

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 247

CS 217 107

AUTHOR Albright, James
TITLE Not So Sweet Dreams Are Made of These: Cat Massacres and Reading Revolutions in Literacies and Literate Identities. The Problematics of Appropriating New Technologies into English Education.
PUB DATE 2000-04-25
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Mediated Communication; *English Instruction; Grade 8; Higher Education; Junior High Schools; *Literacy; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Author Text Relationship; Chat Rooms; Columbia University NY Teachers College; Interactive Communication; New York City Board of Education; New York (New York Chinatown); Pennsylvania State University; *Technology Integration

ABSTRACT

This paper is particularly concerned with the authorial text with its single, usually male, frequently European, inspired and objective voice. Enabled by a discourse of clarity, a reader of this text may identify with a single author's mind. While much has been done to displace this construct in schools over the last few decades, the paper contends that it still foregrounds dominant assumptions about reading and texts in classrooms. Introducing textual practices associated with what is being called here "new machines for dreaming" provides a possible means of displacing long-lived and preferred literacy practices in schools. People are going through another "leserevolution," a term Rolf Engelsing has coined for a period of intensification brought about by an increased access to texts. The new technologies for dreaming return literate subjects to collaborative makers, users, consumers, and critics of hypermedia, Internet, and similar sorts of visual and interactive texts not unlike the pre-Modernist literacies described in Robert Darnton's "The Great Cat Massacre." The paper focuses on uses of electronic bulletin boards, hypermedia constructions, chat rooms, etc., in teacher education courses at the Pennsylvania State University, Columbia University Teachers College, and elsewhere and on the uses of chat rooms in two eighth-grade classrooms in New York City's Chinatown. (Contains 13 references). (NKA)

Not so Sweet Dreams are Made of These: Cat Massacres and Reading Revolutions in Literacies and Literate Identities; The Problematics of Appropriating New Technologies into English Education.

A paper delivered at the AERA conference. April 25, 2000, New Orleans, LA. by

James Albright, assistant professor of English education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Albright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1

The growing use of new technologies and the many forms of literacy practices that they enable, on the one hand, may be inscribed within the instrumentalist project of schools. They may be employed to promote the ongoing construction of existing preferred literacies and identities. On the other hand, hypertext and multiple forms of Internet use, etc. may be an opening for the perpetuation, revitalization or reawakening, if you will, of literacy practices and identities that have survived on the margins of Modernist school practices. What I am particularly concerned with in this paper is the authorial text with its single, usually male, frequently European, inspired and objective voice. Enabled by a discourse of clarity, a reader of this text may identify with a single author's mind. While much has been done to displace this construct in schools over the last few decades, I contend that it still foregrounds dominant assumptions about reading and texts in classrooms. Introducing textual practices associated with what we are calling here new machines for dreaming, I argue, provides a possible means of displacing long-lived and preferred literacy practices in schools. But, given that schools themselves are social inventions inspired by the Modernist project and steeped in instrumentalist logic, our dreaming may not always be peaceful.

I argue that we are going through another leserevolution, a term Rolf Engelsing has coined for a period of intensification brought about by an increased access to texts (cited in Darnton, 1984, p. 249). Robert Darnton's The great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History (1984) provides an interesting genealogy for theorizing about the problematics of employing new literacies in English or literacy education. Darnton relates the varied literacies of Eighteenth Century France from the disruptive, dialogic and performative literate practices of the lowest Estates to the then new invention of the Modernist text, with its singular authorial voice embodied, for Darnton's "history", in the character of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This paper will argue that our new technologies for dreaming return [L]iterate subjects to collaborative makers, users, consumers and critics of hypermedia, Internet and similar sorts of visual and interactive texts not unlike the pre-Modernist literacies described in "The Great Cat Massacre". Further,

these new literacies and the dreams they allow unsettle dominant Modernist literate practices, texts and subjectivities that have institutionally located in schools. In this paper I have in mind my ongoing interest in the my uses of electronic bulletin boards, hypermedia constructions, chat rooms, etc., in teacher education courses at The Pennsylvania State University, Teachers College, Columbia University and elsewhere, and my research in the uses of chat rooms in two grade eight classrooms in New York City's Chinatown.

