Students' Engagement with Mental Disability Knowledge and Theory in the Writing Classroom: Implications for Transfer Research

Hunter Little

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2025

Reading Committee:

Anis Bawarshi, Chair

Stephanie Kerschbaum

Candice Rai

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

English

© Copyright 2025

Hunter Little

University of Washington

Abstract

Students' Engagement with Mental Disability Knowledge and Theory in the Writing Classroom: Implications for Transfer Research

Hunter Little

Chair of Supervisory Committee:

Anis Bawarshi

English

Drawing on data from a 10-week, classroom-based, qualitative study, this dissertation investigates students' micro-level processes of transferring knowledge about mental disability from a critical disability studies perspective in a general writing course. The study was conducted at the University of Washington within my self-designed and taught Intermediate Expository Writing course which was meant to build students' critical disability literacy. This study builds on the work of disability studies, writing studies, uptake theory, and knowledge transfer scholars, including the ongoing and prominent conversations about knowledge transfer in writing studies as well as theories of students' boundary-work. The results demonstrate that students' engagement with mental disability knowledge and theory in the writing classroom is deeply informed by their incoming relationships with the subject matter and the innumerable interactions that occur between students' experience, each other, concepts, readings, writing tasks, and material space/place. Student writing, survey, and interview data were analyzed using thematic and discourse analysis and within the framework of Dylan Medina's (2017) concept of *micro-transfers* or moment-to-moment interactions which inform how students define people, places, and things. Tracing such micro-transfers revealed how students uniquely take up and adapt knowledge about mental disability within a single course and across writing tasks. Through this analysis, I present five themes that

help complicate traditional understandings of knowledge transfer as broad, easy-to-see translations of knowledge across contexts. The analysis illuminates the unique shifts in students' relationships to disability, their dynamic process of adapting knowledge about disability, the impact of class environments on knowledge transfer, students' need for alternative pathways for engaging with difficult concepts, and the potential of courses centered around critical disability studies to support student advocacy stances. These findings illustrate the use of micro-transfer as a framework for the analysis of knowledge transfer and course design and the benefits of incorporating critical disability studies discourse into general writing courses. To close, I offer implications for transfer, writing, and disability studies research; teaching; and writing program administration.

Contents

Chapter 1. The “Theoretical Alliance” of Disability Studies and Transfer in Writing Studies ……..…. 1

Chapter 2. Uncovering the Elusive: The Methodological Complexity of Studying Transfer …….. 41

Chapter 3. Constructing a Disability-Centered Transfer Pedagogy …….. 77

Chapter 4. Missing the Trees for the Forest: Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Work in Students’ Relationships to and Adaptations of Mental Disability Knowledge …… 112

Chapter 5: Supporting Micro-Transfer and Expanding Uptake Possibilities through Class Environments, Rhetorical Awareness, and Opportunities for Advocacy …… 174

Chapter 6. The Implications of a Micro-Level Analysis of What Students do With Mental Disability Knowledge in the Writing Classroom …… 235

References …….. 263

Appendix I. English 110: Critical Composition Student-Participant Biographies ……... 272

Appendix II. English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing Student-Participant Biographies …….. 274

