated at having to stay awake due to a possible concussion. In this example, she is successful at connecting the reflective voice over to her younger self’s thoughts. Here, I was confident in Reagan’s understanding of how to write in this genre. However, I was not as confident in how she chose to conclude it—by reflecting back on this memory. It was common—natural, even— for students to use a reflective standpoint as a form of conclusion or resolution of their traditionally written memoirs—something I even did in my own memoir. Using reflection as a way to conclude a memoir in Comic Life, or any other tool, is not erroneous by any means; however, the length of the text and the design of the

Figure 8: Reflective Standpoint 1
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panel seems out of place for a comic book. This particular panel is a splash, or a panel
that spans the width of the page, and the margins are small, emphasizing the voice over
box making it much larger than any other text in the memoir. While she addresses her
choice in changing the content of the ending, Reagan does not speak to her choice in
integrating an entire paragraph of text in a splash panel, which is rare in comic books.
Perhaps she intentionally created this panel in this way so as to draw attention to it,
creating contrast between the other panels on the page which include pictures with very
little text, save for two speech bubbles. This is something I wish Reagan would have
addressed more specifically in her Statement of Goals and Choices because it is
remarkably dissimilar to the rest of her remediated memoir. Which, again, could have
been intentional; however, without an explanation, I cannot know for sure. I believed that
because Reagan demonstrated a sophisticated knowledge of writing (and reading) comic
books and other multimodal texts, I also believed she understood how the layout of her
graphic memoir helped her achieve her intentions for this piece.

**Layout**

Reagan began work on her remediated memoir by first choosing her tool, Comic Life,
and second, choosing which theme to use within the app. After considering Urbana and Retro, she
ultimately elected to use the Retro theme because she felt it fit her story best, and “it’s [sic] neutral background didn’t interfere
with the story” (Reagan, May 2015, p. 1). “The dark colors and misshapen picture
boxes,” she continues, “were meant for a story with constant action, much unlike mine.”
After having chosen her theme, Reagan reflects that it was rather easy to decide on the placement of pictures--“I didn’t run into many problems, until page three” (p. 2).

On the third page of her comic, Reagan chose to have her three larger splash panels staggered, instead of aligned in the middle straight down the page. Keeping with the template for all other pages, Reagan reports that the original layout in the Retro theme did not have this layout. When she was placing images into the suggested layout, she noticed the “two bottom pictures just didn’t have enough room to be fully in the frame” (p. 2). In response, she made all three pictures larger, and staggered them on the page. Staggering the panels allowed them to be “exciting and different” (p. 2). She continues, “A straight line would’ve made them seem more boring and I wanted to keep the reader’s eye moving throughout the piece so as to keep their brain moving” (p. 2). Even when crowdsourcing with students the assessment rubric, Reagan exhibited a sophisticated understanding of layout and its importance in the author (and reader or assessor) carefully considering its effect. I remember in class Reagan suggested I address the issue of layout in the design section of the rubric (Campbell, field notes, April 28, 2015), which surprised me because I should have considered that already; but I had not, until Reagan drew attention to it.

Color
Reagan only used two colors besides white, black, and the background of each page. Using colors strategically, she used red to signify pain, and blue to signify help. Because she sparsely included color, it seemed to emphasize her choices more. One specific move she documents in her Statement of Goals and Choices involves her use of blue on the Emergency Room sign. She labeled this as a difficult decision for her, considering if she should keep it red as it traditionally is, or color it blue. “In the end,” she reports, “I decided that since the ER was where I was going to get help, that it should shine blue” (Reagan, May 2015, p. 1). She also drew the Emergency Room nurse’s uniform blue, but then realized she didn’t draw her body in other panels and worried they “would not get the extra color that they deserved” (p. 1). Instead, she drew the nurse’s headband and hair tie blue “to further show her role as a healer” in her comic (p. 1). Finally, how much blood to illustrate (or how much red to use) was another of Reagan’s uncertainties. There was a lot of blood, much more than she illustrates, but she did not want to be so “extreme” in her drawings; and instead, placed small patches of red on each shirt, “cutting the wound out of the picture wherever I could” (p. 2). On the surface, these decisions and rationales might seem inconsequential, but from a Multiliteracies perspective, these are considerations on the micro-level that contribute to a piece’s overall impact on a reader, much like a book jacket or spine might for a book in print.

Reagan surprised me in this unit. Truth be told, I did not expect her to be as interested in this project as she was; I predicted her participation and enthusiasm would be about the same as it was toward everything else in English: uninspired. However, I was pleased and proud to see her excel and show genuine interest in something others seemed less passionate about. At the beginning of the unit, analyzing multimodal texts by
both professional and student writers, right away I noticed a spark in Reagan. All of a sudden, she was participating in all discussions, leading the class in analysis with astute observations. Perhaps it was the newness of it in the English classroom with a curriculum steeped in traditional literacy practices. Or perhaps what others found challenging-- open-ended multimodal composition-- came more natural to her.

One thing for sure is Reagan disrupted my expectations and practice, and from this, I learned it is imperative to take notice, encourage, and capitalize on this response whenever possible. Throughout the unit I never stopped learning from my students. The iterative nature of teaching allows me as a teacher to adapt and grow, especially when I am integrating emerging technology that is ever changing. From a practitioner’s perspective, this research helps me prepare for students like Reagan—students who will disrupt my practice in positive ways.

Eve

Without a doubt, Eve was one of the most exceptional students I have ever had the privilege to teach. She was the kind of student who inspired me to be a better teacher. Several times throughout the school year, when planning or reflecting back on lessons taught, I would ask myself, did I do enough, and did I challenge Eve? Not interested in superficial details, she was inquisitive, introspective-- she challenged herself. In short, Eve was the type of student I wish I had more of in my classroom. For her memoir, Eve chose to write about when she was very young and bit her sister in the middle of a fight. When her mother spanked her as a consequence, she scoffed at her punishment and she
received double punishment. From this lesson, she writes, she learned her mother is not someone to cross, but also a woman who loves her unconditionally.

**Genre**

Eve’s main purpose in remediating her memoir (besides it being a course requirement) was to make people laugh, which is why she ultimately decided to use Comic Life for her final product. But not before considering other options, including iMovie, Book Creator, and Google Slides. A comic book, she muses, seemed “more action packed with the story based more on pictures than words” (Eve, May 2015, p. 1). She also wanted dialogue to be “as important, if not more important than additional text” (p. 1). Book Creator was not a viable option for Eve because she “wanted it to seem more fun for the reader. A book in some ways seems like more work than just flipping through a picture packed comic book where design of everything gives a big impression” (p. 2).

