11-2017

"She's Definitely the Artist One": How Learner Identities Mediate Multimodal Composing

James S. Chisholm
University of Louisville

Andrea R. Olinger
University of Louisville, andrea.olinger@louisville.edu

"She's Definitely the Artist One": How Learner Identities Mediate Multimodal Composing

James S. Chisholm
Andrea R. Olinger
University of Louisville

Multimodal composing can activate literacy practices and identities not typically privileged in verbocentric English classrooms, and students' identities as particular kinds of learners (e.g., "visual artist") may propel—or limit—their engagement in classroom work, including in multimodal composing. Although researchers have studied the ways multimodal projects can evidence literacy learning and have argued that identity is negotiated, improvisational, and hybrid, they have offered few sustained analyses of the processes by which identities evolve during and across multimodal composing tasks. By examining how students position themselves and one another as particular kinds of learners over time, researchers can better understand the ways in which multimodal tasks help students explore new skills and roles or reify old ones. Drawing on an approach to discourse analysis from the linguistic anthropology of education, we trace the pathways of three 12th graders' learner identities across two events as they worked in a group to compose visual responses to literary texts for their English class. We examine how one student's robust identity as an artist emerged in tandem with the devaluing of other participants' artist identities. Seven weeks later, these positionings led her to act as the painting's primary author and other students to act in increasingly perfunctory ways. We call for teachers and researchers to consider how students' identities—interacting with factors such as the teacher's expectations for group work and the affordances of particular media and materials for collaboration—drive students' participation in and ownership of multimodal compositions.

Case studies of multimodal composing have highlighted the ways multimodal projects can promote literacy learning (e.g., Hull & Katz, 2006; Miller & McVee, 2012) and help students generate and express meanings potentially unavailable in other modes (e.g., Zoss, 2009). Because such activities extend the modes through which students co-construct meaning in interaction (Siegel, 1995), students can perform and ascribe to others learner identities not typically available in verbocentric secondary English classrooms (e.g., "a visual artist"). Designers of multimodal tasks and curricula for teachers and students should, as a result, be interested in how learner identities shape students' work and participation. Yet although accounts of identity in adolescent literacy view it as negotiated and hybrid (e.g.,

Lewis & del Valle, 2009), few have traced how students' identities, triggered by multimodal tasks, influence students' participation in the process of composing. The literature abounds with analysis of students' multimodal texts but reveals less about the coproduction of texts and identities from moment to moment and over time (Prior & Hengst, 2010). How do students' shifting and cementing learner identities—co-constructed by individuals, classmates, and teachers—shape their collaborative multimodal composing? How do enactments of identity affect students' participation in and sense of ownership of the group's products?

To explore these questions, we employ an approach to discourse analysis from the linguistic anthropology of education (Wortham & Reyes, 2015). We examine how one student's robust identity as an artist emerged in tandem with the devaluing of other participants' artistic identities. Over time, these stabilized positionings led the student to act as the primary author of the painting and the other group members to act in increasingly perfunctory ways. Our findings call for educators to consider the processes whereby multimodal composing unfolds, the identities privileged and/or marginalized during multimodal tasks, and the collaboration dynamics during student-led instructional activities.

Identity and Multimodality in Literacy and Composition Research

Literacy researchers have conceptualized identities as stable and dynamic, unified and hybrid (e.g., Beach, Johnston, & Thein, 2015; Beach, Thein, & Parks, 2007). The fact that individuals may inhabit multiple, hybrid identities can be seen as "a positive construction, rather than a source of crisis" (McCarthey & Moje, 2002, p. 237). Similarly, we theorize identity as both ephemeral and shifting as well as enduring and stabilizing. In this study, we understand identity through the metaphor of "positioning" (Moje & Luke, 2009).

Identity-as-positioning accounts for the "layering" of identities that occurs over time as a result of positionings, but it holds open the possibility that identities "can be stripped away, reapplied, nicked, scratched, or even gouged" (Moje & Luke, 2009, p. 430). Using language and other semiotic resources, we position ourselves and others as certain types of people—as recognizable members of some groups and not others (Gee, Allen, & Clinton, 2001)—and these temporary positions can be treated (by self and/or others) as if they were stable (Hall, 1996). Over time, particular identities may congeal, and others may dissipate. In addition, identities are not equally received in institutions such as schools, where academic identities like the "good student" tend to be privileged over nonacademic identities (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). It is important, as a result, to examine identities within and across contexts, as they are "enacted (in time) and placed (in space)" (Lewis & del Valle, 2009, p. 318).

Identity constructions and performances are inherently multimodal. Even written texts, which may seem to be solely linguistic, are "visually designed" (New London Group, 1996, p. 81). Human interaction more generally depends on the "simultaneous, layered deployment of multiple semiotics (talk, gesture, artifact use and production, interaction with environmental structure)" (Prior & Hengst,

2010, p. 19). Not only are all texts multimodal, then, but so is the process by which those texts are produced—involving, for example, talking and gesturing with colleagues, sketching a diagram, scribbling notes, typing on a laptop, and taking inspiration from music. Research on multimodality in literacy and composition, however, tends to focus on the study of textual artifacts (although see, e.g., Prior, 2010; Shipka, 2011). In this article, we use Lutkewitte's (2014) definition of multimodal composition, "communication using multiple modes that work purposely to create meaning" (p. 2), to describe not just textual artifacts but also the processes involved in their production and interpretation.

In what follows, we consider research at the intersection of multimodal composing, collaboration, and identity. We review the benefits of multimodal activities for developing literate identities, discuss the dynamics of collaborative group work in classrooms, and argue for the importance of capturing multimodal composing processes. Through this survey, we demonstrate the need for research on how learner identities emerge and evolve over time in contexts of collaborative multimodal composing.

Identities in Literacy Learning and Transmediation

Many literacy researchers study multimodality through the concept of transmediation. The process by which learners recast meanings across sign systems (Siegel, 1995), transmediation can generate new interpretations potentially unavailable within any given sign system (Whitin, 2005). Because sign systems have different meaning potentials, each can function to mediate new understandings about texts, and researchers have demonstrated that transmediation can enrich students' textual interpretations and reflective practices (e.g., Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear, & Leu, 2008).

Multimodal tasks that promote transmediation often elicit generative identity enactments from students. In her ethnographic study of preschool children's play, for example, Rowe (1998) found that children who used dramatic play to transmediate their understandings of a book about paleontologists were able to imagine new identities for themselves. Reading led the children to innovate during play by describing new uses for playground tools (e.g., using a shovel to dig for bones). Additionally, after acting as a paleontologist on the playground, one girl, rereading the book with the researcher, "pointed to one of the characters with longer hair and said 'That's me! That's a girl!'" (Rowe, 1998, p. 30). The result was that "children were different readers after play and different players after reading" (Rowe, 1998, p. 30). These new learner identities emerged from the transmediation activities. Depending on the task, transmediation may also promote identities not typically privileged in classrooms. Scholars should, as a result, consider how social interactions during classroom transmediation activities can shape the identities that students perform and are ascribed. In particular, small-group collaborative work can be a rich site for studying these identity shifts.

Identities in Collaboration

Although often hailed for their capacity to shift power and authority from teachers to students, collaborative groups can recreate the same marginalized identities that they were meant to disrupt (Evans, 2011). Research has documented how these

configurations can empower and disempower students along lines of gender and class (e.g., Clarke, 2006), introduce them to conceptions of collaborative authorship (e.g., Ede & Lunsford, 1990), and allow them to (re)create (and suppress) identities as they adopt new roles (e.g., Lewis, 2001). In addition, research has examined how gender ideologies shape how students compose (e.g., Davies, 2003) and the embodied ways they do so (e.g., Wolfe, 2005).

Whether and how a group shares power depends, partly, on teacher and student assumptions about and expectations for group work. To understand how group members' purposes and practices inform collective composition, Yancey and Spooner (1998) integrate Ede and Lunsford's (1990) concepts of dialogic and hierarchical orientations toward small-group work with Smith's (1994) distinction between collaboration and cooperation. Dialogic approaches foster *collaboration*, which requires ongoing dialogue among authors whose contributions shape and are shaped by the emerging composition. Hierarchical approaches, in contrast, promote *cooperation*, whereby each group member completes a portion separate from the whole. Whereas Ede and Lunsford (1990) privilege dialogic over hierarchical interactions, Yancey and Spooner (1998) note that both collaborative and cooperative approaches can be productive, depending on the writers' contexts. Of course, no group functions only by collaborative or cooperative principles; identity construction and power dynamics, as we show below, continually shift and "[depend] on moment-to-moment performances" that are nonetheless "embedded in sociocultural conditions and contexts" (Lewis, 2001, p. 181). Because of the new learner identities that multimodal composing may elicit, such identity shifts may be especially visible when a small group works together on such a task.

Identities in Multimodal Composing

Research at the intersection of multimodality, composing, and identity has tended to analyze students' products more than the processes of production and/or reception (see, e.g., McVee, Bailey, & Shanahan, 2008). Bailey (2012), for instance, describes how a multimodal poetry project gave Helena, a ninth grader, the space to interpret Emily Dickinson's poem "Conferring with Myself" by connecting meanings from the text with visual representations of Helena's identity. The visual identity artifacts (e.g., Christian imagery, antidrug signs) were imposed upon a series of question marks, reflecting Helena's "active search for a way to articulate exactly who she is" (Bailey, 2012, p. 58). Such an analysis shows how the project helped Helena express her identities and generate new meanings about the poem. For deeper insight into the identities constructed by, but invisible in the multimodal artifact, however, it would be helpful to access the process by which Helena orchestrated semiotic resources, made choices about what to include, and discussed her project with classmates.