Appendix III. In-Class Recruitment Script for English 110 …… 277

Appendix IV. In-Class Recruitment Script for English 281 ……..... 279

Appendix V. Invitation to Participate for English 110 ……..... 281

Appendix VI. Invitation to Interview for English 110 ……... 284

Appendix VII. Invitation to Participate for English 281 ……... 287

Appendix VIII. Invitation to Interview for English 281 …… 290

Appendix IX. Audio Recording Consent Form …… 293

Appendix X. English 110 Interview Questions …… 294

Appendix XI. English 281 Interview Questions …….. 295

Appendix XII. English 110 Initial Survey (Handwritten) ……..... 296

Appendix XIII. English 110 Closing Survey (Google Forms) …… 299

Appendix XIV. English 281 Initial Survey (Google Forms) …… 304

Appendix XV. English 281 Closing Survey (Google Forms) ……..... 309

Appendix XVI. English 110 Syllabus …… 314

Appendix XVII. English 110 Course Calendar …… 326

Appendix XVIII. English 110 Assessment Agreement …….. 329

Appendix XIX. English 110 Reading Rationales 334
Appendix XX. English 110 Burrowing Exercise Assignment 338
Appendix XXI. English 110 Genre Translation Assignment 340
Appendix XXII. English 110 Audience and Genre Reflection Assignment 342
Appendix XXIII. English 110 Proposal of Conversation Assignment 345
Appendix XXIV. English 110 Research Project Assignment 347
Appendix XXV. English 110 Research Poster Assignment 349
Appendix XXVI. English 110 Final Critical Class Reflection Assignment 351
Appendix XXVII. English 281 Syllabus 353
Appendix XXVIII. English 281 Course Calendar 363
Appendix XXIX. English 281 Assessment Agreement 367
Appendix XXX. English 281 Reading Rationales 372
Appendix XXXI. English 281 Definitions of Rhetoric Email Assignment 380
Appendix XXXII. English 281 Rhetorical Awareness Letter Assignment 382
Appendix XXXIII. English 281 Rhetorical Analysis Memo Assignment 385
Appendix XXXIV. English 281 Project Proposal Assignment 388
Appendix XXXV. English 281 Website Sketch Assignment 390
Appendix XXXVI. English 281 Source Synthesis Assignment 391
Appendix XXXVII. English 281 Website Assignment 392
Appendix XXXVIII. English 281 Final Critical Class Reflection 394
Appendix XXXIX. English 281 Free Writing Assignment Questions 397
Appendix XL. University of Washington Program in Writing and Rhetoric Course Learning Outcomes ... 405

Acknowledgements

There are many people without whom this project would not have been possible. First, I would like to thank the participants of both of my studies for their willingness to share their writing and experiences with me throughout their respective 10 weeks in my course. I am forever grateful for their trust and transparency throughout the research process. Because Institutional Review Board approval was necessary to pursue this project, I extend my gratitude to Renee Lynch who provided me her protocol materials as a model for producing my own. I was also incredibly lucky to be welcomed into Dissertation Club—a writing support group organized by Stephanie Kerschbaum—and the support, advice, and guidance I received from all of its members: Rebecca Taylor, Kathleen Lyons, Meg Garver, Jacob Wilson, Jack Wolfram, MiSun Bishop, and Fatema Baerzae. I owe a special thanks to Rebecca for her friendship and support that was further fostered through our weekly writing group which we called "Getting the Diss Done." These last few months would have been much less manageable without our meetings. In addition, Kathleen Lyons has extended a great deal of support beyond Dissertation Club in the form of models for presentations, job materials, and outside advice on how to approach data analysis and the writing process in general for this once unfamiliar genre.

Thinking back to the roots of this project, which are embedded in my teaching and learning as a Master's student at Western Kentucky University, I am grateful for my former mentors, Daniel Liddle and David LeNoir, who read multiple drafts of the writing sample I submitted to the English Department for admission into the Ph.D. program. Without their feedback and the time they sacrificed to help me explain only the seeds of this idea, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to teach and research at such a prestigious institution alongside many kind-hearted, like-minded scholars. I also thank my mentor, Fabián Álvarez (Western Kentucky University), and first-year writing instructor, Jeffrey Hillard (Mount St. Joseph University), for modeling writing instruction that inspired my teaching philosophy.

Importantly, I thank my wonderful, dedicated, and encouraging committee members, Professors Anis Bawarshi, Stephanie Kerschbaum, Candice Rai, and José Alaniz who read and provided feedback on multiple drafts of these chapters, supported my ideas at their conception during my candidacy exams, made time to meet whenever necessary, challenged me intellectually by asking thought-provoking questions, extended grace, and continually expressed pride in my work. I also want to thank Stephanie

for inviting me to Dissertation Club—which was the space in which I found the most community during my exam year—and for always reminding me to celebrate my wins and that caring for ourselves sometimes must come before writing. For Anis, in particular, I underscore my immense gratitude as he has been the most supportive chair anyone could ask for in his patience, kindness, inquisition, repeated feedback on chapter draft after chapter draft, flexibility in schedule even as department chair, excitement for my research, and overall belief that this work could be done by someone like me.