Eve was also concerned with what would happen during the synaesthesia process; she worried she would lose content, moving from a text relying solely on the written language mode to a text relying on multiple modes, including written and oral language, but also visual and spatial representation. During her multimodal composition process, Eve admits, “I hated having to cut parts of the story where my voice showed through” (p. 3), but later reflects that she remained true to her original voice through her pictures and dialogue. During work time in class, I remember having a conversation with Eve on April 28, 2015, where she addressed her concerns about having to sacrifice some of the narration in her original memoir to make room for the more visual modes. My response was that she needed to negotiate this and figure out how to draw scenes that communicate much more than the dialogue in the panels. She needed the images to do a lot of the
telling where her words once were used. Eve was successful at this. On the fourth page of “The Great Consequence,” Eve uses voice overs in the top panel to replace larger sections of narration from her original memoir. In this panel, she narrates at the bottom, “Five dumb words. Five more spankings” (Eve, 2015, p. 4). In her original memoir, she wrote much more including description about her mood at the time and what the spankings felt like. In the synaesthesia process, Eve truncated this part and used shouting and thought bubbles; and emanata, or emotion, to convey her mood and reaction to her additional spankings. In addition to having a firm grasp on her choice of genre, and a growing understanding of the power and limitations of each genre, Eve understood her choices with regard to layout.

**Layout**

Eve demonstrates an understanding of the importance layout is to the overall piece reflecting that its role is “crucial for understanding the piece” (May 2015, p. 3). Wanting her story to be the center focus for her reader, Eve chose not to use any of the preloaded themes Comic Life provided and wanted “to keep the overall format clean with straight lines” (p. 3). She admits that “The format might have seemed plain, but I wanted to make [sure] it didn’t distract from the story itself” In one instance, she did break away
from her standard layout. On page three, she cropped her three panels to look like broken glass. To her, it “symbolizes that those events were extremely painful…” (p. 3). The usage of the broken glass panels intentionally disrupted the flow of her piece, which further emphasizes this particular detail in her story. Authors of traditional print texts may use short, punctuated sentences to disrupt a reader’s fluency, Eve did the same thing, just visually.

Because Eve uses shorter, less complex sentence structures throughout her comic, perhaps she chose to visually punctuate these three panels to further separate and highlight the pain she felt.

**Color**

Among genre, layout and color, Eve spent the majority of her Statement of Goals and Choices discussing her color choices. Eve was successfully able to use color to serve a variety of purposes, including conveying mood, tone; and creating emphasis and contrast. In her Statement of Goals and Choices, Eve reports that she used a black fill behind the panels with pale colors in the images to create graphic weight between the two (p. 2). She reflects, “While drawing the picture[s] I used softer paler colors to convey a cute childhood
story that was light and sweet (even if the story was not necessarily about cuteness, more like consequences)” (p. 2). Eve was also able to use color to convey a reflective tone of voice. She writes, “The [pale] color of the pictures show that as I reflect on the events that occurred, they don’t seem as serious when I was experiencing them” (p. 2). Additionally, Eve writes that she emphasized her dialogue by matching the shape and color of the speech bubbles with a particular tone of voice. Speech bubbles with jagged lines and sometimes a red fill conveys rage and signifies to the reader that a character is yelling. Speech bubbles with a round shape and white fill signifies regular speech tones. Pale yellow rectangular voice over boxes match the pale colors used in the images creating a lighthearted mood. Finally, text in blue-green clouds signifies to the reader that a character is thinking (Eve, May 2015, p. 2).

Eve was an absolute joy to have in class. She responded to the challenges this unit posed with enthusiasm, a critical eye, and a genuine desire to understand and learn how to compose multimodally. Eve has always been articulate orally and in writing, and that literacy served her well in this unfamiliar landscape. Looking ahead, I could better serve students, even students like Eve who were more successful than others, by spending more time in class on the study of graphic novels and other emerging genres so students could more effectively compose in these existing and emerging genres. If I had incorporated more multimodal texts including graphic novels prior to this unit, I would have been able to teach features of this genre so as to give students the background knowledge and experience before composing in the comic book genre, which validates the need for Multiliteracies to be present throughout the English curriculum.
Jackson

Like Eve, Jackson was a student who had an outstanding work ethic in my class. An expression of seriousness seemed almost permanent on his face, yet he still smiled at my puns and corny jokes (probably in pity). If he was going to be absent for a school activity, he would inform me well in advance, and even remind me as the day approached so he could finish his work before he returned to class. He demonstrated a concern for meeting expectations by asking clarifying questions during and after class. Not afraid of being wrong or seen as uninformed, he asked for clarification in front of his peers. I had Jackson’s older sibling in a previous school year, and was excited to have another student from the same family. Despite being an introvert, Jackson decided to write his memoir about when he was five years old and streaked through the country club his family belonged to. His memoir described how as a young child, Jackson apparently hated showers and preferred baths. To avoid taking a shower at the pool, he bolted out of the locker room stark naked for everyone to see, much to the mortification of his parents.

His purpose for his remediated memoir was to expand his audience besides the country club members who witnessed his streaking and myself, and entertain more people. “I designed it,” he writes in his Statement of Goals and Choices, “to be a lighthearted read that will hopefully be read for a good time and a nice laugh by my audience” (Jackson, May 2015, p. 1). As part of his audience, I definitely enjoyed not only reading his original memoir, but also his visual representation of it as well.

Genre

Before settling on Comic Life, Jackson considered creating a video of himself telling his story. Like Eve, Jackson was slightly concerned with losing his voice in this
new genre; however, he felt a video could have afforded him a much stronger voice. In his Statement of Goals and Choices, he reflects, “That course of action would allow me to showcase my voice, and I would tell the complete story with nothing left out, which is a major upside” (p. 2). This plan could have yielded a great final product in which Jackson retained his original voice. Conversely, Jackson considered it a constraint that he would not be able to show any visuals (I think he meant still images) that captured the feel of the setting, his fear of the shower, and his father’s anger (Jackson, May 2015, p. 2). I was slightly confused by this last statement and concerned that Jackson did not remember it was a possibility to include still images in a video. In his reflection, he does not specify which app he would have used to create a video, but he should have known it was possible at least in Explain Everything because he was required to use the app in an earlier assignment for class.

