Spring 2022

Mobility Work in Composition

Meng-Hsien (Neal) Liu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/communityliteracy

Mobility Work in Composition

Edited by Bruce Horner, Megan Faver Hartline, Ashanka Kumari, and Laura Sceniak Matravers
University Press of Colorado, 2021, pp.242

Reviewed by Meng-Hsien (Neal) Liu
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Our world is no stranger to mobilities, ranging from molecular movement in ecological systems to quotidian economic transactions and social interactions to transnational voyages across continents. Thus, readers of the *Community Literacy Journal* (*CLJ*) are sure to be engaged by this eclectic addition to the current scholarship on mobilities work, with the construct of mobility emerging as a central theoretical idea that underpins the epistemological and methodological premises of many disciplines, including that of cultural geography, feminist studies, critical race theory, queer studies, and composition and rhetoric. With a universalizing and broad focus on composition-in-mobility, this edited collection—organized in two sections across which all the contributing authors unpack and articulate the *mobile* nature of mobility and composition—answers the central question of what constitutes and sustains mobility in our divergent, diverse, literate activities and practices. The volume editors—Horner, Hartline, Kumari, and Matravers—advance a *mobilities paradigm* to further unpack the dynamic constitution of mobility in composition and rhetoric and to cast a norm-based light on mobility-in-composition work (3). In particular, rather than treat mobility as a matter "requiring adjustment or accommodation", Horner et al. argue that the proposition of mobility as a commonplace or even as a fact is long overdue (4–6). One hallmark that characterizes this paradigm is that mobilities are poly-faceted forms, whose social value is mercurial, relational, and provisional (4–6). This critical premise holds the potential to shift our perspective of viewing language, composition, writing-curriculum administration, writing pedagogy, or writing research as impermeable to perceiving them as fruitfully unsteady and potentially subject to transformation.

As the volume addresses the nature of mobility in composition, the organization of the twenty chapters—divided into Part I where case studies in mobility-in-composing-practices (e.g., community literacy, translingual composition, or digital and professional writing) are reported and Part II where critical responses to Part I are articulated—also attempts to reflect on the nature of mobility, with each chapter conversing

with another chapter for a never-ceasing *reworking* of the mobility work through mobilized disciplinary expertise (11). This edited volume offers an outstanding balance between theoretical interventions and pragmatic uptakes of *a mobilities-paradigm* to reveal a kaleidoscopic tapestry of how mobility characterizes and can be mobilized in our everyday literate lives, writing research practices, composition pedagogies, or WPA work.

In "Mobile Knowledge for a Mobile Era: Studying Linguistic and Rhetorical Flexibility in Composition," Christiane Donahue yokes the mobilities paradigm to writing knowledge transfer and adaptation, which leads to a view of communicative competence in a mobile world that involves a dialogic co-construction of meaning- and knowledge-making. According to Donahue, knowledge mobility—in tandem with knowledge transfer—is not marked by a static movement from one point to another; rather, it is always transformed through interrelated, yet not-so-neatly-nested, processes (22–23). With a specific focus on language-in-use or composing practices, Donahue further adopts a translingual disposition to highlight the problematics of mobilizing discrete linguistic systems as extractable units of analysis. Thus, terms such as *code* and *competence*—which are often abstracted as stable and interaction-void—must be reworked. For instance, based on Bakhtin's formulation, codes only become meaningful when uttered and turned into (unstable) bits of signs that are in constant contact with one another and "that combine and recombine in an unending transformative mobile activity of production of *utterances*" (27). Through the lens of codes-beyond-fixity, Donahue observes that we could further reconceptualize our approach to (translingual) knowledge competence in terms of mobility; specifically, Donahue articulates that terms such as 'communicative competence' or 'situated competence' all similarly point to the socially situated and discursive nature of knowledge making, adaptation, and transfer. Mobile competence enabled by transfer is thus characterized as flexible, relationally oriented, and partial (28–30).

As Ann Shivers-McNair argues in "Marking Mobility: Accounting for Bodies and Rhetoric in the Making," (im)mobility—in the sense of boundary demarcation—is marked such that the politics of mobility entangles many facets of our bodily and linguistic performance (37). Extending the concept of 'diffraction' (Barad 2007) in theorizing differences, Shivers-McNair delineates that 'diffraction' compels us to understand (im)mobility as both markedly relational and experiential in our knowledge-making practices. More important to the politics of mobility—through the lens of diffraction—are questions of inclusion and exclusion in our research methodologies, apparatuses, and spaces; thus, what matters and figures into our methodological approaches informs the ways in which our epistemologies are formulated (40). Shivers-McNair's illustration of one mobility-marking moment is a multi-year ethnographic case study of a makerspace in Seattle—where she interacted briefly with the founder of the makerspace who was engaging in laser cutting—sheds light on how her role as a participant, interviewer, and observer (which she calls 3-D interviewing) was marked by the (im)mobilities of bodies, machines, materials, networks, ideas, and exchanges in that particular space and moment. Specifically, Shivers-McNair describes that this fleeting moment of interaction, documented through a camera worn on her head, pro-