The pedagogical import of these studies I believe is to encourage us to work with our students to demonstrate how literacy is plural and integral to subjectivity. I contend that students' critical capacities are more fully engaged when they are invited to consider how literacies may be seen as historical, changeable, and located in social formations such as classes, races, genders, etc., in social sites such as classrooms or cyber space. Working with our students we may see literacies as practiced by social beings, such as students and teachers, who in their daily lives transact these multiple social formations and sites. Schools are sites of struggle where literate practices contest for hegemony within the subjectivities of students and teachers. Wendy Morgan (1997) has argued that these literacies are so familiar that they become a unquestioned normative hybrid of English practices founded on competing aesthetic, ethical, rhetorical and political concerns (p. 17). Annette Patterson (1997) reviews compelling evidence of the persistence of particularly normatively sanctioned 'personalist' literacies in English education. Literacy historians, such as Ian Hunter (1988) provide insights into the genealogy of the common assumptions of English education. Students can study how literate practices are continually at work to construct relations to one another, within and among their users, in what Pierre Bourdieu (1992) would term the contest for social, cultural as well as economic capital whose unstable values are negotiated by various means that are themselves contextualized within and across relatively autonomous fields of social space, education being only one of these.

Yet, this work is not done without a host of persistent and troubling challenges. These challenges require addressing. I would urge that we curb our desire to represent the introduction of new literacies into our classrooms as celebratory stories. Nothing is so simple. Rather, we may best serve our students and ourselves if we focus on the more truly instructive logics of our failures in the practice of our teaching (Albright, 2000).

It is with this understanding in mind that I now turn to Darnton's study of 18th Century French literacies as my example.

Darnton presents his work as a cultural history, a reading of readings (Darnton, 1982, p. 5). He describes it as a tricky and fuzzy history of mentalities, how through their use of oral and written texts individuals within pre-Revolutionary French Estates constructed and invested the world with meaning and feeling (p. 3). He selects to investigate six texts and literacy practices from the rural peasant, urban working, bourgeois, aristocratic, and intellectual classes. In order, from lowest to highest Estates, he deconstructs a fairy tale; a revolt of Parisian print shop laborers in which the casualties were a large number of cats; an anonymous nonfiction description by a middle-class citizen of the provincial city of Montpellier; a police inspector, Joseph Hemery's, report on the book trade, Diderot's encyclopedia, and letters written to Rousseau from his readers. Darnton admits that his is an interested selection of texts put together in order to make a case. But his selection does raise issues for literacy teachers to consider. I will review Darnton's reading of the six texts to point out some of these issues. I will focus on his description of the workers revolt and Rousseau's readers' responses as particularly important for us. And, finally, I will refer to some ongoing studies with which I have been involved recently and what problematics I think they raise regarding shifting dominant Modernist discourses about texts and text practices in English classrooms.

Darnton make a number of important observation about literate practices as he begins is history. One is that, given how texts are appropriated and reappropriated over time and social formations, the usual distinction between elite and popular culture has to be abandoned. His example is Perrault's rewriting of peasants' fairy tales. He notes

the inadequacy of envisaging cultural changes in linear fashion, as a downward seepage of great ideas. Cultural currents intermingled, moving up as well as down, while passing through different media and connecting groups as far apart as peasants and salon sophisticates. ...In the hands of peasants [fairy tales] do not provide morals or deal with abstractions. The show how the world is made and how to cope with it. The world is made of fools and knaves, they say: better to be a knave than a fool. (p. 63, 65)

For students of literacy, Darnton's reading instigates a number of important issues. What do shifts in media do? Perrault's or Grimms' fairy tales are not the same. Nor is the modality of oracy and print literacies. Nor is the telling in the peasant hut or the aristocrat's salon. Yet they commingle. These shorts of shifts happen today inside and outside classrooms as texts of various kinds are brought into them to uneasily co-exist along side the established literary canon and practices. The introduction of new literacy texts and practices can be the basis of a cultural anthropology for students as well as a technical training in their use. Second, Darnton notes that French peasant's fairy tales, a fund of knowledge hoarded over the centuries, while various in details had stable structures, conventions and continuities of form and style (pp. 17-21). Students of literacy may examine new literacy texts and practices for similar patterns in genre and register. Third, Darnton notes that the peasant's fairy tales didn't collapse at the onset of print literacy. How literacies survive, change and flourish alongside one another is another possible area of inquiry for students of literacy (p. 20).