Early in his Statement of Goals and Choices, Jackson expresses feelings of nervousness and apprehension remediating his original written memoir and worried he would lose pieces of his story. When discussing drawbacks of using Comic Life, he reflects on the possibility of details “inadvertently being forgotten and left out, because of the limited space offered” (p. 3). This is exactly what happened with Jackson’s piece. First, Jackson’s comic is only three pages long--with the entire first page serving as the title page--which is the main reason he lost a significant amount of his story in the synaesthesia process. Second, although the piece is actually only two pages in length, Jackson still relied heavily on narrative voice overs, which led me to believe he did not have prior experience composing in this genre. Whereas Eve was able to make her images do the work of some of the text she lost in the synaesthesia process, Jackson was
not. The length of his text dictated the small size of font he was able to use, which, along with the font style, made it difficult to read, making the piece visually ineffective.

An advantage to using Comic Life, Jackson reflects, is that the “experience can be tailored perfectly to describe... [my] memory, and capture its feeling” (p. 3). It is this reason why Jackson chose to hand draw his images instead of using generic images because they would not be unique and would “fail to capture the special aspects of... [his] memoir that add to the story’s action and comedy” (p. 3). I am pleased Jackson chose to hand draw his images. The combination of the long narration and stock images would have made this piece mediocre, far more pedestrian than he is capable of achieving. While Jackson predicted my biggest concern with his piece, I am content he was even aware of the effect this new genre would have on his original writing. Although I felt slightly disappointed with Jackson’s final project, I felt satisfied that he was at least considering how his choices in this genre would impact his efficacy achieving his purpose. Perhaps, Jackson just was not as literate in the comic book genre; and with more exposure and instruction, his purpose and piece would have been better executed.

*Layout and Color*

Jackson gave less insight into his color choices, and no input as to the layout of his comic. For the background, Jackson chose a “subtle blue-to-black fade that mimics the appearance of water” (p. 2). Which, when contrasted with the white and gray images (with little touches of color), gives graphic weight to the images creating emphasis. The only other detail Jackson provided in his Statement of Goals and Choices involved the title page. He writes, “The title page of the comic is very fanciful and regal, giving the feel of the country club” (p. 2). These two choices, while seeming superficial and
insignificant, demonstrate that Jackson understands the connection between his purpose and the design choices that best serve that purpose.

Despite his sparse attention to layout and color is his Statement of Goals and Choices, Jackson did spend some time discussing his images. Jackson describes his pictures as “less realistic and more cartoonish, which creates a more child-like feel to his memoir. He also categorizes his images as representational and exaggerated, which “aims to transport the reader into the story through the perspective of [his] four-year-old self” (p. 2). For example, Jackson personified the shower as an “angry monster spitting everywhere” because “Drawing a simple shower would not have captured my fear and hate of the shower” (p. 2). In another instance, Jackson exaggerated his father’s anger by drawing fire in his eyes to show how his father was “so amazingly different in his anger from his usual fashion” (p. 2). Reflecting on his father, he writes, “As a four year old he was much older and scarier to me, which made me run away, so it was important to capture the reader in the story, and making them see the situation in the way I did when it happened” (p. 2). Jackson was very concerned about his readers being able to experience
his story through the eyes of his four-year-old self, which, dictated a lot of his decisions outlined in his Statement of Goals and Choices.

While Jackson might not have been as successful as others writing in the comic book genre, I could still see that Jackson’s rhetorical and design choices derived from a consideration of how these choices would help him achieve his purpose. In his Statement of Goals and Choices, he intimated that he understood the relationship between intent and impact; however he was not very successful in achieving his desired impact. As a teacher, I struggled with how to assess his project. On the one hand, he demonstrated a consideration for his intentions as an author, but he was unable to successfully execute it. I decided that with this project, consideration was enough for me as I assessed his project; but as I move forward, I need to decide if consideration for intent is enough, or if execution will be paramount in the assessment as well.

Anna

As a student, Anna was always concerned about meeting expectations and understanding how her performance would be assessed, which early on in the school year, I remember thinking she was a little too hyper vigilant. Yet as the year progressed, I came to expect and even look forward to it. After I assessed her literary analysis video for *The Book Thief* in December, I remember Anna expressing confusion and concern because she lost points for her font choice not being purposeful. She chose to use black, and at the time I thought it could have been a little more visually engaging with different font colors. In a conversation, she said she chose the black font color so as not to distract her readers from what was written; therefore, her decision was purposeful. At first I was
frustrated with Anna’s concern. Upon reflection, I realized while I was attempting to actually assess her project (instead of assign a completion grade), she was just pointing out the arbitrariness of how I arrived at her score. And she was right. Typically, teachers do not appreciate being called to carpet for their grading practices, and I am no different. However, as I approached the remediated memoir unit, I recalled this experience with Anna, and decided to involve my students in the development of the rubric I would use.

Instead of seeing Anna as a frustration, I saw in her an opportunity to better my teaching. Using Anna to respond to gaps in my assessment of multimodal composition strengthened her voice and at the same time relieved me of some of being the sole person in charge of learning. I was no longer the only one in the classroom with the power to affect assessment and grading. While that may be disconcerting for some, it was a relief for me because as I realized I was not alone in this uncharted territory. Having my own teaching and assessment practices be questioned led to a greater understanding of how teacher and student roles blend together to achieve a common purpose.

Genre

Anna decided to write about her grandfather and their pretend games they played on his front porch when she was younger. Entitled “Captain,” Anna remediated her memoir for her friends and family, but most importantly for her grandfather to thank him for their time together. At first, she expressed interest in creating a video with pictures, text, and audio. She had plans to use what digital photos she had on her home computer and scan the ones she did not, and use Notability to type the text in the font type, style, size, and color she desired. She would use GarageBand to record her audio, and assemble all of these pieces in Explain Everything. In her Statement of Goals and Choices, Anna
took considerable space in explaining what she would have done had she went this direction, demonstrating a clear understanding of the affordances and constraints of the many tools she would use to create a video. Sure she would use either iMovie or Explain Everything, she then began to explore Adobe Slate, a new app released in May 2015, the same month as the remediated memoir unit. Slate reminded her of “Snow Fall”; she writes, “This app was not as intricate, but comes as close as I have seen yet” (Anna, May 2015, p. 2). After messing around with it for a while, Anna decided to use Slate. Between creating a video or a scrollable story, I believe Anna chose the best genre for what she wanted for her piece.