pels her to 'diffract' this seemingly banal and linear experience with movements and mobilities that precede and ensue the interaction (45–46). In chapter 16, Kumari integrates Shivers-McNair's 3-D interviewing and diffraction practices with Scenters-Zapico's "Small m to Big M-Mobilities" model. Kumari also discusses the critical implications of the 3-D interviewing and "Small m- to Big M-Mobilities" model to consider how we could explicate and attune to unaccounted-for dimensions or alternative perspectives in our space-making and how such a process may inform our research roles vis-à-vis participants, objects, materials, and times and spaces (199–200).

In "Small m- to Big M-Mobilities: A Model," John Scenters-Zapico advances the paradigm of small m-mobility and Big M-Mobilities to describe complex professional movements. Specifically, Scenters-Zapico had spent more than a decade working as a writing program administrator (WPA) at the University Texas, El Paso (UTEP) and performing responsibilities in the program prior to quitting the job and undertaking another WPA role at California State University, Long Beach. Drawing on the key hallmark of mobility that is posited as active emplacement, Scenters-Zapico investigates how composition classrooms and programs are often rendered static by institutions. Scenters-Zapico lists three stages that culminate a small m-mobility paradigm as follows: 1) the envisioning of mobility stages, where professional advancement is planned and chronicled; 2) the positioning of contingent and emergent events that serve as anchors to understand the flow and immobility of professional experiences; 3) the consideration of inertia (57). Utilizing the three components of small m-mobility, Scenters-Zapico narrates his dissatisfaction at UTEP, accounting for how some contingent and emergent events of and encounters with institutional leaders dampened his vision for the writing program. Moreover, UTEP was further plagued by a lack of sufficient funding and other institutional hardships. The friction at UTEP was complicated by institutionally imposed delays by administrative superiors who, according to Scenters-Zapico, demonstrated indifference to or strategic avoidance of Scenters-Zapico's requests for more funding, hiring of more writing center tutors, and other programmatic assistance. Scenters-Zapico describes that he was kept "in a state of professional statis or inertia" by the UTEP administration (62). In short, Scenters-Zapico's invocation of a paradigm of small m-mobility—to account for his professional experiences with UTEP's administration—showcases the complicated, socially endowed, and constructed meanings of mobilities.

In "Managing Writing on the Move," Rebecca Lorimer Leonard traces the literacy practices of a multilingual immigrant, Nimet, and unpacks the movement of Nimet's literacy practices pre- and post-immigration in relation to institutions. Specifically, Lorimer Leonard attempts to understand how a lived literacy, when it is defined through mobility and the (in)equalities that accompany it, is *paced* by differing social institutions which attempt to expedite or stall literacy practices and developments. By contrasting Nimet's literacy experiences in the pre-immigration time with those in her post-immigration time, Lorimer Leonard discovers divergent attitudes showcased by institutions toward literacy movement of a multilingual speaker/writer and strategies for this multilingual speaker/writer to maneuver around the roadblocks. Nimet, according to Lorimer Leonard, had been teaching English to local students and teachers in Azerbaijan prior to her movement to the United States (69). During her teaching

career in Azerbaijan, she had managed to circumvent the government-mandated language-and-literacy curriculum that focused solely on reading and writing and diminished the importance of speaking and listening (70). Thus, Nimet founded an Azerbaija English Teachers Association to integrate a more well-rounded language curriculum that permitted more teacher collaborations and more diverse pedagogical practices and materials, such as visual aids. Nimet also organized several initiatives and projects to garner funds for the Association, moving towards a more self-controlled and self-paced literacy development for herself, her students, and her fellow teachers. After her immigration to the U.S., Nimet registered in a nursing program that demanded quick "English-based writing skills," which Nimet had never experienced before (74). Lorimer Leonard attributed Nimet's experiences of feeling stalled in writing in English, in the U.S., to not only a linguistic factor but to an institutional one. Lorimer Leonard reports that Nimet's multilingual capacity was deemed to be a detriment to her progress in the nursing program, which, according to another participant of the study—Paj—used Nimet's multilingualism as an excuse to sideline her and other international nursing students. For Nimet, the stalling of her literacy development included not only extra costs and an extended timeframe, but misguidance. She was required to take additional ESL courses that did not fruitfully improve her English ability (79). Lorimer Leonard concludes that literacy agency can be "slippery and highly contingent on the conditions that greet mobile literacy upon arrival" (77). Lorimer Leonard's research on Nimet's transnational literacy experiences illuminates that literacy is controlled and negotiated by different agents, entities, and material constraints.