As we noted, multimodal composition has tended to be examined as an artifact, not a process. Indeed, in literacy, composition, applied linguistics, and anthropology, few studies on multimodal composing processes have both considered collaborative groups and provided situated analyses of identity construction in interaction. Research has highlighted how different groups of writers coordinate semiotic resources as they compose multimodal texts, but has not necessarily fore-

grounded the identity enactments that take place during group work (e.g., Ranker, 2014). Conversely, research on identity construction during collaborative literacy activities has centered on small-group discussions (e.g., Lewis, 2001), whole-class discussions (e.g., Leander, 2002), and collaborative writing (e.g., Olinger, 2011) but not on the composing of multimodal texts. And while rich, process-focused analyses of students' multimodal compositions have illuminated how individual identities are indexed in texts (e.g., Vasudevan, Schultz, & Bateman, 2010), these analyses have concentrated on single authors and backgrounded the collaborative and distributed nature of composing. Our study extends this literature by focusing on the shifting and cementing of identities during collaborative multimodal composing over time.

Microanalyses of discourse within speech events in language and literacy classrooms have revealed how agency, identity, and power are constructed (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Lewis et al., 2007). However, few of these analyses have looked across events to study how identity stabilizes and shifts (see, however, Leander, 2002; Wortham, 2005). We align our theoretical and methodological framework with Wortham and Reyes (2015), who argue that the complex processes involved in identity work necessitate analytical attention at multiple points in time. They reason that since learning and socialization occur over time and across occasions and scales (Lemke, 2000), analyses of these processes should account for the ways in which some identities may endure whereas others may be more fleeting. With these possibilities for studying identities in mind, we asked the following questions:

1. How did students' identities become stabilized within and across two collaborative multimodal composing activities over a semester?
2. How did these identity enactments affect students' participation in and sense of ownership of the group's products?

Methods

Data were selected from a semester-long project on leveraging adolescents' multimodal literacies to promote dialogic discussions of literature. Focal participants—Leonard, Louise, and Nick—were 12th-grade students at a suburban high school in the eastern United States. During two 60-minute class periods in Week 6 and Week 13, small groups of students discussed several questions and prompts (Appendix A) about Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Malamud's (1952) *The Natural*. Students then addressed one question by creating something with clay, digital video, chalk and paper, or paint and canvas in the 60-minute class period. The teacher also told the class that groups might want to compose a "short, written statement that explains your project." For both tasks, the focal group chose to create a painting. (See Figures 1 and 2 for reproductions.) We assert that the process and product of painting are accurately characterized as multimodal, as the paintings were mediated through a complex array of semiotic resources, including copresent talk, gesture, sketching, writing, and painting.

FIGURE 1. *"Macbeth's Overreaching Ambition" (reprinted with permission from the Literacy Research Association [Chisholm, 2011]).*

FIGURE 2. *"Roy's Character Tested by Misfortune" (reprinted with permission from Emerald Group Publishing [Loretto & Chisholm, 2012]).*

Instructional Context

Riverview High School (a pseudonym, as are all names in this article) was part of a middle-sized suburban school district. Riverview was consistently recognized for student achievement as measured by state-mandated assessments and a tradition of placing most seniors at two- or four-year colleges and universities. James was an observer-researcher in Mr. Smith's classroom for a semester-long collaborative research project. Mr. Smith was a second-year English teacher whom James had taught in a teaching methods course. Although Mr. Smith included a project that drew on students' multiple intelligences in his 12th-grade curriculum, he desired to incorporate multimodality and inquiry into his everyday practice. To that end, Mr. Smith and James planned three cycles of inquiry-based multimodal (i.e., combining another mode with the linguistic mode) or primarily linguistic small-group activities to promote students' interpretations of literary texts. James stationed a video camera to record the focal group during each cycle and wrote field notes, which functioned as the first interpretive steps in this study.

Since the focal group engaged in a primarily linguistic activity during the third cycle, we excluded that event from this analysis, focusing instead on the tasks from the first two cycles (Week 6 and Week 13). The purpose of these multimodal activities was to (1) encourage students' interpretive talk and meaning-making about the texts and (2) support their participation during the next day's whole-class discussion, which James observed and recorded. Students were not graded on their performance in their small groups, but they were asked to assess the contributions they made to the whole-class discussion. At the beginning of the semester, Mr. Smith articulated his stance toward discussions, which he said would occur "frequently": "You are driving things on your own," he explained to the class; "I think you can get what's going on in the story, but the most interesting part is interpreting your ideas. . . . Hearing others talk will increase your own understanding." In this framing, Mr. Smith positioned his students as competent readers who could comprehend text and take charge of their learning. He also situated the practice of discussion as a site for expanding one's ideas about what and how texts could mean.

Additional contextual factors informed the identities that were enacted in Mr. Smith's classroom. The participants' 12th-grade "academic" English class was tracked; there were two tracks "above" their class ("Honors" and Advanced Placement [AP]) and one track "below" ("Developmental"). Placement in these tracks informed students' identities as particular kinds of learners—evidenced, for example, by some AP students who labeled their literature binders with bright colors and large letters. Ten percent of the students at Riverview qualified for free or reduced-price lunches, which reflected the school's predominantly middle- to upper-middle-class population. We recognize as a limitation of this study that our analysis was limited to two hour-long interactions among three students from a predominantly affluent school and that we were unable to include a careful analysis of how gender identities informed participants' interactions. Studying the stabilization of learner identities across other contexts, with a particular eye

toward gender ideologies and over longer stretches of time, is beyond the scope of this study but is a much-needed area for future research.

James distributed a survey to identify students' perceived proficiencies with various multimodal literacies, such as using instant messaging and making music. With a desire to promote multiple perspectives that could, in turn, spur potentially generative learning conversations, Mr. Smith and James configured small groups heterogeneously according to survey responses so that each group consisted of at least one "expert" (in the focal group, Louise), one "novice" (Leonard), and one student at an "intermediate" level (Nick). In a sense, then, students' perceptions of their learner identities were activated even before they began working.

Data Sources

Our primary data are two 60-minute video recordings (with audio backups) of the participants' small-group work, as well as transcripts. As the process of transcription reflects the theory and analysis guiding the investigation (Mishler, 1991; Ochs, 1979), we represented how students made meanings beyond the words they uttered by noting embodied actions such as facial expressions, gestures, and intonation, as well as proximity and other ways in which students occupied space to the extent possible given the positioning of the camera. (In the *Macbeth* task, Nick's back was to the camera, as was the teacher's when he approached the group, which meant that we were unable to note their facial expressions and some of their gestures.) Finally, we drew on a transcription of James's 25-minute, audio-recorded, end-of-semester group interview with Leonard, Louise, and Nick to gain insight into students' perceptions of themselves and their learning.

Data Analysis

This study relies on a tradition in linguistic anthropology that analyzes discourse across speech events (Wortham & Reyes, 2015). *Speech events* are defined by the semiotic resources used to accomplish social action in context. In this study, the small-group discussion is the speech event under scrutiny.

Because semiotic resources can be interpreted in multiple ways, processes of entextualization and enregisterment are critical to this approach to discourse analysis. *Entextualization* is the process by which an event becomes recognizable as a particular type of social action: "Entextualization establishes an event, its boundaries, and its meaning" (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 61). *Enregisterment* accounts for how identities "come reliably to signal certain social types, for some group of speakers, over time" (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 64; see also Agha, 2007) and can be traced by examining the relative rigidity of *pathways*: linked speech events that presuppose earlier events and follow potentially unpredictable lines.

We engaged in several systematic yet flexible and recursive phases of analysis that allowed us to study how the *Macbeth* and *The Natural* speech events formed pathways through which students' identities emerged. To determine the contours of these students' pathways, we analyzed discourse within and across events in three phases, following Wortham and Reyes (2015): (1) mapping events and identifying linked events, (2.1) identifying indexicals and relevant cross-event context,

(2.2) construing indexicals and tracing the shape of pathways, (2.3) configuring indexicals and delineating cross-event configurations, and (3) interpreting social action and identifying cross-event processes. Although these phases are recursive, following the processes of all phases is necessary to study entextualization and enregisterment (Wortham & Reyes, 2015; Appendix B provides definitions and examples of how we used these tools).

We began our analysis not by mapping events, as suggested by Wortham and Reyes, but by identifying indexicals and engaging in close reading of transcripts and recordings to identify speech events we found interesting or puzzling. Because we purposively sampled the heterogeneous focal group and therefore knew, in advance, many of the elements of the narrating events (the actual talking that occurs apart from what is talked about) and narrated events (what is being talked about), we returned to mapping events after identifying, construing, and configuring indexicals, as the recursive process allows.

We looked within each event to identify indexicals—specifically *deictics*, *reported speech*, and *evaluative indexicals*—that might reveal self- or other-positioning. Tracing *deictics*, especially personal pronouns, allowed us to uncover interactional patterns and shifts in footing (Wortham, 1996). We examined *reported speech* for the ways in which metapragmatic verbs used to characterize speech positioned the speaker, other group members, or characters in a narrated event as particular types of people. Our microanalysis also focused on *evaluative indexicals*, "any signs that associate people or objects with some recognizable social type and evaluate that type" (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 52). These evaluations can be revealed in a speaker's particular use of signs to typify characters or speakers.

The next phase, construing indexicals, gave us the opportunity to begin our metapragmatic sense-making, addressing the fact that any linguistic sign can have multiple potential meanings. To construe indexicals metapragmatically is to examine how signs mean in interactional context by determining the likelihood that any sign carries a particular meaning implicitly or explicitly. We wrote provisional interpretations of the indexicals we had identified in the previous phase and analyzed how these discourse features were used.