Like the others, Anna was concerned about losing parts of her story in the synaesthesia process. Instead of abridging her memoir, she inserted the whole thing in Slate. In her reflection, she writes, “I did not decide to remediate this memoir to summarize my story, I decided to do this so I can present the whole story nicely with photos” (p. 2). Anna’s choice ended up serving her purpose well. Slate creates scrollable stories and uses transitions, different picture layouts, and font sizes and styles to help break up the text, but still can still allow the creator to rely on the written mode, like Anna did. Had Anna used a different tool, such as Comic Life, she probably would have been frustrated at the genre’s reliance on images rather than text, and her memoir would have suffered for it.
Layout and Color

Along with conscientious considerations regarding genre, Anna carefully chose the layout of her memoir’s various features, and articulated them clearly (in exhaustive detail) in her Statement of Goals and Choices. Driving her layout choices was a concern for avoiding creating a story that was not “so long and boring” (p. 3).

She chose to use photos to divide the text into smaller chunks. Essentially, she uses images, either in full width format or in clustered tiles where she deemed it would help the reader visualize her setting and characters. In her reflection, Anna describes several separate sections of her memoir and explains her layout choices. The set of photos (aside from the title image) she uses first in a grid includes the brick path, flowers from the flower bed, and an old picture of her aunt sitting on the brick wall of the flower bed. She writes, “I included these because they went along with the text surrounding them” (p. 3). In another section of her memoir she includes another photo grid including a photo of the front of her grandparents’ house, two pictures of her laying on the porch steps, and a picture of her and her grandfather riding bikes in the front yard. “These pictures,” she writes, “showed
the porch and the front yard, they were there to give visual representation of...[where]...the story was taking place at that point” (p. 3). Although she did not have many options with Slate, Anna was still able to use her images to successfully facilitate the telling of her story. Finally, with regard to layout, Anna explains that while she could not choose specific transitions between her photos and text as the reader scrolls through her story, she liked the transitions in the “Whimsy” theme she used.

In her reflection, Anna does not speak to her use of color. This is perhaps because the available themes in the free version of Slate did not allow users to change the font type, style, size, or even color, so there was nothing for Anna to address, other than her choice of theme.

While I believe Anna chose the right tool and genre for her Remediated Memoir and her purpose, I also believe she chose it because it was as close to her written piece as possible, and the app did not allow for many choices to be used. Perhaps Anna used Slate so she would not have many decisions to make and thus would not have to articulate those choices with a rationale. Although choosing to use a new, unfamiliar tool is risky, Anna was playing it safe with this piece. Given her zeal and determination to meet expectations in past assignments, she could have challenged herself and created a video with moving pieces using different apps together. And maybe she played it safe because taking a risk with the literary analysis video resulted in points being taken away because I misunderstood her intentions. As much as that first project was a learning experience for me, it may have been a learning experience for her-- a lesson in not taking risks.

Final Thoughts
One recurring theme throughout Reagan, Eve, Jackson, and Anna’s remediated memoirs is a consideration of genre. The genre for the original memoir assignment was the same for each student; however, it became much more open-ended when students remediated their memoirs. And as a result, some students were more successful than others composing in their selected genre. Part of knowing how to communicate in multiple modes involves knowledge of the different ways these modes can be used, and in different genres. One way to address this is to engage with students more in the Experiencing dimension of a Multiliteracies pedagogy. In other words, provide students more opportunities to experience multimodal texts by reading and composing them. This exposure is ultimately the responsibility of the teacher. From just these four students’ Statement of Goals and Choices and remediated memoirs (and others not mentioned in this section), it became clear to me that students would have benefitted from instruction on composing in specific genres such as comic books, videos, and scrollable stories. Perhaps if more instruction were in place prior to this assignment, or if multimodal texts had a more significant presence in English curricula, students would have had a more firm grasp of the relationship between intent and impact, which would narrow the gap between the two and help students develop and strengthen their voice as multimodal composers.

Another major takeaway from this unit, with regard to students’ interpretation of their rhetorical and design choices, is students had a genuine concern for what would happen to their piece as they retold their story through multiple modes altogether in a different genre. Part of this uncertainty could be a fear of the unknown. Students had no practice in remediating anything, and probably did not know what to do should they run
into a problem where their piece no longer made sense to them. Again, exposure to this
type of composition could have alleviated anxiety and given students recourse for
handling potential obstacles.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This study involved using technology to integrate Multiliteracies and multimodal composition into a high school classroom. As an English teacher, I was interested in conceptualizing how this could be enacted in my own teaching, and understanding how I and my students made sense of this experience. My research highlighted the work of 21 students and myself as we explored reading and designing multimodal compositions using various mentor texts such as “Snow Fall,” “A Game of Shark and Minnow,” and my own remediated teaching philosophy statement as exemplars for study. Using a Multiliteracies perspective, I sought to answer four research questions:

1. How do I operationalize Multiliteracies in my high school English classroom?
2. How do I operationalize teaching multimodal composition?
3. How do students make sense of their experience composing multimodally?
4. How do students make sense of their rhetorical and design choices?

To answer each question, I relied on self-study and phenomenographic research methodologies, utilizing Ference Marton’s (1981, 1986) work as a guide for the latter methodology. Data collection involved an interview, eight days of field notes, and 21 remediated memoirs and Statement of Goals and Choices. I used a phenomenographic analysis protocol to analyze data collected by identifying utterances of interest and organizing them into categories of descriptions. Salient observations arose from the data:
as I enacted a Multiliteracies pedagogy, we experienced a rebalancing of agency, I was able to create transparency, respond to students in the moment, and create opportunities to explore the relationship between intent and impact. Moreover, from this research, I discovered that my students expressed anxiety and apprehension to composing multimodal ensembles, experienced varying gaps between what they intended their piece to do and the impact it actually had, they apologized for their work, and articulated their rhetorical and design choices focusing on genre, layout, and color.

**Discussion of Findings**

**Purposeful Planning and a Rebalancing of Agency**

While I expected a shift in teacher and student roles, even planned for it, I did not expect it to be as pervasive throughout the entire unit as it was. To guide me in my planning and implementation, I relied on the four dimensions described in New London Group’s *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures*—experiencing, conceptualizing, analyzing, and applying.

*Experiencing.*

Because this project was notably different from what my students had previously experienced in my classroom and beyond, I needed to expose my students to multimodal texts and engage them in the use of the new literacies needed to understand and analyze them before. I chose two professional multimodal pieces, “Snow Fall” and “A Game of Shark and Minnow”, my own remediated teaching philosophy, and two student examples from the previous school year. Additionally, before asking students to practice these new literacies with their own composition, it was important for me to bridge the new with the
familiar. To accomplish this, I first assigned my students to write a memoir of their earliest childhood memory, which was a district required writing assessment, and then plan a storyboard in preparation for remediating it using their iPads. Having examples to refer to made me a more confident teacher because I had experience and expertise in what I was asking my students to know and be able to do, and was designed to make my students feel more confident in this new endeavor as well. In order to provide my students with those rich experiences with nontraditional, multimodal texts, I needed to have experienced them myself.