Darnton reads how pre-Revolutionary French peasants viewed their world as harsh, dangerous, arbitrary, amoral, a life conducted under the principle of mistrust (p. 54). In these stories defiance to authority rarely succeeds (p. 58). Fairy tales present themes of humiliation. Darnton argues that even the

Rabelaisian trickster “works within the system, turning its weak points to advantage but ultimately confirming it. Tricksterism [as exemplified in the story of Puss n’ Boots] expressed an orientation to the world that conforms to the world as it is rather than a latent strain of radicalism (p. 59). Here again is an opportunity to study how new literacies help either to reproduce the existing non-virtual world or how play in cyber environments impinge on how we think and act outside them. If the texts of our new times are experienced as more immediate, commercialized, seamless and less bounded, what forms of creative reconstruction are offered by new technologies or are we like our peasant literate forebearers, just given more space in which to reproduce what is already there. Like the fairy tale trickster, the computer hacker, caught and then hired, does little to change established social relations. .

This problem of reproduction in text practices continues in the story of the workers revolt. Darnton’s reading of Nicholas Contat’s apprentice tale underscores the long days, hard and demeaning conditions endured by the French pre-Revolutionary urban working class. Briefly, the great cat massacre isn’t so much the single story of the capture, torture and killing of hundreds of cats, including that of the print shop owners’ wife, by insubordinate and rebellious apprentices and journeymen. Rather it is a report on a set of twenty or more reenactments, a satirical burlesque that was replayed and elaborated overtime. These were fictive reconstructions in which the whole shop participated. What made these reprises so powerful was how they were produced through a rich intertext pulled from the printer’s own craft-based discourse of producing “copies.” This is what the printers called such performative text (p. 77). Also, they called upon their shared histories of recent changes in the relationship of laborer and owner--the commodification of labor from respected artisan partner to itinerant wage earner (p.80). And, they called on the generic repertoire of juridical institutions and cultural ceremonies (p. 101). They derived great satiric force from the narrative symbolism to cats. Cats were the frequent targets of attack during carnivals at the summer solstice that brought good luck in the rest of the year. Cats were associated with witch-hunts and

were also associated with sexual infidelity (pp. 82-3). The enormous symbolic import of the massacre of the cats formed what Darnton calls a “metonymic insult” that required great dexterity to pull off. The performances, a form of pantomime, storytelling, and music demonstrated a sensitive literacy that manipulated symbols as “effectively as poets in print” (p. 101). The performances targeted the bourgeois’ hypocrisy, which formed a separate world from that of the working class, and it aided in constructing their solidarity as printers. They forged a hetroglossic text that linked the killing of the cats to the symbolic trial and execution of their master and mistress. The death of the mistress’s pet along with the other cats assaulted her, as what Darnton calls “the most intimate treasure of the bourgeois household” (p. 99). And the best part of the joke was that it was all lost to the bourgeois who was angered primarily by the loss of production. Darnton writes,

By goading him with catcalls, they provoke him to authorize the massacre of cats, then they used the massacre to put him symbolically on trial for the unjust management of the shop. They also use it as a witch hunt which provides an excuse to kill his wife’s familiar and to insinuate that she herself is a witch. Finally, they transform it into a charivari, which serves as means to insult her sexually while mocking him as a cuckold. (p. 100)

Darnton notes that the great cat massacre only goes so far in forging working class militancy in the decades prior to the French revolution. But it does raise interesting questions about the role the liminal or ludic in critical literacy practices. Wendy Morgan (1997) and others have theorized that we are mobilized by desire and pleasure according to various discourses that speak to us as we speak them. James Gee (1997) has written of how subjectivities are coordinating and being coordinated through discourses. The shaping of literate identities is a complex, partially determined, yet productive interplay of related competing discourse practices. Engaging teachers and students in exploring the how these practices may be pleasurable, productive, socially sanctioned, problematic, etc. could help them realize alternative ways of reading and writing with many forms of texts in their lives. The tactical use of such the postmodern ludic

antics in irony, parody, self-conscious mockery, pastiche, metaphoric play, punning, like Darnton's printers could work to desocialize and denaturalize dominant meanings in social relations. Morgan terms this a practice of questioning within an ethics of care for others (p. 27). Peter McLaren's (1994) reading of the work of Lyotard and DeCerteau sketches the productive employment of ludic poststructuralist tactics in literacy education.