Configuring indexicals, the next phase, allows researchers to develop accounts of entextualization. In other words, how does one particular meaning of an event become solidified through the social actions that a configuration of semiotic resources enacts? In order to develop a robust account of the actions that were accomplished, we examined how others responded to a participant's utterance or embodied action. In such recontextualization of signs, we could better determine what the event was and how it affected the group's interactions.

Identifying, configuring, and construing indexicals are iterative processes in which "the selection of relevant context and the construal of that context shap[e] each other, until a configuration of signs solidifies and makes one interpretation of the positioning and social action most plausible" (Wortham & Reyes, 2015, p. 23). Our own writing practices—transcribing recordings, summarizing key moments, analyzing provisional interpretations—coincided with and supported the recursive

analytic process. In the final phase, we described *moments* that shaped learners' pathways and determined the most robust account of how learners' identities became entextualized within and enregistered across events.

Findings

In this section, we trace a pathway in which Louise's robust identity as an artist—co-constructed by herself, her classmates, and the teacher—emerged in tandem with the devaluing of other participants' artistic skills. Over time, these enregistered positionings led Louise to act as the primary author of the painting and her classmates to participate in increasingly desultory ways.

Louise's identity as an artist was evident in James's end-of-semester group interview, in which Louise characterized herself as "a very visual person" and remarked that her childhood diary contained pictures, not words. Throughout the group's work on both paintings, as we will show, Louise positioned herself and was positioned by others as a talented artist. However, Leonard and Nick also positioned themselves as artists in different ways. Both Leonard and Nick spoke about what the painting could look like, articulating their visions through words and gestures. Leonard, during both events, demonstrated his knowledge about how art is made or practiced, used the language of visual composition (e.g., "frames"), sketched his visions of the painting, discussed art classes he had taken or videos he had watched, and mentioned the kinds of art he made (graffiti, painting houses and rooms). Nick spoke less during both events, but, like Leonard, he identified as a particular kind of artist: he liked to draw anime characters.

Despite this evidence of their facility with "visual thinking" and art-making, we argue that Louise was still seen as the primary "author" of the paintings. In fact, Louise even signed the *Natural* painting (see Figure 2). We can account for this interpretation by examining how, when Nick and Leonard positioned Louise as an artist, they often devalued their own artistic skills or treated them as irrelevant. These nonartist or specialized identities became enregistered across speech events. In fact, these identities hardened to the point that, during the *Natural* task, Louise's group members participated in superficial ways. With this context, we can better understand how and why Louise would sign a painting that was supposed to be a group effort.

Macbeth: Entextualization of Identities

After students clarified the directions with Mr. Smith, they brainstormed possible responses to four interpretive questions and decided to compose something "that captures a theme of *Macbeth*" (Appendix A). The following analysis traces how four moments entextualized students' learner identities.

Macbeth, Moment 1: Louise Danced to Get in the Mood to Paint

After the students presented their idea to Mr. Smith, they began dividing up tasks (Figure 3; see Appendix C for transcription conventions).

Present at start: Louise, Leonard, Nick, Mr. Smith
01 Lou: [*(Louise dances by jiggling her fists, shuffling her shoulders)*]
02 Leo: *(turns to Louise)* [Uhh do you want to draw it or paint it 'cause
03   (.) I don't do that.]
04 Lou: (Why?/What.)
05   [*(continues shuffling shoulders, snapping fingers)*]
06   [I just have to dance when I- I have to dance before I draw a
07   picture. I'm not even kidding. I have to- this is how I get in
08   the mood for-]
09   *(stops dancing and turns to Leonard)* Is that weird?
10   *(Mr. Smith walks away)*
11 Leo: I don't want to hear about how you get in the mood to draw a
12   picture.
13 Lou: What? *(resumes dancing)*
14 Leo: I get in the mood by having a peanut butter and jelly sandwich.
15 Lou: *(stops dancing and turns to Leonard)* What. *(smiles, possibly*
16   *identifying his double entendre)*

Figure 3. *Macbeth,* Moment 1: Louise danced to get in the mood to paint.

As Louise was dancing in her chair, Leonard turned to her and asked if she wanted to "draw it or paint it 'cause (.) I don't do that]" (lines 2–3). The deictics positioned Louise as the sole artist and Leonard (and Nick, excluded with the first-person pronoun) as a nonartist. Whereas a word like "either" (e.g., "'cause I don't do **either**") would have left open the possibility of other unmentioned artistic hobbies, his use of the deictic "that" ("'cause (.) I don't do **that**"), with its vague referent, allowed him to deny all artistic skill. Neither Louise nor Nick responded to this statement, which could signal their tacit agreement with this positioning.

Louise did not answer his question; instead, while shuffling her shoulders and snapping her fingers, she explained that she had to dance before she drew a picture in order to "get in the mood" (lines 7–8). This allusion to and demonstration of an artistic ritual allowed her to enact an authentic artistic persona. Leonard dismissed her comment, telling her he did not want to "hear about how you get in the mood to draw a picture" (lines 11–12) and possibly turning her words into an innuendo when he remarked, "I get in the mood by having a peanut butter and jelly sandwich" (line 14). At this point, his rejection of her performance of an artistic identity may or may not shape their future interactions. In fact, Leonard and Nick repeatedly demonstrated that they valued her artistic identity; as a result, her identity was positively reinforced over time.

Macbeth, Moment 2: Leonard and Nick Claimed Specialized Artist Identities
A few turns later, Louise asked her classmates if they wanted a painting or a sketch (Figure 4).

Present at start: Louise, Leonard, Nick
01 LOU: What do you want, a painting or a [(.) sketch.]
02   [(*turns to Leonard*)]
03 LEO: (*Leonard says something inaudible*) I don't care. What would
04   take less time.
05   (2.0)
06 LEO: (So/go) [(*brushes Louise on the shoulder*)] [get] it.
07 LOU: Probably painting. (*rises*)
08 LEO: Less time?
09 LOU: Yeah, painting would take- because paint (2.0) is something
10   you can do in quantity. Like sketching you have to do
11   [detail detail detail]
12   [(*touches index finger to thumb and moves it around as if
13   sketching*).]
14   paint you can just (*sticks tongue out*) [puh]
15   [(*makes a loose fist and brushes it upward*)].
16 LEO: Like go [[(puh/pow)]] [[(*mimics her painting gesture*)]] Let's do it.
17 LOU: All right (*Louise leaves to get supplies*)
18 LEO: I mean, you do it. [I can't paint.]
19   [(*shakes head*)]
20 NICK: Neither can I.=
21 LEO: =Tried it one time,=
22 NICK: =Drawing,
23 LEO: [wasn't working]
24   [(*shakes head*)]
25 NICK: [Drawing,] drawing's all right, painting no.
26 LEO: I can draw letters, like graffiti? That's what I do.
27 NICK: I can draw a (figure in art)
28 LEO: I need to see some before I draw though.=
29 NICK: =All I can draw is Japanese animation.
30 LEO: Japa(h)nese a(h)nime(h).
31 NICK: I showed you the Vegito.

FIGURE 4. *Macbeth,* Moment 2: Leonard and Nick claimed specialized artistic identities.

Leonard suggested the quickest option, which Louise identified as painting. Her assertion that sketching requires "detail detail detail," which she said as she sketched in the air, with her thumb delicately touching her forefinger (lines 10–13; see also Figure 5), along with her statement that painting can be done "in quantity," which she said as she brushed a loose fist upward while sticking out her tongue and saying "puh" (lines 14–15; see also Figure 6), illustrated her history with and embodied knowledge of painting and sketching.

FIGURE **5.** *Louise indexed precise sketching by touching her finger and thumb together.*

FIGURE **6.** *Louise indexed coarse, less precise painting by sticking out her tongue and brushing a loose fist upward.*

Seemingly satisfied with her explanation for why painting is quicker, Leonard enjoined the group to start: "Let's do it" (line 16). However, as Louise rose to get supplies, Leonard qualified his statement: "I mean, you do it. [I can't paint.]" (line 18). (It appears Louise was out of earshot when he said this.) Clearly, Leonard was not speaking literally; we don't know if he just didn't feel like working or wanted the better artist to do the work. By stressing his own lack of ability, however, he justified why he wouldn't be working, and by publicly acknowledging that Louise, not he, would be doing the work (switching from the deictic "let's" to "you"), he appeared an honest and fair group member: someone who would never take credit for another's work.

Nick aligned himself with Leonard in claiming an inability to paint ("Neither can I.=", line 20) but specified that he could draw ("drawing's all right, painting no.", line 25). Nick's comment then prompted Leonard to claim some artistic identity: skill in drawing graffiti letters. Leonard's statement, "That's what I do" (line 26), bounded his artistic identity to only that. Arguably, when Leonard said that he needed models in order to draw graffiti letters (line 28), he narrowed his artistic identity even further.

Nick subsequently delimited his artistic identity by clarifying that "=All I can draw is Japanese animation." (line 29) and giving an example, Vegito. By the end of this interaction, an almost poetic structure emerged through the repetition of the deictic "I" paired with negatives ("can't," "neither") and qualifiers ("that's what I do," "I need to see some before I draw though," "all I can draw is . . ."):

LEONARD: **I** can't paint. (line 18)

NICK: Neither can **I.**= (line 20)

LEONARD: **I** can draw letters, like graffiti? That's what **I** do. (line 26)

NICK: **I** can draw a (figure in art) (line 27)
LEONARD: **I** need to see some before **I** draw though.= (line 28)
NICK: =All **I** can draw is Japanese animation. (line 29)

This verbal parallelism entextualized Leonard's and Nick's identities as artists who were so specialized that they could not contribute to the work. Of course, graffiti and anime could have been used in the assignment, and, given Nick's earlier unqualified assertion that he could draw (line 25), a drawing instead of a painting might have allowed Nick to more actively participate. But Leonard and Nick evidently did not see these artistic skills as useful.