*Conceptualizing.*

In the conceptualizing dimension, learners make the tacit explicit. To concretize a composers rhetorical and design moves, I implemented Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) multimodal analysis framework. I used this framework as a basis for discussions of “Snow Fall,” “A Game of Shark and Minnow,” two past student examples, and my own remediated teaching philosophy. I introduced this framework to provide students a common language, or grammar, for them to use in their Statement of Goals and Choices, as well as for myself in the assessment of these projects. Again, because this was a new experience for students (and myself teaching it), we needed to create a common language from to use in our discussions, writing, and assessment. In all three scenarios--discussion, composition, and assessment--we used Arola, Sheppard, and Ball’s (2014) rhetorical choices (genre, purpose, audience, authorship, and context) and design choices (emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, and proximity). To keep these terms at the forefront of our conversations and usage, I created a series of posters to hang from my wall which we referred to often.
Using the terminology consistently throughout the unit was key to its success in helping students articulate composition moves in such a way that the reader (and assessor) understood the author’s motives in making these choices.

Analyzing.

Compared to the other activities and lessons in this unit, students spent considerable time analyzing other writer/designers’ moves, and their own as well. Students typically spend minimal time reflecting on their own writing and themselves as writers, and therefore, the lessons where we analyzed examples of multimodal ensembles and the reflection assignment-- the Statement of Goals and Choices--necessitated extensive analysis. The lessons described in both the experiencing and conceptualizing sections are examples of an instructor engaging students in the analyzing dimension.

Applying.

Applying means, “Learners do something that expresses or affects the world in new way[s], or that transfers their previous knowledge into a new setting” (Kalantzis,
Cope, & Cloonan, 2010, p. 74). The remediated memoir, itself, is asking students to express themselves in new ways, which is significant. However, in the future, I would like to expand their audience even further. While sharing their remediated memoirs with their peers and family was likely more than they have done in the past, I wanted the audience to be even broader. I wanted students to share their remediated memoirs with a larger audience on their blogs, but we ran out of time at the end of the school year. Time is an issue I predicted and one that offers implications for my practice in the future.

A Rebalancing of Agency.

As a result of careful and purposeful planning relying on the four knowledge processes of a Multiliteracies pedagogy, my students and I experienced a rebalancing of agency. Throughout the unit, I created opportunities that shifted agency from myself to my students. Students were able to choose the topic they wrote about, the tool they used to remediate their written memoirs, the members in their peer-revision groups; they also had considerable input into the rubric I used to assess the piece, and were asked to write a Statement of Goals and Choices articulating their choices. No longer was I the sole bearer of knowledge and insight, quite the opposite, actually. All of a sudden, students (especially Reagan) were offering ideas and insights I had not even conceived. This was liberating, but also a little discomforting. Loughran (2006) deems this “an important attribute to learning, especially so in respect to learning about teaching, as it leads to a heightening of the senses” (p. 97). Even though this caused some discomfort, I was still pleased to see my students taking the lead using what I had taught them in their own discussion and analyses.
Increasing students’ role and decision making parameters was not always met with enthusiasm, however. Several students in their Statement of Goals and Choices, and in class, expressed difficulty figuring out how or where to start the synaesthesia process (beyond creating their storyboards), and even a little resistance. I knew to expect this because based on their past mostly successful experiences, my students sought clear, distinct directions and parameters, and are less likely to take academic risks. Other students, however, reacted positively to this shift. From very early on in the unit, Reagan expressed more interest and investment into this unit than she had all school year. From our discussion and analysis of “Snow Fall” to the writing of her own remediated memoir and Statement of Goals and Choices, Reagan seemed to appreciate the open-endedness of this unit, as opposed to the other units in the year. Had I not implemented this unit, it is doubtful I would have had the opportunity to see Reagan so absorbed in anything as much as she was here. Multiliteracies and multimodal composition has the potential to engage students, like Reagan, in the content who might not have otherwise before taken an active interest. It provokes traditional learners to respond to challenges open-ended tasks pose, and better prepares them for life beyond high school. Conversely, it allows the teacher to foster a more democratic environment creating a space for students to find and develop their voice.

Creating Transparency and Responding to Learners at Work

From my lessons, I learned that creating transparency, being open to change, and responding to learners at work naturally helped shift the balance of agency, capitalizing on students’ individual and collective strengths (Corno, 2008), making the teacher’s role seem more like a facilitator than information holder. Creating transparency in my
teaching seemed to have benefitted me as well as my students. By letting students see me thinking on my feet and responding to them as learners in the moment, I was able to strengthen our understanding of multimodal composition. If I had not asked for student input into the assessment rubric, remembered my own remediated teaching philosophy statement, or even provided examples from past students, I would not have been able to engage my students in the experiencing dimension of a Multiliteracies pedagogy as deeply as I did. As I found in this study, when guiding students (and myself) through new experiences in Multiliteracies, being transparent in my teaching moves and responding to my students in the moment were imperative so as to place students in more agentive roles-- shifting the instructor to the role as facilitator, rather than lecturer-- and to understand more deeply reading, teaching, and designing multimodal compositions.

**Teaching and Understanding Intent and Impact**

I wanted students to see a clear and direct link between what they intended for a piece to be and do and the actual effect they achieved through their rhetorical and design choices, rather than thinking that multimodal composition was a series of unlinked decisions with neither rhyme nor reason. It was important for them to see themselves as their own makers of meaning, going beyond the default settings of the tools they were using, and really thinking about-- and articulating-- those decisions. To facilitate this understanding, I provided opportunities for students to practice identifying and explaining connections and disconnects between the author's intent and impact.

Surprisingly and unexpectedly, all of the disconnects students identified were from past students’ remediated memoirs and my own remediated teaching philosophy statement. Conversely, all of the connections between intent and impact students identified were
from *The New York Times’* “Snow Fall” and “A Game of Shark and Minnow”. What I found interesting was that students critiqued the professional pieces in a positive manner, highlighting their strengths, while they critiqued the amateur pieces in a negative manner, highlighting the discrepancies. A possible conclusion for this could be that the professional writer/designers had more expertise and experience-- and possibly more time-- composing in these emerging genres. Additionally, not enough attention (and in some cases no attention at all) is paid to teaching new literacies required to read and write in these emerging genres. Placing the professional and amateur multimodal ensembles side by side highlighted and emphasized differences. Also, the expectations for both sets of pieces are different. We expected the professional pieces to be better than the student examples because of a difference in experience composing multimodally. Both conclusions are highly likely, and are true in the case of my own classroom. I was confident my students could easily detect a strong link between intent and impact, and that knowledge would transfer into their own writing; but this was not the case with certain students. Several students’ objectives articulated in their Statement of Goals and Choices went unfilled, as was the case with Jacob, Brielle, and Joslyn. The more I teach this unit, the more experience and examples I will have to share with students, both successful and unsuccessful attempts, which will help students see the connection, and any disconnects, more clearly.