Darnton's readings of the citizen of Montpellier's, the policeman's and the Encyclopedist's texts that follow the story of the great cat massacre, illustrate how the writers of these Estates were beginning to use print texts to impose order in the world. The Montpellier bourgeois reveals a corporate world of complexities and contradictions built on precedence. While he rejects the nobility, he accepts the hierarchical organization of society as natural. His text illustrates an anxiety about the increasing democratization of opportunity of wealth and education (p. 130, 135) that is both a promise in the overthrow the unnatural order of inherited privilege and threat to his place in the newly-emerging and normatively preferred capitalist order. He secures his place by building distinctions, constructing the binarisms of public and private, polite and ill mannered, cultured and savage, industrious and profligate... They are distinctions that set limits in space and morality. The policeman's report attempts to systematize an unruly criminal republic of letters. It constructs common objective psychological profiles of its citizens, from pornographers to intellectuals. Darnton notes that the text predates "the standardizing, pigeonholing, filing-and-classifying drive of the modern bureaucracy" (p. 160). Finally, Darnton represents Diderot's encyclopedia as a supremely Modernist text (p. 191). In classifying and setting up boundaries for knowledge, it is an exercise of power. Borders of knowledge were to be established and policed. The constitution for the state of what can be known and how it can be known, when and by who was proclaimed. Darnton traces the history of pre-Revolutionary Encyclopedists as a series of strategic moves

to wrest control of knowledge from the clergy and to put it into the hands of intellectuals committed to the Enlightenment. But, it was not a neutral ordering of information. Darnton writes

The triumph of this strategy came with the secularization of education and emergence of the modern scholarly disciplines during the nineteenth century. But the key engagement took place in the 1750's, when the Encyclopedists recognized that knowledge was power and, by mapping the world of knowledge, set out to conquer it. (p. 209)

If we accept Darnton's readings of these texts, they present a number of challenges for students and teachers in literacy education. While many of us may avow postmodern stances, we employ text practices and live in institutional relations imbued with this modernist inheritance. We work within disciplines of knowledge that we help to promote and police. And, we may ask how do new technologies both reproduce or contest these relations. We may ask how texts fulfill generic functions that maintain or trouble the ideological constructions outlined in Darnton's reading of history. What new texts and practice may become available to us with the new technologies? How can these be shown to be transmutable across multiple frames of knowing? What are the consequences for others and us when this is done?

Darnton prefaces his study of Rousseau's readers by first asserting that the Enlightenment's success was dependent on imprinting their world view in the minds of the reading public and second the Enlightenment marked a significant shift in how people read. He contends that it is misleading to think that people have always read the way we do today (pp. 215-216). This understanding has profound implications for how we may present reading to our students as a historically changing, socially constituted, and contextualized set of cultural practices. It also how implicates how we consider new technologies are changing the way we read.

Like our own times, pre-Revolutionary France was undergoing a literacy revolution influenced by the advent of mass print literacy. There was an explosion of the availability of print. Darnton notes that the old "typographical consciousness" regarded "books themselves as individuals, each copy possessing its

own character[.] [T]he reader... approached them with care, for he paid attention to the stuff of literature as well as its message (p. 224). Reading was a tactile, physical, and aesthetic experience. The reader possessed the book. The mass production of books and the rapid expansion in the number of readers changed how books were read.

Yet it is important to note that this once dominant literacy practice, did not completely die out. It may be interesting to study how typographical consciousness as an orientation to print texts may yet flourish as a discreet literacy for those who can afford and appreciate rare books or in may coexist in the dispositions of certain English teachers and librarians who may insist that even mass produced texts be handled in respectful ways such as may imply more in the act of reading that the decoding of marks on cheap paper. We might ask: How might this “typographical consciousness” be located in social formations of class, occupation, etc.? How might they have transmuted to literacy practices with other kinds of texts?

Darnton illustrated how Rousseau and others responded and shaped this revolution by proposing to teach audiences how to read. They mentored that with patience and guidance reading teachers should instruct according to the *natural* development of learners’ faculties how to be good. “For reading is a kind of spiritual exercise: It trains one not for literature put for life” (p. 226).