Provisional Summary

In the above two interactions, Leonard's marking of the start of the painting process with multiple deictics and evaluative indexicals ("do you want to draw it or paint it 'cause (.) I don't do that." [Figure 3, lines 2–3]; "Let's do it." "I mean you do it. [I can't paint.]" [Figure 4, lines 16, 18]) follows a pattern. Both statements simultaneously positioned Louise as the artist and denied Leonard and Nick artistic skill. This parallelism—self-deprecating statements triggered by references to Louise or what she would work on—entextualized Louise's identity as a skilled artist and Nick's and Leonard's identities as artists with specialized skills irrelevant to the task.

This interactional pattern (positive positioning of Louise and negative self-positioning) was also occasioned by the presence of the teacher, who wanted equal participation from all group members. Mr. Smith indicated this desire when he introduced the task to the class, stating, "I'll come around to make sure that you're all aware of how to split up the responsibilities and make sure that each person is contributing to the group." On two occasions, when he entered the group's area, he inquired about the division of labor, and these comments triggered additional positionings of learner identities.

***Macbeth,* Moment 3: Nick Oversimplified Self and Other Identities**

About four minutes later, after Louise began painting, Mr. Smith wandered over and asked how the tasks were divided (Figure 7).

Mr. Smith's query ("who's doing (.) what here.", line 1) triggered exaggerated claims about all three students. Nick responded by saying that "we" (he and Leonard) were "feeding her the ideas and putting them in her head." (line 2) and that Louise was painting because "none of us have any artistic ability" (lines 8–9). With the deictic "we," the evaluative indexical "feeding" (which treated their ideas as providing nourishment to Louise), and the metapragmatic, metaphoric characterization of Louise's head as an empty container, Nick erased Louise's contributions to the brainstorming phase to show that although they would not be helping with the actual painting, he and Leonard did indeed contribute substantially. (Interestingly, Louise did not dispute this characterization.) In addition, Nick's statement that "none of us have any artistic ability" (lines 8–9) upgraded the assertions in the previous interaction, denying both Leonard and Nick any artistic competence.

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Mr. Smith (Tchr)
01 TCHR: So who's doing (.) what here.
02 NICK: We are like feeding her the ideas and putting them in her head.
03   And uh- *(someone walks by, hands Louise an empty cup)*
04 LOU: *(sweetly)* Thank you! *(person walks away)* Thank you!
05   *(Leonard returns to the table and sits down)*
06 NICK: We're giving her the [ideas] of what like to do,
07 LEO: *(inspects cup, turns to Louise)* [water?]
08 NICK: but she's like doing it because none of us have any artistic
09   [ability *(inaudible)*]
10 LOU: *(to Leonard)* [Yeah actually no yeah,] get some water.
11   *(Leonard leaves)* That might be a good idea. Just in case.
12   These don't look like extreme acrylics. *(looks up at Mr. Smith)*
13   What- wha- what's up.
14   (2.0)
15 TCHR: So yeah, so [you two=]
16   [*(points to Nick, then Louise)*]
17 NICK: =We'll come up with the captions [[(strips/just) like]]
18 TCHR: [[So you're]] feeding her
19   the ideas.
20 NICK: We're giving her the ideas.
21 LOU: If you guys want to paint, you can, I mean.=
22 NICK: [=I'm sorry,] but I do not want to ruin your masterpiece.
23   [*(shaking head)*]
24 TCHR: (Well looks/it's) good. You know,
25 LOU: Oh.
26 TCHR: (You) can sketch, and=
27 LOU: =[All right]=
28   [*(shakes head, shrugs)*]
29 TCHR: =if you want to fill parts in, but [[definitely at least]]
30   [[*(taps on Nick's desk)*]]
31   [do the captions.]
32 NICK: [color by numbe(h)rs huh]
33 TCHR: Definitely at least do the captions. *(Mr. Smith walks away)*

FIGURE 7. *Macbeth,* Moment 3: Nick oversimplified self and other identities.

Responding to Nick's representation of the division of labor, Louise invited Nick and Leonard to help her ("If you guys want to paint, you can, I mean.=", line 21), but Nick instantly refused, shaking his head and explaining, "[=I'm sorry,] but I do not want to ruin your masterpiece." (line 22). Here, Nick's statement marked Louise as sole author of the painting, and his use of the evaluative indexical "masterpiece" (as opposed to, say, "painting" or "work") heightened the contrast to the deictic "I," thus more strongly justifying his lack of participation. His use of "do not" instead of the contraction "don't" also seemed to intensify his stance. When Mr. Smith showed that he wasn't troubled by Nick's refusal to help paint, instead identifying other ways in which Nick could participate, Louise

commented, "=[All right]=", shaking her head and shrugging (lines 27–28). Her response indicated that she didn't necessarily agree with Nick's decision but that she wouldn't continue to press him.

This interaction also involved discussion of what Nick and Leonard would do while Louise was painting. Nick suggested that he and Leonard could "come up with the captions" (line 17). A few turns later, when Nick had explained that he didn't want to "ruin [Louise's] masterpiece" by painting, Mr. Smith offered, "(You) can sketch, and= =if you want to fill parts in, but [[definitely at least]] [do the captions.]" (lines 26–31). Yet Nick dismissed the work of filling in Louise's sketches, calling it, while chuckling, "[color by number(h)rs huh]" (line 32). This evaluative indexical identified such work as facile.

Macbeth, Moment 4: Louise Invited Leonard and Nick to Paint, and They Refused

Approximately twenty minutes later, just before the lunch bell, Louise was still painting and Leonard was writing the caption while Nick watched. Nick complimented Louise on her work (Figure 8, line 1), laughed about the moles she'd added to the witches' faces (line 5), and commented on their haggard appearances (line 8).

After a 4-second pause, Louise remarked to the group that she was "just kinda freehanding this, I don't think I need to spend <u>too</u> much (.) time on this." (lines 9–10). Nick's compliments and Louise's glossing of her activity as "freehanding" constructed and reinforced Louise's identity as a talented, effortless artist.

Mr. Smith then interjected, reiterating his suggestion for Louise to sketch and "have someone else do some coloration?" (lines 11–12). (When Mr. Smith wandered over, he was not captured by the camera, so it is unclear when he arrived.) Nick objected to this change in the division of work, saying that he would "screw that up" (lines 15, 17). Whereas "I do not want to ruin your masterpiece" helped him justify his lack of participation in helping with the painting in general, the evaluative indexical "screw" justified his nonparticipation even in coloring in what Louise had sketched. Agreeing with Nick, Leonard also rejected the proposed division of labor, stressing to Mr. Smith just how talented Louise was ("Yeah um, she's (0.2) <u>good</u>." [line 18]; "[She's definitely] the artist one in this group." [line 25]) and declaring that he and Nick were otherwise occupied with caption revisions ("he helped me revise this." [line 23]). In the above interactions, references to Louise or the division of labor triggered her classmates' self-deprecating positionings; here, merely referencing Louise's talent was meant to justify their lack of participation in the painting process.

Having accepted Mr. Smith's suggestion to change her work habits so others could contribute, however, Louise refused Nick's and Leonard's positioning as nonartists ("No!" [line 20]) and invited them to help ("<u>You</u> guys can-" [line 20]), stating she wouldn't mind if they contributed ("[it's not a big <u>deal,</u>]" [line 20]). After Leonard called her "the artist one in this group" (line 25), she accepted that positioning ("Well yeah" [line 28]) but again implied that she wouldn't mind if they helped ("but if [[you guys want to help]]" [line 28]). Louise dropped the offer, though, after Leonard asked Mr. Smith if the painting had to be completed

Present at start: Louise, Leonard, Nick, Mr. Smith (Tchr; it's unclear when he approaches the group; he is not captured by the video camera)

01	NICK:	That's <u>so good</u>
02	LOU:	Oh thank you
03		(7.0)
04	NICK:	*(presumably referring to the moles she has painted on the*
05		*witches)* Mole(h)s huh huh huh huh huh .hh
06	LOU:	Why not
07		(2.0)
08	NICK:	They did look that haggard in the *(inaudible)*
09	LOU:	Yeah. (4.0) I'm just kinda <u>free</u>handing this, I don't think I
10		need to spend <u>too</u> much (.) time on this. You know like=
11	TCHR:	=Yeah, could you maybe start sketching something else
12		and have someone else do some coloration?
13	LOU:	*(looks up at Mr. Smith)* Huh?
14	TCHR:	Like [sketching *(inaudible)*]
15	NICK:	[I'll screw that up]
16	LOU:	Yeah. I'll sketch the [[second part.]]
17	NICK:	[[I will screw that up.]]
18	LEO:	*(looks up at Mr. Smith)* Yeah um, she's (0.2) <u>good</u>.
19		(1.5)
20	LOU:	No! <u>You</u> guys can- [it's not a big <u>deal</u>,]
21		[*(turns to Leonard)*]
22		(0.3)
23	LEO:	[[I'm doing <u>this</u>.]] He he he helped me revise this.
24		[[*(points to his paper)*]]
25		[She's definitely] the artist one in this group.
26		[*(looks up at Mr. Smith and points thumb at Louise)*]
27	LOU:	[If you wanna-]
28		Well yeah but if [[you guys want to help]]
29	LEO:	[[It has to be done today, right.]]
30	TCHR:	*(inaudible)*
31	LOU:	It's not a big deal, I can finish it up, it'll be quick.

FIGURE 8. *Macbeth,* Moment 4: Louise invited Leonard and Nick to paint, and they refused.

that day. Mr. Smith's response is inaudible on the recording, but Louise replied, "It's not a big deal, I can finish it up, it'll be quick." (line 31).