Carmen Kynard in "'Pretty for a Black Girl': AfroDigital Black Feminisms and the Critical Context of 'Mobile Black Security,'" lends critical insight into how colorism works and is subverted. Specifically, Kynard describes the practice of 'cultural-spatial contouring' to spotlight how one of her students—Andrene (who had had little web design experience prior to taking Kynard's course)—used linguistic resources, narratives, images, video clips, and artifacts to build a website ("Pretty for a Black Girl") to express her skill as a rhetorician and to critically depart from white academic conventions (86–87). Andrene's multimedia 'blackscape' highlights her "full range" of "rhetorical savvy" (164).

Scott Wible in "Composing to Mobilize Knowledge: Lessons from a Design-Thinking-Based Writing Course" examines how textual practices—in the design thinking process—get re-articulated into problem (re)definitions, solution ideation, and knowledge transformation in professional writing courses. Mobilizing design thinking as a recursive and iterative knowledge-in-mobilization process, Wible showcases the steps his professional writing students took to help new faculty members better adapt to a new professional environment. Wible had his students engage in diverse textual genres (e.g., empathy maps, Post-it brainstorming notes, interview transcripts, and research field notes) to craft point-of-view (POV) statements to not only acquaint themselves with the empirical research process but also to work iteratively through the five phases of design thinking: "empathetically researching, defining, ideating, prototyping, and testing" (99). Through the use of POV statements and a knowledge-mobilization paradigm, Wible grounds his pedagogical interventions in the politics of mobility (109).

These interventions are inclusive of, but not limited to, questions such as how to incorporate more humanistic and ethnographic research processes that can be better aligned with (local) community needs, as evidenced through Wible's observation of how his students interacted with the local campus environment and the community members therein. Wible concludes that "[b]y critically engaging with design thinking methods as knowledge mobilization work," writing studies scholars, teachers, and students can further their understandings of and approaches to the ways in which mobile writing and knowledge making can positively support local community needs (110).

In "Rethinking Past, Present, Presence: On the Process of Mobilizing Other People's Lives," Jody Shipka articulates that agencies and collaborations in composition are not the province of humans; rather, they are distributed across both humans and nonhumans. Shipka focuses on the mobility of a deceased couple's (Dorothy and Fred's) collection. Shipka, whose increasing familiarity with Dorothy and Fred's collection had stabilized and sedimented her perceptions of the collection, initiated the "Inhabiting Dorothy" project to "remobilize the potentials of this collection" and to see how interpretations of this collection could be expanded (115). The "Inhabiting Dorothy" project asked participants to engage in collaboration to articulate the relationship between materials, bodies, affects, and most importantly, the past, the present, and the future. Through this project, Shipka argues that it is necessary to view mobility as both distributed and variegated, with the composing process being conceptualized not only as pertinent to the production of the present moment but also as relevant to the past and the future.

In "Imagine a School Year," Eli Goldblatt draws on the notion of networked literacy sponsorship to trace and understand the movement of the Cecil B. Moore School schoolyard redevelopment plan, which was initially devised as an afterschool literacy center for children and their parents to engage "both academic and imaginative reading and writing" (130). Rather than glorify the emancipatory capacity of literacies as taken-for-granted, Goldblatt forwards the argument that literacies can be constrained, encouraged, or qualified by sponsors whose collective power, which Goldblatt remains cautiously optimistic about, provides a hopeful and promising picture, or even a necessary social-justice orientation towards community literacy development (143). Although Goldblatt's articulation of a networked sense of literacy sponsorship serves as a critical entry point for community literacy scholars to draw upon, several questions remain unanswered. For example, Hartline states that Goldblatt's explication of the process—from problem identification to solution design—remains somewhat occluded (186).

This edited volume is by no means comprehensive, and some chapters are more descriptive than applied; however, as Horner et al. cogently describe, the aim of the editors is to offer differing perspectives and engagements through which a *mobilities paradigm* may be useful to composition researchers and teachers, especially given that the paradigm is still relatively new (11). This edited volume provides multiple entry points for *CLJ* readers to explore what mobility could mean in our research, teaching, activist work, and everyday encounters.

Works Cited

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke UP, 2007.