Rousseau, the writer, did more than find readers, he constructed them. In so doing he helped *found* the modern practice of regarding reading a conversation with the author and as the cultivation of the imagination. Rousseau’s writing directs how his readers could approach a book. Guiding them, he instructed his readers to play a certain role in relation to his text, transforming earlier relationships between the reader and the text and the reader and the author. Darnton observes a sea change in the construction of literacy tastes away from the obvious and mechanistic rhetorical practices of neoclassical literature. Rousseau appealed directly to the virtue of a newly lettered mass audience of readers. Connecting to earlier religious reading practices of reading in order to hear the divine word of god, Rousseau resurrects

the author as prophet of truth (p. 228). Disarming his readers, by proposing that they suspend belief, Rousseau promotes a form of literary voyeurism where the writer's crafting of the text is disguised as a form of naturalism (p. 233). I contend that reformulations of these textual relations remain in our classrooms, within our favored teaching practices and embedded within the dispositions of our students and quite possibly ourselves as teachers.

Darnton's reading of Rousseau's fan mail speaks of a faith in the author, who has suffered through the "passions of his characters" and who has fashioned these into truths that transcend literature. The discourse of writer as artist begins. What also begins is what counts as a reading of character. Bronwyn Mellor and Annette Patterson (1991) cite Ian Hunter's historical analysis of the shift in the conditions of reading character between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Older readings of character were not linked to whether they were good or bad, realistic or not. Older readings viewed character as an aspect of rhetorical craft and representation (p. 5-7). Mellor and Patterson note Catherine Belsey's research into the reading of character as a set of different historically constructed practices open to inquiry (p. 7-8).

Rousseau's fan mail reveals in his readers a desire to know whether his characters were "real." They tell him that they identify with his characters. They know his novels to be true because they have experienced the same things in their lives (p. 240). His readers write of the force of the author's personality that is achieved partially through Rousseau's confessional tone. This remains a powerful set of tactics in the politics of textual relations between readers and writers. The text is presented as a window through which clearly shines the author's reality. While Darnton's argues that Rousseau has created a new kind of reader and a new kind of reading, it can be contended that Rousseau creates a new writer as well. It is one who speaks directly and honestly to the ideal reader of the text. "Author and reader triumph[ed] together over the artifice of literary communication" (p. 234).

Part and parcel of the Rousseau's project, Darnton relates, is a shift in the what are considered appropriate subjects for writing. Rousseau's takes up topics that mattered most to his new bourgeois audience. They are what Darnton calls the big events of little lives: love, marriage and parenting. In doing so, Darnton argues that Rousseau completes his project of domesticating literature, reading and readers, through his invention of the pedagogical subject, the child. The student is taught, as are her parents, through the pleasure of the text. He notes that Rousseau's influence is soon after found in textbooks on teaching and reading. We might call it his new technology for sweet dreams.

While Darnton warns us that "reading has assumed too many forms to follow a single course of development," (p. 252) I argue that genealogical (re)readings of historic intensifications in reading practices like that which occurred in pre-Revolutionary France are instructive in how we may better understand what is happening now. As teachers committed to more critical stances in literacy education, these (re)reading may help us contest well-established reading practices that have done little to promote active and resistant textual practices in our classrooms. I will now turn briefly to the some problematics connected to the incorporation of new technologies in English education.

It has been, I think, successfully demonstrated that electronic communication has a strong resemblance to oracy (Florida, Luciano, 1999). I will review how forms of electronic communication are extremely fast and symmetric and share qualities with many forms of talk:

- ♦ paratactic (clauses and phrases appear one after another without connecting words) than hypotactic (clauses and phrases are subordinated).
- ♦ colloquial and telegraphic (using acronyms, e.g. Internet, Modem, IBM, but also ASAP = as soon as possible; BTW = by the way; OTOH = on the other hand; OIC = oh, I see; ROFL = rolling on the floor, laughing; RTFM = read the F. manual; all words formed from the initial letters of other words).

- ♦ technical (using insider vocabulary from the ICT vocabulary, e.g. input/output, interface, hardware/software, etc. and using logograms--symbols that have universal meaning independent of the language employed, such as mathematical and other symbols, &, #, \$, etc. that initiates apprentices into a new argot).
- ♦ Informal (the implicit acceptance of the belief in the speed and closeness of communication, the precedence of content rather than form, e. g. the disregard for formal conventions of standard usage--users tending to write the first person singular pronoun as "I" rather than "I").