**Anxiety: Productive For Some, Paralyzing for Others**

I intentionally wanted my students to experience some level of discomfort when remediating their memoirs. Stemming from Vygotsky’s (1978) *zone of proximal development*, it is in the space between what students are capable of on their own and
what they can do (with their instructor and peers) that they can experience the most
growth and learning. In this unit, students like Harper and Joslyn experienced discomfort
in this space; and it was their response to this anxiety that made them stand apart. With
Harper, who expressed the most anxiety, I worried that if I pushed her too hard, she may
shut down. Instead, I trusted that she could problem solve on her own. Because I could
easily recognize that Harper was stressed, I was able to respond accordingly. However, I
did not see Joslyn struggle during the composition process, although she expressed mild
anxiety in her Statement of Goals and Choices. Joslyn’s final project left a lot to be
desired, and I wondered if it was possibly resistance to the task, or an inability to cope
with the anxiety she was feeling at doing something so unfamiliar to her. No matter the
cause, I wished I would have recognized her anxiety or hesitance early on so I could have
responded and helped her through whatever was inhibiting her.

This needs to be a potential area of focus for teachers as new literacies create
anxieties in students. To respond, we need to learn how to help students manage their
emotions so they can be productive and keep learning. We need to help them develop
grit, which according to researcher Angela Lee Duckworth from the University of
Pennsylvania, is “having resilience in the face of failure” and “having deep commitments
that you remain loyal to over many years” (2013, p. 1). Her research on grit is very
similar to Carol Dweck’s on a growth mindset. In her research Duckworth (2013) has
found that students who have a stronger growth mindset “tend to be grittier” (p. 3). Just
as Dweck’s research suggests students can change their mindsets, Duckworth argues that
students can change their grit. Learning how to help students develop non-cognitive
skills, such as resilience and grit, will strengthen a Multiliteracies’ pedagogy impact on student learning.

Wishes and Apologies

In their Statement of Goals and Choices, several students either expressed wishes they had for their final project or they apologized for their work. Sometimes they did both, recognizing the gap between their ideas and intentions for their pieces, and what they actually produced. The majority of students wished they had more time to complete the remediated memoir. Another explanation could be that students, like Harper, did not practice good time management, and perhaps did not work on this much at home as instructed. Upon reflection, I wondered if I had given students more time in class to complete this project (time which I actually did not have), would they have been more satisfied with their pieces and, therefore, apologized less? Even more compelling, was that certain students who experienced a larger gap between their intent and impact did not apologize or identify their pieces’ deficiencies. I did not expect students to apologize for their work, I encouraged the opposite, in fact. I tried to model to students not to apologize for our work, to be proud of it. I was surprised, however, that they did not address any of their pieces’ faults in their Statement of Goals and Choices. While it is not mentioned as a requirement in the three questions I provided students as heuristic prompts, I did mention it to them orally as I introduced the questions. Perhaps Jacob and Brielle, who experienced large gaps between intent and impact, were not paying attention while I introduced the Statement of Goals and Choices, which is very likely. Another explanation, and perhaps even more accurate, is that because multimodal composition and metacognitive writing such as the reflection paper was so foreign to students, they
lacked the background knowledge and experience to be able to recognize deficiencies in
their own work, and then articulate them in writing, or they may have been afraid to point
out deficiencies because they knew their projects and Statement of Goals and Choices
would be graded.

Understanding Rhetorical and Design Choices

From the Statement of Goals and Choices, students expressed consideration for
the new genre of their remediated memoir, and how layout, organization, and color can
be leveraged to create a desired effect. Students were able to articulate a definitive link
between intent and impact with regard to genre, layout, and color; however, the degree of
success in their final projects varied. Out of the three main considerations evident in the
Statement of Goals and Choices, genre was discussed the most. Specifically, Eve,
Reagan, and Abby were successful in composing in their chosen genres; however,
Jackson was not as successful. Eve and Reagan chose to use Comic Life and create a
graphic story of their memoir, while Abby chose to use Adobe Slate to create a scrollable
narrative. I knew Reagan was already a comic book reader, so I attributed part of her
success in this genre to her already established knowledge base. Eve, Jackson, and Abby
were all concerned about losing parts of their story in the synaesthesia process. This was
a strong consideration for them in the synaesthesia process. Those who used Comic Life,
an app relying more on the visual mode, had to make their images do a lot of the work
where they would have used words. In this case, the genre and the tool created the
constraints that the writer/designers must work with. Abby, did not want to lose any part
of her story, which is why she chose Adobe Slate because this app was still more reliant
on the written mode. She copied her entire memoir into Slate and separated certain
sentences to place in front of images to further punctuate them from the rest of the memoir. She also added pictures to help the reader make connections. Her final remediated memoir was very similar to her original, which is what Abby wanted, and she was successful. As new genres become possible through the affordances of devices, I believe more instruction in the specific genres, such as Comic Life, would help students develop deeper understanding of multimodal composition.

This research offers valuable contributions to the field of Multiliteracies and teaching in several ways. This study allows teachers a view into the multimodal composition process from dual perspectives—that of teachers and students—in an area where little research exists. Incorporating Multiliteracies and multimodal composition into a traditional English classroom dominated by print literacy and instruction is, for lack of a better word, messy. Through the murkiness of this journey in my teaching, others can see how the negotiation of Multiliteracies and multimodal composition requires planning, responding, and reflecting. It is in this murky area where I learned the most about myself as a teacher, and this research offers others to see that as well. It is my hope that this research will open the door further for teachers to study their own practice through documentation, interpretation, and reflection; and share that with others. Finally, I believe this study further validates the necessity of widespread integration of multiple literacies into the English classroom.