Thanks are also owed to Dylan Medina, Mandy Macklin, and Joe Wilson—UW English Ph.D. graduates—whose dissertations were motivating and inspirational, allowing me to decide how best to structure such a huge project. Dylan's work, in particular, has been essential, offering the theoretical framework I needed for better understanding students' learning and transfer processes. My gratitude for Dylan will extend deep into my career as I aim to expand on and support ideas of micro-transfer that have been central to my development as a teacher, scholar, and human. In addition, Megan Callow and Jonathan Isaac of UW's Program for Writing Across Campus have been immensely helpful in their collegiality and teaching support; the additional time and energy they have granted to feedback on teaching that contributes to this research and that I'll conduct in the future is deeply appreciated.

Further, despite their physical distance from this project and me, my family members across the country—from Indiana, to South Carolina, to Arizona—have supported me in ways I didn't imagine they could. My grandmother, Ruth Back, who always believed I could do better than the day before, has been one of my biggest supporters. The degree of gratitude I have for her will never truly be expressed in words. Similarly, I'm thankful for my found family, including my long-time friends from Western Kentucky University, Zane DeZeeuw and David Haydon who have stuck by me even when life gets in the way of making a phone call for months; my roommates and now friends, Amelia Lehosit, Makenzie Dyer, and Molly Porter who were gracious enough to listen to even the most trivial graduate school woes; those long-distance friends I met playing silly games on Discord: Chris Banotai, Jake Eisele, Max McDonald, Mason Turner, Shjon Campbell, and Colin Barbour; and the friends we call "the silly little guys" who taught me the talent of work-life balance, reintroduced me to the importance of physical movement, and helped heal my inner child despite the great deal of growing up we must do in pursuit of a Ph.D.: Claire Gooding, Celeste Kieran, Em Lim, Nikola Radoicic, Asim Renyard, and Perrin Swanson.

Finally, and most importantly, I am grateful for my husband, Brett Hodinka, who met me before the conception of this project, witnessing my transition into rhetoric and composition and my excitement for supporting student writers. This meant seeing me through some of the darkest days of both of my post-graduate degree programs while pursuing two of his own. I thank him for his persistence, sacrifice, encouragement, and the strength he conjured to support himself and me while we navigated the challenges of necessary cross-country physical distance to achieve our dreams of being doctors. Despite his position in the biological sciences, he admirably listened to me work through theoretical, methodological, and practical challenges and did so with an enthusiasm that assured me this project is important. And, like those listed above, he prevented me from being further convinced that each spare minute was one during which I must produce. Growing up together carries with it a fear of succumbing to rigidity for the sake of being taken seriously, but Brett has contributed significantly to the restoration of my desire for playfulness, my pursuit of joy, and my comfort with spontaneity. Without his love for living, I wouldn't have found the balance necessary to build a healthy relationship with this project that has allowed me to fully care for and be excited by it. I'm thankful for him believing in me, being my voice of carefree reason, and making my dreams achievable.

Chapter 1. The "Theoretical Alliance" of Disability Studies and Transfer in Writing Studies

Before entering my course, Cara, who I introduce in more depth in Chapter 4 and whose story I carry through into Chapter 5, had been diagnosed with depression and an eating disorder. She disclosed this part of her identity early in the term along with her identity as a queer woman. These interlocking aspects of her positionality were revealed to be further complicated and particularly vulnerable given she was born and raised in a rural town in Illinois where conservative values made the act of coming out difficult and the utility of mental healthcare often misunderstood. In receiving her diagnoses, she remembered having her disorders diminished by a male healthcare professional as only needing to be listed so that they could bill her insurance. She wrote "I was once told, by a doctor, that my diagnosis from my psychiatrist, therapist, and dietician was a result of their need to put something on a billing statement. I felt unseen and unheard. I felt that this man was belittling the years I struggled." Although Cara entered the course with a desire to help others who have experienced similar struggles, she also claimed she didn't yet feel equipped with the tools and knowledge to do so, in part, because she had yet to have her personal experience validated as evidence and expertise. By the end of the term, after Cara had learned about and accepted a more social model of disability (defined further below); seen others in the field of disability studies, Indigenous research, and feminist theory use story as evidence of injustice; adopted *mental disability*[1] as a way of describing how she lives with her diagnoses; and practiced applying the critical perspectives in writing, Cara saw herself as more capable of having difficult and uncomfortable conversations with her family members about mental health and heteronormativity and envisioned a greater number of ways she could support others who share similar experiences. In thinking about mental health and disability from these disability studies perspectives, she was able to state that "I feel more comfortable and honestly, like it feels more…powerful almost to say mental disability." Cara was not only able to adopt a new vocabulary for speaking about her mental health experiences but also came to see herself as someone more capable of participating in conversations about social justice and as existing differently in relation to others across material planes.