Electronic communication mimic other features of oracy, for example:

- ♦ e-mail and chat rooms frequently paraphrase, retrace and echo the previous bits of conversation that is evident in asynchronous form of electronic communication.
- ♦ electronic texts dialogic features such as emoticons--a pictorial element obtained by using a standard keyboard, e.g. 8-) = a person who wears glasses is smiling, an extralinguistic semiotic system of their own, indicating of mood, intonation, pitch, accent that affect meaning and similar to the prosodic features of speech.
- ♦ e-mail and chat rooms have indexical expressions such as "now", "there", "tomorrow," etc. that acknowledge the locutory quality of these forms of communication.

The familiarity and lack of formality of electronic communication has constructed particular contexts of discourse where participants are fully engaged while enjoying the possible privilege of anonymity that may free communication from particular constraints associated with face to face talk. This lack of restraint is augmented in such practices as:

- ♦ flaming--a form of impolite address that can happen in some face to face communications.
- ♦ shouting--which is often done with capital letters.

- ◆ speakers talking over each other--the lack of orderly turn taking as in informal conversations in groups.

Participants are often involved in several conversations simultaneously.

(Floridi, Luciano, 1999, pp. 71-74).

The demonstrated oral quality of written communication in new technologies as well as the noted increase in the allied use of images that commingle within electronic texts I argue form another intensification of the history of literacy. On the one hand they may permit larger scope for performative and critical practices such as that found in the text of the Great Cat Massacre. On the other hand, I argue they open up to question the dominant literacy practices forged during the Enlightenment and have been well taught to us in schools.

My study of exchanges in a preservice teachers class bulletin board demonstrates how students can forge a common text around issues that are pertinent to their studies (Albright, 2000). In constructing this common text no one could claim sole authorship. Students contested this form of categorical voice. The process of this co-construction of the bulletin board was performed in an intertext that is rich in metaphorical play and identity shifting. These exchanges allowed a greater sense of possibility in this virtual space and issues were more up for grabs there than in the classroom. In an initial reading of the data of a study of a collaborative research project involving of three university teacher education classes, in Newfoundland, Alabama and New York City, looking at responses to a common set of texts, one interesting observation has been about how users are able to claim cyber rooms as there own. Some of the students in this study moved beyond the intended pedagogical purpose set up by their three collaborating teacher researchers to construct their own. And some went so far as to contest and reconfigure this virtual space to meet their needs.

My work in two grade eight classroom in New York's Chinatown illustrates how aspects of new technologies are changing the landscape of literacy. These classrooms recently appropriated the use of

chat rooms as a part of their reading and science curricula. Reading the transcripts of these synchronous conversations and interviewing these young teenage students has raised some interesting concerns for their teachers. As Richard Smith and Pamela Curtin (1998) note this type of communication appears on the surface to be typical of chaotic systems and their use seemingly demonstrates highly flexible cognitive abilities and behavior. These students constructed their own chat rooms without teacher instruction, and they operate and maintain them without supervision.

Many have noted that students like these appear to their teachers as "aliens" living at ease in an all-encompassing electronic world such that conventional schooling becomes anachronistic (Bill Green and Chris Bigum, 1993; Richard Smith and Pamela Curtin 1998). These students are on line an average of two or more hours a day. Their literacy practices are well removed from their working class immigrant parents and their teachers. It has been argued that "the notion on 'alien' is likely to be short-lived... and the differences between youth culture and the parental culture have disappeared. ...Emergent cultural forms and practices have distinctiveness of their own and are foreshadowing a different society to that which triggered the changes (Richard Smith and Pamela Curtin, 1998, p. 223). These students live in a cyber culture that harkens to the collaborative play in Darnton's printers' workshop. It is personable, intimate, constantly refashioning itself from what is available and not fully understood by those outside of it (p. 215).

Beyond issues regarding access and differentials in how particular groups of students use new technologies, studies like the ones I have sketched here raise a number of formidable problematics that displace conventional modernist-schooled literacy education. They are:

- ◆ how to appreciate and contend with the widening variety of narrative and textual possibilities
- ◆ how to appreciate new possibilities of meanings for texts within expanded cultural diversity and hybridity.

- ◆ how do schools remain relevant for students who seemingly learn what they want, when they want.
how they want, without schools.
- ◆ how do schools help students understand the social and economic contests over new literate technologies and information.
- ◆ how can educators keep pace with new forms and means of electronic representation, especially if they are not apart of the new and evolving cyber-culture. Students' uses of mediated texts appear to be evolving faster than researchers and theorists can note in academic journals, books and teaching in universities.