Several times throughout the class period, Louise's artist identity seemed to obstruct Mr. Smith's desire for all group members to participate equally, as Nick and Leonard used her talent to justify their lack of participation. Once the end of class neared, however, and Louise reassured everyone that she could "finish it up" quickly, her visual artist identity may have become more of an advantage to Mr. Smith, who wanted groups to finish in time.

Summary
Over the course of the class period, we witnessed the entextualization of Louise as an authentic, talented artist and of Leonard and Nick as her admirers who were

aware enough of their artistic limitations to know their participation would hurt more than help. These personae emerged across the four interactions through self-deprecating statements that were repeatedly triggered by references to Louise, Louise's talent, or the teacher's injunctions to divide the work, and these statements contained configurations of signs, including deictics (e.g., "You do it," "I can only . . .") and evaluative indexicals (e.g., "masterpiece," "screw that up," "She's good"). Some might wonder whether Nick and Leonard also developed entextualized personae as goof-offs strategically avoiding work. Although this suspicion may have motivated Mr. Smith's repeated visits, this particular identity was never ascribed to Leonard or Nick.

The Natural: Entextualization and Enregisterment of Identities

Seven weeks later, the group began a similar task for *The Natural*. Mr. Smith introduced the activity by facilitating a whole-class discussion of a famous painting of Macbeth, Banquo, and the witches, thinking out loud about how theme can be conveyed through techniques like use of color. When the group convened, there was no discussion about what materials would be used; as a testament to the success and quality of the *Macbeth* painting, a painting for *The Natural* was assumed. In addition, the group fell into similar participation structures. In fact, we will show that the identities that emerged during *Macbeth* were presupposed during the creation of the *Natural* painting. In response to Mr. Smith's continued desire for group members to participate equally, these identities contributed to Louise's classmates' pretend work and Louise's ownership of the *Natural* painting.

The Natural, Moment 1: Mr. Smith Asked Students to Cooperate

Thirty minutes into the activity, Mr. Smith approached the group (Figure 9).

As he walked over, Louise was painting, Nick was finding passages in *The Natural*, Randy (an addition to the group) was writing the caption, and Leonard was playing with Louise's scarf. Mr. Smith initially addressed Randy, speaking inaudibly and then telling him to "[Find something you can help with]" (line 6). It appears he did not wait for Randy to respond, and he then turned to Leonard, asking, "Could you [help out] with uh [[what Randy and Nick are working on]]" (lines 10–11). Leonard used reported speech in protesting that he *had* been involved: "I told 'em what to do, and they're doing it.=" (lines 12–13); "I am the mana<u>ger</u>.]" (line 15). Mr. Smith did not visibly respond; instead, he turned to Louise, asking her if she could "sketch out certain parts [(so someone else can) color it in?]" so there could be "somebody else working at the same time?]]" (lines 21–22, 25–26). Louise responded with an apology: "Sorry, I get [like into it. Yeah, no. I understand.]" (lines 29–30).

For the first time across these events, Louise took responsibility for the lack of equitable labor. With "I get like into it.", she implied that she didn't ask her classmates to help her because she was so immersed in her work and forgot her surroundings. This comment allowed Louise to align herself with the stereotype of a "real" artist. By accepting responsibility for her classmates' lack of participation, however, she also positioned herself as a poor collaborator who hogged the work.

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Randy, Leonard, Mr. Smith (Tchr)

01   [*(Mr. Smith walks over to the group)*]
02 LEO: [*(wearing Louise's scarf)* I'm having fun with this right
03   now.] Uh oh. We have a problem.
04 TCHR: *(to Leonard?)* (Have a seat)
05 LEO: Houston, we have a problem.
06 TCHR: *(to Randy) (inaudible)* [Find something you can help with]
07 LEO: *(to Mr. Smith)*   [Can I just stand up real quick?]
08   I mean I'm tired of sitting. I know you'll understand this,
09   (bro/but)
10 TCHR: *(to Leonard)* Could you [help out] with uh [[what Randy and
11   Nick are working on]]
12 LEO: [What.] [[What do you want me to help out with?]] I told 'em
13   what to do, and they're doing it.=
14 RAN: *(to Mr. Smith)* =<u>I</u> know what I'm doing.
15 LEO: [I am the mana<u>ger</u>.]
16 RAN: [I know what <u>I'm</u> doing.] I'm-
17   (3.0)
18   *(Voice in background says, "bring in supporting ideas")*
19 LEO: *(rapping)* Yo buddy you ever seen Tupac *(inaudible)*
20 RAN: *(to Nick)* Why is the bird flying to Memo again?
21 TCHR: *(to Louise)* Could you sketch out certain parts
22   [(so someone else can) color it in?]
23 NICK: *(to Randy)* [Because it's supposed to represent]
24 TCHR: *(to Louise)* [[I know you like this (concept) but is there
25   something else you could do to have somebody else
26   working at the same time?]]
27 NICK: *(to Randy)* [[(1.0) um (2.0) that (2.0)]] later in the story,
28   Memo is like-
29 LOU: *(to Mr. Smith)* Sorry, I get [like into it. Yeah, no. I
30   understand.] *(Mr. Smith walks away)*
31 NICK: *(to Randy)* [Harriet Bird, you know what I mean?]
32 LOU: C'mon guys, we can uh- [<u>Guys</u>-]
33 NICK: *(to Randy)* [Ask] her, she knows how to explain it a little bit
34   better. Like as it's transferring, the bird like goes to Memo

FIGURE 9. *The Natural,* Moment 1: Mr. Smith asked students to cooperate.

Also new in this event was the absence of self-deprecating statements trig-gered by Mr. Smith's queries about the division of labor. In response to Mr. Smith's suggestions, Randy, Nick, and Leonard said nothing about Louise's talent or their own lack thereof. Their identities as non- or specialized artists were treated as self-evident, and their seeming lack of work no longer needed to be justified. In fact, the two students Mr. Smith addressed, Randy and Leonard, both claimed to be working or have worked on something: Randy was writing the caption ("=<u>I</u> know what I'm doing.", line 14), and Leonard had served as "manager" by giving orders to Randy and Nick ("I told 'em what to do, and they're doing it.=" (lines 12–13).

The Natural, Moment 2: Louise Enjoined Her Classmates to Look Busy

A few turns later, after Mr. Smith left, Louise reported Mr. Smith's directive that she sketch instead of paint so that someone else could fill in her sketches (Figure 10).

Instead of offering to share the painting with her collaborators, Louise told them to "[Just look like you're doing something so he (.) doesn't keep coming over and asking you guys to actually do work." (lines 8–9). Note that Louise did not ask her classmates to help her; she used reported speech ("He wants me") to voice Mr. Smith's desire that Louise's classmates help her ("He wants me to color- he wants me to draw this out", [line 5]), and she stated that she didn't "[care if you do work or not," (line 10). Here, Louise positioned herself as a taskmaster, but one who was an ally of her classmates, not an extension of the teacher. Despite being their ally, however, when directing Leonard to "just write something down" (line 21), she dismissed the importance and substance of what they might produce, as evidenced by her evaluative indexical "something" as opposed to, say, "a description of the painting." Responding to the teacher's persistent desire to see equal participation, engaged in a task in which equal participation seemed impossible, and inhabiting enregistered identities as artists or nonartists that seemed to be hardened, the students looked to fake work to appease Mr. Smith.

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Randy, Leonard

01 NICK: Um isn't it going to her because it's supposed to represent how
02   similar they are?
03 LOU: *(nods)*
04 NICK: °Alright yeah°
05 LOU: He wants me to color- he wants me to draw this out so some of
06   you- you guys can help (.) paint it in.
07   [*(whispering, furrowing brow)*]
08   [Just look like you're doing something so he (.) doesn't keep
09   [coming over and asking you guys to actually do work. I don't
10   [care if you do work or not, just (.) [[<u>look like</u>]] you're
11 RAN: [[look like]]
12 LOU: [doing something.]
13 RAN: *(points to Nick's book)* Read the book.
14 LOU: Like write [something down]
15 RAN: >[Put your head down] look like you're reading a book<
16 NICK: *(makes heaving sound, throws his head down into his book)*
17 RAN: Not li(h)ke tha(h)t.
18   (4.0)
19 LEO: Do we have anything in writing, or are we gonna have
20   subthemes below it.
21 LOU: [He's] writing something. Just write something down,
22   [*(nods at Randy)*] I don't care, just look like you're working.

FIGURE 10. *The Natural,* Moment 2: Louise enjoined her classmates to look busy.

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Randy, Leonard, Mr. Smith (Tchr)
01   (*Mr Smith walks over and peers over the group*)
02 Leo: (*looks up Mr. Smith*) You told me to do somethin'. (2.0)
03   I'm <u>doin'</u> somethin'.= (*looks at Louise*)
04 Ran: =What is that.=
05 Lou: ="I(h) lo(h)ve a(h)nima(h)ls"? [Come on. Guys, come on.]
06   [(*Leonard and Randy chuckle*)]
07 Lou: There's stuff you guys could be doing.
08 Leo: Alright, fine.
09 Ran: (*to Mr. Smith*) I wrote my paper.
10 Lou: I can draw- [You guys can help me-]
11 Tchr: (*to Randy*) [(Are you) working on the memo?]
12   (2.0)
13 Lou: Yeah. Someone could help me work on- (.)
14 Leo: Give me that revise thingy. (*Randy hands Leonard his paper*)
15 Ran: Revise it.
16 Lou: (*looks up at Mr. Smith and shrugs*) (*inaudible*) help.
17 Ran: (*to Leonard*) Is representation a word?

Figure 11. *The Natural,* Moment 3: Louise enjoined her classmates to work.