Limitations

Several limitations for this study exist. First, because of the nature of my inquiry, I used my own classroom as a research site, which necessitated the use of convenience
sampling rather than random sampling. However, every attempt was made to include a variety of ethnicities and that both sexes were represented in both my possible participant population, and my actual participants. Because this research first and foremost seeks to impact and improve my own teaching, using my own classroom was necessary. Because I had taught these students for eight months prior to this study, and know their strengths and weaknesses, including them in this study allowed me to better and more effectively respond to their needs as learners. The benefits of using my own classroom far outweigh any limitations the use of convenience sampling posed. Second, the nature of self-study and phenomenographic methodologies inherently limit generalizability and replicability; however, generalizability and replicability are not the goals of this inquiry. Third, time constraints were a limitation of this study. Several concerns I had in the operationalization of Multiliteracies and multimodal in my classroom possibly could have been alleviated had I more time to not only teach the remediated memoir unit, but also conduct this study in my classroom. Fourth, there are no prescribed analysis methods within phenomenography, which can be liberating, yet limiting, too. The categories of descriptions formed from the utterances of interest can be subjective; however, the categories, or themes, were tested against the data and adjusted multiple times. As analysis progressed, the meanings became more stable, and therefore, more reliable. This methodology was appropriate for what I was seeking to understand in that, I did not have any preconceived notions of what the data may reveal. This research involved complex individuals all with different experiences and conceptualizations of what it means to compose multimodally; therefore, an open-ended analysis protocol allowed me to
discover how I interpreted teaching and how my students interpreted multimodal composition.

**Implications for Practice**

Multiliteracies offers a tremendous opportunity to change the balance of power and responsibility, creating a more democratic community in the classroom. For some, this may be a profound shift in pedagogy, and teachers need to be prepared to respond and adjust to challenges this shift may pose. Careful considerations need to be made including conceptualizing how Multiliteracies and multimodal composition are operationalized in the curriculum and the classroom, plans for responding to anxiety and apprehension students may experience, and inevitable time constraints this will create for teachers and students.

Instead of being a singular unit of instruction compartmentalized from the rest of the curriculum, Multiliteracies and multimodal composition need to be more seamlessly integrated into English curriculum, being taught and assessed in multiple ways throughout the entire school year. Many times I reflected and wrote that students needed more experience and exposure than just in the unit I was teaching. This is an implication not only for the classroom teacher, but for district curriculum planning committees as well. Students will benefit more from activating what Rohrer and Pashler (2010) call the *spacing effect*, where a “given amount of study time is distributed or spaced across multiple sessions rather than massed into a single session” (emphasis in original) (p. 407). They further conclude that when spacing is implemented, “performance on a delayed final test is improved” (p. 407). “If the goal is very long-term retention or even
life-long retention,” Rohrer and Pashler (2010) suggest, “then previously studied material should be revisited at least a year after the first exposure-- something that happens rather rarely in most educational systems” (p. 409). Therefore, it would be best if Multiliteracies and multimodal composition were integrated in a school district’s curriculum and vertically aligned across grade levels where skills would build upon each other across students’ high school experience.

The way in which Multiliteracies is included in English curriculum matters significantly. In the school district in which this study takes place, “Multiple Literacies,” as it is labeled in the curriculum guide, is separated from the other Essential Objectives-- reading, writing, and speaking and listening. The way this district interpreted multiple literacies is by framing it as reading and writing about a variety of texts from a research perspective. This meant students were required to read a variety of print articles that included graphs and visual representations of data. However, the final assessment students were required to complete involved a research paper solely activating the written mode of expression. If Multiliteracies is not meaningfully integrated into a school district’s curriculum, does not mean that teachers are restricted from including it in their teaching. Teachers can choose to integrate this into their classrooms by themselves, but must be prepared to be purposeful and transparent in their implementation, as I was.

When integrating Multiliteracies into the English classroom, as with anything new, teachers should expect students to experience a certain level of anxiety or apprehension. Having experience integrating technology and new literacies in my classroom prior to this study, I knew to expect this from my students; however, the amount of anxiety I witnessed as they remediated their memoirs was more pervasive than
I anticipated. Students may be comfortable enough expressing this apprehension directly to the teacher, as Harper did, which can afford teachers an opportunity to respond and intervene right away. Others may not report experiencing any anxiety until they are required to reflect on their experience, like Joslyn in her Statement of Goals and Choices. In this case, it would benefit teachers to check in with each student to offer any intervention to help students manage and cope with anxiety and feelings of being overwhelmed. Feelings which are likely to reemerge in conditions of uncertainty in life beyond school. Finally, this anxiety could also cause students to push back and resist the task, as I suspected Joslyn did.

The most common concern students expressed in their Statements of Goals and Choices, and one I echo, is time constraints, with some even reflecting that their project could have been better executed if only they had had more time to complete it. While I teetered between agreeing with students and concluding that some just did not use their time wisely enough, I believe more time would have been beneficial to the community. Ideally, if Multiliteracies and multimodal composition were integrated in the English curriculum throughout the school year, then the issue of time would no longer exist. However, a reality all teachers face is finding time to address all course objectives and standards in what seems like a shrinking amount of time we have with our students. However difficult it may be, there is still need for Multiliteracies instruction in the English curriculum. All three of these considerations are significant in the planning and implementation process, considerations teachers and district curriculum committees need to make.

Future Research
Based on this research, there are several possibilities for future research to be conducted in Multiliteracies and New Literacies Studies. Technology and Multiliteracies integration are still under researched and underrepresented areas of teacher practice. Several studies exist on teachers enacting Multiliteracies and multimodal composition in their own classrooms, and very few of these research projects study students’ perceptions. It is important to see Multiliteracies from a teacher’s perspective, but also just as important to read how students make sense of the same phenomenon. More research needs to be done to understand how students experience Multiliteracies and multimodal composition in the classroom. Even perhaps focusing more on how they interpret their roles as meaning makers, and whether the increased agency is beneficial to their ability to engage with new literacies.

Final Thoughts

A major challenge with integrating technology into teaching and learning is the inevitable pitfalls and obstacles both teachers and students are bound to encounter. Although technology is deictic in nature, as both teachers and students progress through the learning curve and adapt, students’ learning will focus less on the tool and more on the literacies being activated and used. The first two years in the iPad Academy, I felt more like an iPad teacher instead of an English teacher. It was not until Multiliteracies crossed my path that I realized how I could meaningfully leverage this genre of technology in my own previously predominantly monomodal classroom. This study was not about students “learning how to iPad,” but about students purposefully making rhetorical and design choices to express themselves in a new context and setting, as well
as articulating these moves in writing. In her Statement of Goals and Choices, Brielle’s comment personally validated this project for me. She writes,

This whole project was a great experience and probably one of the most in depth one I have ever done. Please I hope you will continue to require students to do this in the future. It has opened my mind up to expressing myself in different ways.

Thank you for this experience (p. 3).