My ongoing research with these grade eight students presents some particular problematics when literacy educators in schools attempt to extend the boundaries of the discipline towards the frontiers of new technologies and cultural critique. These generally immigrant, working class students and their families place great store in education and in electronic communications. Their hope is that both will lead to greater social mobility. But as these students navigate their cyber world they encounter a decentering cultural landscape no longer caught in the grip of a technology of print, closed narrative structures, or the certitude of a secure economic future. The new emerging technologies that construct and position youth represent interactive terrains that cut across "language and culture, without narrative requirements, without character complexities... Narrative complexity [has given] way to design complexity; story [has given] way to sensory environment" (Parkes, 1994, p. 50). Their teachers' appropriation and intervention into students use of synchronous chat programs, motivated in part by a modernist desire to improve traditional progressivist reading instruction did not fully appreciate the differences in literate experiences between classroom journaling and book talks and the chronological scrolling of simultaneous conversations on a computer screen. Nor could did they anticipate how printed transcripts of such conversations could be read and evaluated. They have come to see the students' use of chat rooms as performances. As such these

performances remind their teachers and me that new technologies transform consciousness. On the one hand, the transcripts from these chat rooms can not be definitive versions of the students' experiences just as the score of a piece of music is not the music heard when played. The reading and evaluation of printed versions of the chat room texts has been deeply uncertain. The notion that there is a coherent subject of communication has been disrupted, and the fiction of a single authorial student 'voice,' has become questionable. Raul Sanchez (1999) notes that in the narrow bandwidth of media like chat rooms "participants are forced to raise their level of interpretive engagement, creating and absorbing maximal meaning from minimal symbology" (p. 100). This quality of cyber texts makes them very problematic in traditional pedagogies.

Like the performative "copies" produced by the Eighteenth Century Parisian printers of "The Great Cat Massacre" these forms of cybertexts do not exist for publication but as a catalyst for some kind of temporary and communal synthesis. Definitive reconstructions of these cybertexts for purposes of interpretation, evaluation and assessment have been impossible as no one student was ever in full control of the production and consumption of these texts. Yet, the students have attempted to control the dialogic and simultaneous nature of the medium by appropriating a teacherly discourse pattern within the context of being chat room moderators. Curiously, IRE (Initiation, Response, and Evaluation) patterns that dominate classroom talk are often reproduced in these texts. Yet again, many student have adopted troubling chat room identities such as "Cute Asian Boy." Drawing chat room technology, cyber culture and discourse into the framework of a pedagogical project has reshaped it. It has become a hyperglossic melange of both.

Beth E. Kolko (1999) has noted that these new literacies "raise the stakes in students' literacy acts ...because the online self is dispersed, fragmented, and multiple. The question of accountability is left dangling" (p. 65). These grade eight students meet and work everyday in class and in cyber space. The postings do reveal a rich interweaving of their identities inside and outside of school. I argue that while

these students played school in cyber space but they also know where they were. Their classroom, home and cyber identities exist bodily in relation to each other and consequently shift and position each other as they navigate these spaces. As Kolko observes it has become more difficult for teachers to address cyber-students as responsible rhetors. In earlier times it was easier to maintain the Enlightenment fiction that these students, like Rousseau, were the sole and controlling authors of their texts. While these students' cyberselves were being appropriated back into the classroom, the immediacy of new technologies and "the vivid sense of presence" may help teachers and students develop an awareness and an analysis of the rhetorical nature of the interaction, making the link between the writing and identity, writing and the effect. The performative nature of these literacies may revitalize the notion of the body as a social machine, a social creation and physiological hypertext, that is different in different contexts for these students.

Students' incipient awareness of these multiple positionings of subjectivities and the heteroglossic nature of their texts have allowed for performative breaks within the hegemonic structures of school texts and practices. I have found evidence of this in my research of students playing and 'working' the teacher through bulletin boards in teacher education classes (Albright, 2000). There have been instances when the grade eight students' adoption of classroom repertoires and voices has gone beyond reproduction to play with breaks and reversals in a form of discursive resistance to them. My future collaborative research with their teachers aims to illicit specific demonstrations and analysis of these disruptive moments in their students' literate practices. I see these as points at which issues related to the plural nature of literacy, identity and power may be opened up for inquiry.