The Natural, Moment 3: Louise Enjoined Her Classmates to Work

A few minutes later, Mr. Smith returned. Louise was painting, Randy was watching Louise, Leonard was writing something, and Nick was consulting his copy of *The Natural.* Mr. Smith looked at Leonard, and Leonard reacted by declaring that he was keeping busy, using deictics and reported speech ("You told me to do somethin.' (2.0) I'm <u>doin'</u> somethin.'=", Figure 11, lines 2–3).

Louise read what Leonard had written ("I love animals"), laughing, but quickly grew annoyed—"Come on. Guys, come on" (line 5)—and enjoined them to work: "There's stuff you guys could be doing." (line 7). She suggested that the guys help *her*: "I can draw- [You guys can help me-]" (line 10); "Someone could help me work on-" (line 13). No one responded to those particular requests, however; Nick continued working, and Leonard asked to see the caption Randy had written, presumably in order to revise it ("Give me that revise thingy", line 14). Although Louise seemed annoyed with Leonard's goofing off and asked her classmates for help twice (lines 10, 13), she did not press her case after Leonard demonstrated he was busy, and she shrugged to Mr. Smith (line 16). Her behavior confirms our inference that she was more concerned about her classmates' keeping busy than about their helping paint.

The Natural, Moment 4: Randy Remarked on Leonard's Rewriting

Around twenty minutes later, with about ten minutes of class left, Louise was still painting, and Leonard had finished "revising" the caption on a new sheet of paper. (See Appendix D for the final caption.) He gave it to Randy and then faced another group, joining a discussion about TV—a conversation Louise and Nick were also

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Randy, Mr. Smith (Tchr)
01   (*Mr. Smith walks over and looks at Randy, who is out of frame*)
02 TCHR: (All done?)
03 NICK: He:'s rewriting it [and I'm still looking.]
04   [(*Mr. Smith leaves*)]
05 RAN: I'm- I still have no idea why he (.) rewrote this.
06 NICK: What?
07 RAN: I still see no reason why he rewrote this.
08 NICK: Let's see what he wrote. *(touches the paper on Randy's desk)*
09 RAN: >Don't touch it.<
10 NICK: (*Nick retracts his hand and faces forward*)
11   (5.0)
12 NICK: Um (1.0) I'm tryin' to think of uh- (.) more.

FIGURE 12. *The Natural,* Moment 4: Randy remarked on Leonard's rewriting.

participating in—before he left the camera's view. Mr. Smith then walked over to Louise, Nick, and Randy and asked what sounded like "All done?" (Figure 12, line 2). Nick responded that Randy was "rewriting" the caption and he was "still looking" for passages (line 3). After Mr. Smith left, Randy confessed to Nick, "I still have no idea why he (.) rewrote this." (line 5), revealing that Leonard's "rewriting" seemed purposeless. (We do not have access to Randy's original caption, so Leonard may have recopied it or may have made minimal changes.) Nick asked to see what Leonard wrote, but Randy (possibly playfully) refused to show it to him (line 9).

Although Randy had agreed to "look busy" in order to keep Mr. Smith away, his statements (lines 5, 7) indicate that he was surprised by Leonard's needless duplication of work. Although Louise's classmates' identities as nonartists were assumed, Randy's reaction seems to indicate that he felt ambivalent about their effects (the production of pretend work).

The Natural, Moment 5: Louise Took Ownership of the Painting
A few turns later, Leonard made fun of the proportions of Roy's torso in Louise's painting: "How long's his stomach, like three <u>foot</u>." (Figure 13, line 6).

When she replied, "[You know what?]" (line 7), he showed her the back of his hand (line 9). She then countered, "I don't need you criticizing my artwork." (line 12). We think her dismissal of Leonard was playful, rather than serious, because Leonard and Louise proceeded to banter about other topics. Louise's comment, however, indexed multiple artistic personae: that of an artistic genius who was self-assured enough to rebuke her critics (perhaps especially when the criticism came from Leonard, who might not be considered as talented as she) and that of an artist who was self-involved enough to tell someone, "I don't need you criticizing my artwork." One might argue that her use of the deictic and evaluative indexical "my artwork" (as opposed to the more neutral "my painting" or "my picture") to describe a collectively brainstormed painting she created in 60 minutes could be

Present at start: Louise, Nick, Randy, Leonard (sitting backwards in his chair, facing an-other group)

01 LEO: *(tilts body toward Louise)* What's that.
02 LOU: Louise: It's the bullet wound.
03 *Unknown voice off camera*: That's (.) pretty good [*(inaudible)*]
04 LEO: [Stomach!]
05 LOU: That is not his stomach.
06 LEO: Mm hm. How long's his stomach, like three foot.
07 LOU: [You know what?]
08   [*(turns to Leonard)*]
09 LEO: [[*(shows her the back of his hand)*]]
10   [[(2.0)]]
11 LOU: *(turns to face her painting as Mr. Smith approaches the*
12   *group)* I don't need you criticizing my artwork.
13 RAN?:   He's just doin' it to make you do better
14 LOU: *(cocks her head away from Leonard and raises her eyebrows)*
15 LEO: *(pats Louise's shoulder, then reaches out to pat it again)*
16 TCHR?: That's not very nice.
17 TCHR: *(to Leonard)* Is there [anything you can do to help?]
18   [*(points toward Louise, Randy, Nick)*]
19 LEO: Uh (.) no. I [did] my part.
20   [*(points to his group)*]
21 TCHR: Kay. You finished reading? You have any=
22 LEO: =(Um/Bom) (.) What do you mean "have I finished reading."
23 TCHR: I said "have you finished reading."
24 LEO: Yeah.
25 TCHR: (Oh./Um.) (Do you have any of your) research, (stuff)
26 LEO: (Yup) *(turns to Louise)*
27 TCHR: (Yup/Okay) *(Mr. Smith moves to watch Louise)*
28 LEO: The blue is for,
29 LOU: The background.
30 LEO: Oh okay. See that- that just looks so sick how she's doing that
31   right now? (.) You give me a room to paint, I'll go nuts.
32   [*(Mr. Smith leaves)*]
33 NICK: [huh huh huh]
34 LOU: I painted=
35 LEO: =I love painting houses.=
36 LOU: =I painted the (2.0) *(Leonard turns to the group behind him)*
37   the my- um (3.0) I painted the uh (.) the landing going up to
38   my- my room, it looks so sweet I did like a big Peter Max
39   drawing, on the wall, and it's like (5.0)
40 NICK: Who is Peter Max.=-
41 LOU: =*(turns to the group behind her talking about movies)*
42   =Blind Side.
43 GIRL: I wanna see that.

FIGURE 13. *The Natural,* Moment 4: Randy remarked on Leonard's rewriting.

seen as an attempt to make fun of these personae. Yet we think that because she signed the *Natural* painting, she identified somewhat as the painting's author.

A few turns later, Leonard complimented Louise ("See that- that just looks so sick how she's doing that right now?", lines 30–31). Unlike in previous interactions, where discussions of Louise's talent triggered self-deprecating statements about her classmates' limited artistic identities, Leonard asserted a positive identity as a painter: "You give me a room to paint, I'll go nuts." (line 31); "=I love painting houses.=" (line 35). This positioning, however, did not affect the group's work. Although the period was almost over, we argue that the primary explanation lies in the enregisterment of students' identities. Across both speech events, references to Leonard's and Nick's artistic abilities were used to justify giving Louise the reins, not to create opportunities for them to contribute.

Summary
Within this event of multimodal composing and across the pathway of both events, students' learner identities and participation structures congealed. A configuration of signs (e.g., "I get [like into it," "Just write something down," "Give me that revise thingy," "I am the manager.]") led Louise to assume responsibility for her group members' lack of work and even to direct their pretend work while her group members participated in perfunctory ways. In addition, in this event, Louise performed the role of a stereotypically self-absorbed artist: someone who was so immersed in the work that she hogged it and was unable to handle criticism—or was uninterested in criticism when offered by Leonard. However, we would need to examine additional later events to see if this particular identity became enregistered. In this pathway, the stable identity appeared to be, simply, Louise as talented artist and primary author, as evident in her signing of the *Natural* painting.

For Nick and Leonard, the enregistered identities were those of nonartists or artists whose skills were too specialized to be relevant. Whereas in the *Macbeth* project, these identities emerged through self-deprecating statements triggered by references to Louise's talents or Mr. Smith's injunctions to divide the work, in the *Natural* project, these identities were presupposed, and the students wrote and rewrote the caption to avoid calling attention to their lack of work. By recursively identifying, configuring, and construing indexicals within and across two events, we argued that Louise's robust identity as an artist emerged alongside the devaluing of Nick's and Leonard's artistic identities.

Discussion
Our analysis provides an example of small-group multimodal composing in which students' participation structures and identities grew more rigid across events and led Louise to claim ownership of the multimodal compositions. Interestingly, the teacher's hovering presence and desire for everyone to contribute equally neither affected the actual distribution of work nor promoted learner identities

that could do the work. Rather, the teacher's presence led to Leonard's and Nick's self-deprecating positionings as nonartists and diminished involvement—working just for the sake of working.

This analysis calls for teachers and researchers to consider the many influences on students' participation in and ownership of multimodal compositions. Analytical tools from Wortham and Reyes (2015) reveal, within and across events, (1) how learner identities—co-constructed by individuals, group members, and the teacher—affect students' multimodal work as it is being produced, and (2) how specific features of the composing process mobilize particular learner identities and squelch others.

Learner Identities in Multimodal Composing

Students' learner identities shaped both what was contributed and how. For many teachers, an ideal collaborative group is composed of students with different learner identities and ways of meaning-making. In fact, teachers might rationalize such heterogeneous groupings by identifying some students as "more capable others" in Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development. However, it would be unnecessarily restrictive to position a student as only one type of learner or to see a learner identity as fixed. Our analyses reveal both the generative and stifling effects of heterogeneous grouping according to learner identities. For instance, Louise, who had self-identified as a "nonwriter" during the interview, shone in this visual task, yet Nick's and Leonard's artist identities were devalued.