In this study, I wanted to better understand Multiliteracies and multimodal composition and how it can be enacted in my own English classroom; and as a result, I came to better understand myself as a teacher. I am tremendously proud of my students’ accomplishments and willingness to take risks with me in their learning. Consequently, my students came to better understand themselves as writers and meaning makers.
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APPENDIX A

IRB-APPROVED PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

From Literacy to Literacies: Negotiating Multiple Literacies in the English Classroom
Parent Participant Informed Consent Form

IRB# 14840

Purpose:
This research project is aimed at seeking an understanding of how I (Breenne Campbell) can effectively teach the required curriculum focused on print literacy, and incorporate new/digital literacies while integrating iPad technology into my classroom. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a current freshman student of my iPad Academy class.

Procedures:
Signing this consent form allows me to use your child’s classroom assignments for my research. As part of my research, I will use your child’s digital remediated memoirs and his or her Statement of Goals and Choices written reflection. Students will not be asked to do anything outside of normal classroom activities.

Benefits:
There are no direct benefits to you as a research participant.

Risks and/or Discomforts:
There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

Confidentiality:
Any information obtained during this study, which could identify the student, will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be stored in a locked folder on the investigator’s home office computer and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for up to three years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study will be published in a dissertation, and may be published in scholarly journals or presented at academic conferences; however, pseudonyms will be used when referring to specific student work, and any additional potentially identifying information will be removed.

Compensation:
Students and parents/guardians will receive no compensation for participating in this project.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:
You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. Or you may contact the investigator(s) at the phone numbers below. Please contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965 to voice concerns about the research or if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.

Freedom to Withdraw:
Participation in this study is voluntary. You can refuse to have your child participate or withdraw at any time without affecting your child’s grade in my class, you and your child’s relationship with the researcher or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or in any other way receive a penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. In addition, I will not know if you have given consent for your child to participate in this project until after the spring semester of 2015 is complete and grades have been finalized.
Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies that you have decided to give permission for your child to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Parent Consent

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Parent                          Date

Name and Phone number of investigator(s)

Breenne Campbell, MS, Principal Investigator  Office: (402) 293-4150
Guy Trainin, Ph.D., Secondary Investigator   Office: (402) 472-3391
APPENDIX B

IRB-APPROVED STUDENT PARTICIPANT ASSENT FORM

From Literacy to Literacies: Negotiating Multiple Literacies in the English Classroom
Student Participant Informed Assent Form

IRB # 14940

Purpose:
This research project is aimed at seeking an understanding of how J. Brenna Campbell can effectively teach the required curriculum focused on print literacy, and incorporate new/digital literacies while integrating iPad technology into my classroom. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a current freshman student of my iPad Academy class.

Procedures:
Signing this assent form allows me to use your classroom assignments for my research. As part of my research, I will use your digital remediated memoirs and Statement of Goals and Choices written reflection. You will not be asked to do anything outside of normal classroom activities.

Benefits:
There are no direct benefits to you as a research participant.

Risks and/or Discomforts:
There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

Confidentiality:
Any information obtained during this study, which could identify you, will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be stored in a locked folder on the investigator’s home office computer and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for up to three years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study will be published in a dissertation, and may be published in scholarly journals or presented at academic conferences; however, pseudonyms will be used when referring to specific student work, and any additional potentially identifying information will be removed.

Compensation:
Students will receive no compensation for participating in this project.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:
You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. Or you may contact the investigator(s) at the phone numbers below. Please contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6955 to voice concerns about the research or if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.

Freedom to Withdraw:
Participation in this study is voluntary. You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without affecting your grade in my class, your relationship with the researcher or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or in any other way receive a penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. In addition, I will not know if you have given assent to participate in this project until after the spring semester of 2015 is complete and grades have been finalized.

118 Henzlik Hall / P.O. Box 880355 / Lincoln, NE 68588-0355 / (402) 472-2231 / FAX (402) 472-2837
Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Student Assent

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Assent Date

Name and Phone number of investigator(s)

Breanne Campbell, MS, Principal Investigator Office: (402) 293-4150
Guy Trainin, Ph.D., Secondary Investigator Office: (402) 472-3391
December 3, 2014

UNL Institutional Review Board  
Research Compliance Services  
312 N. 14th St. Ste. 209 Alex West  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0408

Dear Review Board Members,

Breanne Campbell submitted a request to conduct her proposed research project, “From Literacy to Literacies: Negotiating Multiple Literacies in the English Classroom”, in Bellevue Public Schools. Following IRB approval, we consent to have her project conducted at Bellevue East High School.

Sincerely,

Kim Bodensteiner  
Executive Director for Teaching & Learning  
Bellevue Public Schools

Cc: Breanne Campbell  
Brad Stueve, Principal
APPENDIX D

UNIT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week and Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1 (Spring Break - No School)</strong>&lt;br&gt;3/30/15-4/3/15</td>
<td>● Students read <em>Night</em> on own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;4/6/15- 4/10/15</td>
<td>● Features of narrative writing; conventions and style of dialogue use  &lt;br&gt;● Discuss how author of <em>Night</em> utilizes it  &lt;br&gt;● Write one-page memoir using dialogue  &lt;br&gt;● Discuss reflective standpoint  &lt;br&gt;● Discuss how author of <em>Night</em> incorporates it into memoir  &lt;br&gt;● Identify reflective standpoint in previously written one-page memoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;4/13/15-4/17/15</td>
<td>● Write in-class narrative essay (3-4 days)  &lt;br&gt;● Introduce Remediated Memoir Project  &lt;br&gt;● Review elements of rhetorical situation (audience, purpose, context, author, genre) (Arola, Sheppard, &amp; Ball, 2014) for Remediated Memoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;4/20/15-4/24/15</td>
<td>● In class: Activities introducing and discussing elements of design (emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, proximity) (Arola, Sheppard, &amp; Ball, 2014)  &lt;br&gt;● If time: students begin work on Remediated Memoir Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;4/27/15-5/1/15</td>
<td>● Students work in class and at home on and finish Remediated Memoir project  &lt;br&gt;● Students work on and finish Statement of Goals and Choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

REMEDIANED MEMOIR STORYBOARD

Remediated Memoir Storyboard
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

From Literacy to Literacies: Negotiating Multiple Literacies in the English Classroom
IRB Project #23170

Post-Interview Questions
Describe your experience.
What are some of the highlights of this project?
What were some challenges you experienced?
What would you do differently next time you teach this unit?
What are your major takeaways from this experience?
What did you learn from your students and your teaching?
### APPENDIX G

**FIELD NOTES TEMPLATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Activities/Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerging Questions/ Categories of Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>