Our particular lever revolution brought on by these new machines for dreaming that spontaneously mix the textual features of speech, writing, sound and images may allow for a return to a performative awareness of discourse and to a new poetics--one that is at least as rich, social and

transformative as Darnton's printers. Perhaps the problematics related to the appropriation of new technologies into Modernist school practices will continue the work of destabilizing and troubling the social and cultural assumptions that they support. These may not be machines for sweet dreaming. As Linda Laddo and David Reinking (1999) have observed in the recent millennial issue of Reading Research Quarterly, "Our orientation to technology and its implications for literacy continually change as technology and its uses advance rapidly, often undermining long-standing assumptions and perspectives that have arisen from print-based literacy" (p. 479).

Bibliography:

Byrd, Don and Derek Owens. (1998). Writing in the Hivemind. In Todd Taylor and Ward Irene, (Eds). Literacy in the Age of the Internet. New York: Columbia University Press.

Castells, Manuel. (1999) Flows Networks, Identities: a critical theory of the information society. In Castells, Manuel, Ramon Flecha, et al. (Eds.). Critical Education in the new Information Age. London: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Floridi, Luciano. (1999) Philosophy and Computing: An introduction. New York: Routledge.

Garner, Ruth and Mark G. Gillingham (1996) Internet Communication in six Classrooms: Conversations across Time, Space, and Culture. Mahway, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Green, Bill and Chris Bigum. (1993). Aliens in the Classroom. Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 37, No. 2. pp. 119-141.

Kolko, Beth E. (1998). We are not just Electronic Words: Learning the Literacies of Culture, Body and Politics. In Todd Taylor and Irene Ward, (Eds.). Literacy in the Age of the Internet. New York: Columbia University Press.

Laddo, Linda and Reinking, David (1999) Negotiating the multiple realities of technology in literacy

research and instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 34. pp. 478-502.

McLaren, Peter. (1999). Introduction. In Castells, Manuel, Ramon Flecha, et al. (Eds.). Critical Education in the new Information Age. London: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Sanchez, Raul. (1998). Our Bodies? Our Selves? Questions About Teaching in the MUD In Todd Taylor and Irene Ward. (Eds.). Literacy in the Age of the Internet. New York: Columbia University Press.

Semali, Ladislaus, and Ann Watts Paillott. (Eds.). (1999). What is Intermediality. In Intermediality: The Teacher's Handbook of Critical Medial Literacy. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Smith, Richard and Pamela Curtin. (1998). Children, computers and life online: education in a cyber world. In Ilana Snyder. (Ed.). Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era. London: Routledge. pp. 211-233

Snyder, Ilana. (Ed.). (1998). Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era. London: Routledge.

Taylor, Todd and Irene Ward, (Eds.). (1998). Introduction. Literacy in the Age of the Internet. New York: Columbia University Press.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

CS 217 107

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Not so Sweet Dreams are Made of These! Cat Massacres and Reading Revolutions in Literacies and Literate Identities; the Problematics of Appropriating New Technologies into English Education</i>	
Author(s): <i>Jim Albright</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>April 25, 2000</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA* FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1

↑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>James Albright</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>James Albright Ass. Prof of Eng. Education</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Box 80 Teachers College Columbia University</i>	Telephone: <i>212 678 3213</i>	FAX: <i>212 678 4648</i>
<i>525 W 120th St. New York NY 10027</i>	E-Mail Address: <i>ja469@colombia.edu</i>	Date: <i>May 29, 2000</i>



(over)



Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation

University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742-5701

Tel: (800) 464-3742
(301) 405-7449
FAX: (301) 405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
<http://ericae.net>

May 8, 2000

Dear AERA Presenter,

Hopefully, the convention was a productive and rewarding event. As stated in the AERA program, presenters have a responsibility to make their papers readily available. If you haven't done so already, please submit copies of your papers for consideration for inclusion in the ERIC database. We are interested in papers from this year's AERA conference and last year's conference. If you have submitted your paper, you can track its progress at <http://ericae.net>.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the **2000 and 1999 AERA Conference**. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form enclosed with this letter and send **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can mail your paper to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 2000/ERIC Acquisitions
 University of Maryland
 1129 Shriver Laboratory
 College Park, MD 20742

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

ERIC is a project of the Department of Measurement, Statistics & Evaluation