Some might suggest that teachers continually reconfigure groups in order to prevent potentially negative positionings from becoming enregistered. This strategy can certainly be enacted, but it is difficult to predict the ways in which, regardless of the group configuration, students' identities will trigger new ones in their peers or cause students to minimize their own strengths. It is also difficult to predict the ways in which power dynamics might shape students' contributions. In Nick's case, although he talked less than the others and was occasionally positioned as an outsider, he never stopped participating. Thus, students' learner identities shaped how and what students contributed, and their composing processes were equally consequential.

Process in Group Multimodal Composing

Various aspects of the multimodal composing process—including the affordances of the materials and media used and the limited time allowed to complete the tasks—also mobilized Louise's artist identity and disincentivized other group members' authorship of the paintings. The material resources for creating a painting restricted both cooperative and collaborative work (Smith, 1994; Yancey & Spooner, 1998): the canvas could only be comfortably worked on by one person at a time, and there were only five or six paints and brushes, which two of the groups used. In addition, the students' likely desire to create the highest-quality paintings possible in the 60 minutes allotted may have entailed a uniform style, thus making it undesirable for anyone besides Louise to paint.

Despite the teacher's and students' orientations toward cooperative work—with Louise painting and her group members writing or revising the caption, "feeding" her ideas, managing others, or hunting for passages in the text—the group's brainstorming process, not analyzed here, was arguably quite collaborative and dialogic (Ede & Lunsford, 1990; Yancey & Spooner, 1998). During this process, the students regularly integrated others' ideas to envision the scene that Louise later represented in the painting. One implication we draw here is that teachers might consider the extent to which different phases of the task (e.g., brainstorming, composing) may allow for cooperative or collaborative work.

Playing around with the structure of collaborative multimodal tasks can create opportunities for new learner identities to emerge. Had Mr. Smith asked for multiple, linked artifacts, Louise might not have been the only one painting; dialogic discussion during composing, however, might still have been limited. Alternately, Mr. Smith could have asked individuals to separately choose a medium they were comfortable with and explore how they might use it to represent a theme. (Leonard, for instance, could have brainstormed how to represent the theme with graffiti; Nick, with anime.) If individual group members then convened to share ideas and decide on the form of their collective composition, they would be forced to reckon with the affordances of each idea, and the product might be more likely to leverage multiple students' strengths. Ultimately, to promote dialogic work during multimodal composing, teachers must share with their students a common vision for productive engagement and product expectations. In addition, the material resources, not just the thinking prompts, should allow multiple authors to work meaningfully and simultaneously.

The entextualization and enregisterment of identities as students engage in different tasks and in response to various disciplinary literacies are subjects for future inquiry. Regardless of the activity in which students participate, however, discourse analysis beyond the speech event can contribute to more robust understandings of how students' shifting identities influence their learning over time. As an increasing number of educators recognize the importance of multimodal composing and appreciate the richness and complexity of students' multimodal products, we argue for corresponding attention to process: to how the production of multimodal texts reflects and constructs students' identities, how students' identities shape these processes and texts, and how new identities emerge, solidifying but also shifting across moments, days, months, years, and lives.

APPENDIX A: INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS FOR *MACBETH* AND *THE NATURAL* MULTIMODAL RESPONSE ACTIVITIES

Macbeth

What is Macbeth's tragic flaw? Synthesize the meaning of this play using the materials provided to you.

Construct something using the materials provided to you that captures a theme of *Macbeth.*

Make something using the materials provided to you that could function as a metaphor that could describe Macbeth's actions and/or thoughts from the beginning of the play until the end.

Create something that shows what you think Shakespeare means to say about "human nature" through this play.

The Natural

Brainstorm for all themes and motifs. Then choose either a theme or motif that no other group has yet chosen. Discuss what you know about the

<u>Themes</u>: (a) character tested by misfortune, (b) human reaction to both success and loss, (c) the importance of ambition, (d) the nature of passion

> Select: Choose one theme that you find most interesting, and about which you know the most as a group.

> Identify: Find at least three different passages in the text in which your theme is evident.

> Create something that shows what you think Malamud means to say about "human nature" through this novel.

<u>Motifs and Symbols</u>: (a) birds, (b) trains, (c) water, (d) Wonderboy

> Select: Choose one motif or symbol that you find most interesting, and about which you know the most as a group.

> Identify: Find at least three different passages in the text in which your motif or symbol is evident.

> Create something (using the materials at your table) that shows what you think Malamud means to say using this motif or symbol.

APPENDIX B: PHASES OF ANALYSIS

Phases[a]	Wortham and Reyes's (2015) Definition of Components Used in Phases	Context of Interaction	Semiotic Resources	Initial Analysis
1. MAPPING EVENTS AND IDENTIFYING LINKED EVENTS ↓	Linguistic and visual description of narrated content (e.g., characters, events, and objects) projected in each narrating event ("event of speaking")	Louise, Nick, Randy, and Leonard are responding visually to an interpretive question about the novel *The Natural.* Louise is painting the image that group members brainstormed together. Louise speaks.	Louise: "Just look like you're doing something so he (.) doesn't keep [coming over and asking you guys to actually do work. I don't [care if you do work or not, just (.) [[<u>look</u> <u>like</u>]] you're [...] [doing something.]"	Events were linked by the composition of students and by the nature of the instructional task (multimodal response to literary texts). The narrated event in this example was linked to other events by reference to the division of labor. Within the narrating event, Louise, Leonard, Nick, and Randy were the participants. Within the narrated event, Mr. Smith, Louise, Leonard, Nick, and Randy were the characters.

Phases[a]	Wortham and Reyes's (2015) Definition of Components Used in Phases	Context of Interaction	Semiotic Resources	Initial Analysis
				This narrating event presupposed events that happened earlier in the class (i.e., the teacher checking in on the group's progress), as well as the participation structures that were established during the first painting activity for *Macbeth,* in which Louise painted the image and Leonard and Nick wrote captions for the painting. In that event, Mr. Smith checked in to see how the work was divided among group members.
2.1. IDENTIFYING INDEXICALS AND RELEVANT CROSS-EVENT CONTEXT ⬇ ⬆	"Identifying signs that might be important signals about the social action occurring" (p. 41) and larger social and cross-event contexts that these signs index; Wortham and Reyes suggest that three types of indexicals be explored (as a starting point): deictics, reported speech, and evaluative indexicals			
DEICTICS ⬇ ⬆	"Denotational indexicals: they establish reference in the narrated event by indexically presupposing or creating an aspect of the narrating context itself" (p. 47); examples include *here, there, now, then, this, that, I, you, me,* and *we;* referent shifts according to the context	Louise, Nick, and Leonard have just determined a preliminary plan for responding to the interpretive prompt with a painting. Leonard marks the end of the brainstorming session as Louise gets up from the group to collect the material resources needed to compose the painting (e.g., acrylics, paintbrush, canvas). Leonard speaks.	Leonard: "Let's do it. . . . I mean, you do it. I can't paint"	Although he initially included himself in the next part of the project ("*Let's* do it"), Leonard seemed to clarify that he saw Louise ("*you*") as responsible for the remainder of the work because he told her that he lacked the ability ("*I* can't").

Phases[a]	Wortham and Reyes's (2015) Definition of Components Used in Phases	Context of Interaction	Semiotic Resources	Initial Analysis
REPORTED SPEECH	"Describes speech that is framed as occurring at some other time . . . typically [speech that] occurred in the past . . . but it can also describe speech that will occur in the future" (p. 49)	Louise, Nick, Randy, and Leonard, sit in desks facing each other. Mr. Smith walks over and peers over Leonard's desk. Leonard speaks.	Leonard: "You told me to do somethin'. I'm <u>doin'</u> somethin.'"	Leonard anticipated Mr. Smith's question about work distribution (although Mr. Smith never said anything at this point). Leonard noted that Mr. Smith "told" him to do "somethin.'" He didn't say "forced," but it was stronger than "said I should do something," so he seemed to be implying that he was working just because Mr. Smith said so (not because there was an actual need for him to work).
EVALUATIVE INDEXICALS	"A very broad category of . . . indexes that point to relevant context in ways that potentially characterize and evaluate narrated characters and narrating participants" (p. 51)	In front of Leonard and Louise, Nick explains to Mr. Smith how group work is divided. Nick speaks.	Nick: "We are like feeding her the ideas and putting them in her head."	Nick and Leonard's "feeding" ideas to Louise may have positioned Nick and Leonard as agentic composers of content and Louise as subjected to the agency of Nick and Leonard. Another possible explanation may be that Nick was describing the distribution of work in the group to convince Mr. Smith that everyone had a job to do.
2.2. CONSTRUING INDEXICALS AND TRACING SHAPE OF PATHWAYS ↓ ↑	"Attend[ing] to salient indexicals and the context that they make salient, infer[ring] which metapragmatic models might make sense of this context and describ[ing] the social action occurring in the discursive interaction" (p. 55)	In the brainstorming phase of their initial multimodal activity, Nick describes how he is imagining his visualization of the scene "Macbeth's overreaching ambition." Leonard listens. Louise speaks.	Louise: "Shut your mouth."	Although Louise's command may be read as an actual request for Nick to close his mouth, an indication that she was impressed by the quality of Nick's idea, a playful jibe, or a directive that had as its goal Nick's intellectual exclusion from the group, we read this move as exclusionary and only marginally playful given the ways in which Nick's ideas were explicitly ignored in other moments and across events.

Phases[a]	Wortham and Reyes's (2015) Definition of Components Used in Phases	Context of Interaction	Semiotic Resources	Initial Analysis
2.3. CONFIGURING INDEXICALS AND DELINEATING CROSS-EVENT CONFIGURATIONS[b] ⬇ ⬆	"Identifying configurations of indexicals that emerge and collectively presuppose relevant context and support some model of social action occurring" (p. 63) "Describing how indexical signs from more than one event come to presuppose each other and create relevant context for interpreting both individual events and pathways across them" (p. 66)	Louise, Nick, and Leonard sit in desks facing each other. They brainstorm ways in which they can visually represent a theme in *Macbeth* (Week 6) and *The Natural* (Week 13). Mr. Smith checks in with the group regularly. Louise paints while Nick and Leonard (and Randy in Week 13) alternate in searching for evidence from the text to support their drafting of the caption that accompanies each painting. Louise speaks.	1. Spoken example: Louise: "I need this (hand). This is the future of my life, actually. If something happened to my hand, I don't even know what would happen." (Week 6) 2. Gestured example:	A configuration of signs across semiotic systems entextualized Louise's identity as a visual artist and the author of the visual composition.
3. INTERPRETING SOCIAL ACTION AND IDENTIFYING CROSS-EVENT PROCESSES ⬆	Selecting the "account [that] best explains the positioning and social action occurring in the narrating event (or across the pathway of narrating events)" (p. 67)		Louise indexed the "precise detail" needed when sketching by touching her thumb to her pointer finger. (Week 6) 3. Written/visual example: Louise signed *The Natural* painting (Week 13)	Louise's social identity became enregistered as a visual artist. Her leading role in the painting project for *The Natural* was presupposed by the processes and product that we identified in the *Macbeth* project. Both within her small group and outside of her small group, others recognized Louise as an artist.

[a] Arrows denote the recursive nature of the process.
[b] We combined Phase 2.3 and Phase 3 to emphasize the dialectical nature of these components.

Appendix C: Transcription Conventions

Convention	MEANING
(word) (word1/word2)	guess at speech
A: [Hi] B: [Hello] C: [[How are you]] D: [[What's up]] A: [Hi] [(*waves hand*)]	overlapping speech
A: words= B: =words	utterances that follow each other without a pause
<u>words</u>	emphasized speech
(words)	researcher's observations, typically about embodied actions
wo(h)rd	utterance infiltrated by laughter
word,	rising-falling, also known as continuing, intonation
word.	falling intonation, not necessarily the end of the utterance
word?	rising intonation, not necessarily a question
wor-	cut-off speech
(2.0)	duration of a pause in tenths of a second
(.)	a micropause, one-tenth of a second
°word°	lowered volume compared with the surrounding talk
.hh	speaker has inhaled
>word word word<	rushed utterance compared with the surrounding talk

APPENDIX D: *THE NATURAL* CAPTION

In this painting, you can see Roy hitting the baseball and it turning into a bird. This bird is flying towards Memo while carring [sic] a gun. The bird carrying the gun symbolizes Harriet Bird because the bird brings bad luck to Roy. The bird flies to Memo to show the similarities between the two, and also symbolizes how Memo reminds Roy of Harriet.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

AGHA, A. (2007). *Language and social relations.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

BAILEY, N. M. (2012). The importance of a New Literacies stance in teaching English language arts. In S. M. Miller & M. B. McVee (Eds.), *Multimodal composing in classrooms: Learning and teaching for the digital world* (pp. 44–62). New York: Routledge.

BEACH, R., JOHNSTON, A., & THEIN, A. H. (2015). *Identity-focused ELA teaching: A curriculum framework for diverse learners.* New York: Routledge.

BEACH, R., THEIN, A. H., & PARKS, D. L. (2007). *High school students' competing social worlds: Negotiating identities and allegiances in response to multicultural literature.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

BLOOME, D., CARTER, S., CHRISTIAN, B., OTTO, S., & SHUART-FARIS, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

CHISHOLM, J. S. (2011). A profile of three high school students' talk about literature during multimodal instructional activities and whole-class text-based discussions. In P. J. Dunston, L. B. Gambrell, S. K. Fullerton, V. R. Gillis, K. Headley, & P. M. Stecker (Eds.), *60th Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association* (pp. 245–262). Oak Creek, WI: Literacy Research Association.

CLARKE, L. W. (2006). Power through voicing others: Girls' positioning of boys in literature circle discussions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38,* 53–79.

COIRO, J., KNOBEL, M., LANKSHEAR, C., & LEU, D. (EDS.). (2008). *Handbook of research on new literacies.* New York: Erlbaum.

DAVIES, B. (2003). *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities* (Rev. ed.). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

EDE, L. S., & LUNSFORD, A. A. (1990). *Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

EVANS, K. (2011). Creating spaces for equity? The role of positioning in peer-led literature discussions. In M. B. McVee, C. H. Brock, & J. A. Glazier (Eds.), *Sociocultural positioning in literacy: Exploring culture, discourse, narrative, and power in diverse educational contexts* (pp. 205–222). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

GEE, J. P., ALLEN, A. R., & CLINTON, K. (2001). Language, class, and identity: Teenagers fashioning themselves through language. *Linguistics and Education, 12,* 175–194.

HALL, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London: SAGE.

HULL, G. A., & KATZ, M.-L. (2006). Crafting an agentive self: Case studies of digital storytelling. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41,* 43–81.

LEANDER, K. M. (2002). Locating Latanya: The situated production of identity artifacts in classroom interaction. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37,* 198–250.

LEMKE, J. L. (2000). Across the scales of time: Artifacts, activities, and meanings in ecosocial systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 7,* 273–290.

LEWIS, C. (2001). *Literary practices as social acts: Power, status, and cultural norms in the classroom.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lewis, C., & del Valle, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Implications for research and practice. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 307–322). New York: Guilford Press.

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power.* New York: Routledge.

Loretto, A., & Chisholm, J. S. (2012). Learning to teach generative meaning-making through multimodal inquiry. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11*(1), 136–149.

Lutkewitte, C. (Ed.). (2014). *Multimodal composition: A critical sourcebook.* Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Malamud, B. (1952). *The natural.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

McCarthey, S. J., & Moje, E. B. (2002). Identity matters. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37,* 228–238.

McVee, M. B., Bailey, N. M., & Shanahan, L. E. (2008). Using digital media to interpret poetry: Spiderman meets Walt Whitman. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43,* 112–143.

Miller, S. M., & McVee, M. B. (Eds.). (2012). *Multimodal composing in classrooms: Learning and teaching for the digital world.* New York: Routledge.

Mishler, E. (1991). Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 1,* 255–280.

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44,* 415–437.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66,* 60–92.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.

Olinger, A. R. (2011). Constructing identities through "discourse": Stance and interaction in collaborative college writing. *Linguistics and Education, 22,* 273–286.

Prior, P. A. (2010). Remaking IO: Semiotic remediation in the design process. In P. A. Prior & J. A. Hengst (Eds.), *Exploring semiotic remediation as discourse practice* (pp. 206–234). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prior, P. A., & Hengst, J. A. (2010). Introduction: Exploring semiotic remediation. In P. A. Prior & J. A. Hengst (Eds.), *Exploring semiotic remediation as discourse practice* (pp. 1–23). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ranker, J. (2014). The emergence of semiotic resource complexes in the composing processes of young students in a literacy classroom context. *Linguistics and Education, 25,* 129–144.

Rowe, D. W. (1998). The literate potentials of book-related dramatic play. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33,* 10–35.

Shipka, J. (2011). *Toward a composition made whole.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Siegel, M. (1995). More than words: The generative power of transmediation for learning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 20,* 455–475.

Smith, J. B. (1994). *Collective intelligence in computer-based collaboration.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Vasudevan, L., Schultz, K., & Bateman, J. (2010). Rethinking composing in a digital age: Authoring literate identities through multimodal storytelling. *Written Communication, 27,* 442–468.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whitin, P. (2005). The interplay of text, talk, and visual representation in expanding literary interpretation. *Research in the Teaching of English, 39,* 365–397.

WOLFE, J. (2005). Gesture and collaborative planning: A case study of a student writing group. *Written Communication, 22,* 298–332.

WORTHAM, S. (1996). Mapping deictics: A technique for discovering teachers' footing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25,* 331–348.

WORTHAM, S. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 15,* 95–112.

WORTHAM, S., & REYES, A. (2015). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event.* New York: Routledge.

YANCEY, K. B., & SPOONER, M. (1998). A single good mind: Collaboration, cooperation, and the writing self. *College Composition and Communication, 49,* 45–62.

ZOSS, M. (2009). Visual arts and literacy. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 183–196). New York: Guilford Press.

James S. Chisholm is an associate professor in the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at the University of Louisville. **Andrea R. Olinger** is an assistant professor in the Department of English at the University of Louisville.

Search for the Next Editor of *CCC*

CCCC is seeking the next editor of *College Composition and Communication.* The term of current editor Jonathan Alexander will end in December 2019. Interested persons should send a letter of application to be received no later than **January 15, 2018.**

Letters should be accompanied by (1) a vita, (2) one published writing sample (article or chapter), and (3) a statement of vision, to include any suggestions for changing the journal as well as features of the journal to be continued. Applicants are urged to consult with administrators on the question of time, resources, and other services that may be required. NCTE staff members are available to provide advice and assistance to all potential applicants in approaching administrators about institutional support and in explaining NCTE's support for editors.

Finalists will be interviewed at the CCCC Annual Convention in Kansas City in March 2018. The applicant appointed by the CCCC Executive Committee in spring 2018 will effect a transition in 2018–19, preparing for his or her first issue in February 2020. The appointment term is five years.

Applications should be submitted via email in PDF form to kaustin@ncte.org; please include "CCC Editor Application" in the subject line. Direct queries to Kurt Austin, NCTE Publications Director, at the email address above or call 217-328-3870, extension 3619.