[1] I take Margaret Price's (2015) understanding of mental disability to be a "term encompassing cognitive, intellectual, and psychiatric disabilities, mental illness, m/Madness and a/Autism, as well as brain injury and psychiatric survivorship" (p. 280).

Even in only Cara's story, my broad research question—"what happens in the writing classroom when we center discourses of disability and mental disability specifically?" —is responded to in ways that productively complicate the role of disability studies scholarship in our classrooms, demonstrating the discursive, embodied, and identity-based shifts that can happen when student experience interacts with academic knowledge on a topic that is often seen as separate from our classrooms, as reserved for our personal and private lives. "What happens" when students engage with mental disability from a critical disability studies perspective is highly varied depending on students' prior experience, positionality, and the boundaries they draw around themselves and material planes to determine where such knowledge belongs. Again, Cara is only one example of how complex and dynamic students' process of taking up disability studies (DS) perspectives is, with other's stories being informed differently based on race, gender, sexuality, geographical location, and other elements of their positionality that impact what they know about and how they have known mental disability and disability broadly. Therefore, the stories I present alongside Cara's in Chapters 4 and 5 further demonstrate how speaking about mental disability can be useful and beneficial in the writing classroom as well as a need to build on current conceptualizations of and approaches to studying students' acts of knowledge transfer. In other words, Cara's story is one demonstration of how I came to respond to my series of research (sub)questions which are as follows:

1. What changes occur when students are reading and writing about mental disability?
    a. What happens to student writing as a result of this engagement?
    b. In what ways do thoughts, ideas, or concepts related to mental disability translate or reappear in student writing and dialogue?
    c. What anticipated and perceptible knowledge application and micro-transfer occurs within the course?
    d. What new words, perceptions, relations to knowledge, and concepts do students demonstrate a knowledge of?
    e. In what other ways might we find indications that the writing classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate transfer of mental disability knowledge?
2. To what extent can these changes prepare students for future engagement with mental disability?
    a. In what ways does confidence with course content contribute to student self-advocacy and agency?

b. What genre possibilities do students see for engaging the content we have covered in the course?

c. What changes can we trace to the boundaries that students construct about mental disability discourse?

d. What changes can be observed in students' perception of their relationship to disability?

e. Where do students see this information being useful for them beyond the course?

I asked these questions in the hope of countering dominant perceptions of disability as a deficiency, especially those that circulate in academia, by building students' critical disability literacy. Importantly, *discourses*, in the simplest terms, are "ways of representing reality" (Fairclough, 2018, p. 15); so, "discourses of disability" are the tools—be they written, verbal, aural, embodied, and so forth—used to determine how disability is known, what we know about it, and how it is otherwise constructed in our collective consciousness and therefore tied to those issues of race, gender, sexuality, and geographical location. Dominant discourses of disability often frame disability as deficit and, as with all discourses, are a way of reinforcing hierarchies of power and superiority or, in other words, a way of keeping the oppressed as such. Beyond shaping our collective consciousness, these discourses also impact the way we structure the physical world and live in relation to others. I will speak more on the social and medical models of disability below, but it's worth acknowledging briefly that how we talk about disability contributes to the physical construction of a world that further disables those who do not fit our idea of the normate subject position. The discourses engaged in the courses I designed and studied as the basis for this dissertation are those that aim to counter dominant discourses that frame disability as deficit.

I did this work within the writing classroom not only because of my proximity to it as a writing instructor but also because writing classrooms can and should be a site for supporting the transfer of critical disability knowledge since writing is one tool used for supporting students in the process of transfer. I am interested in the power of the writing classroom to serve as a site of cultivating and inspiring the transfer of knowledge that is necessary for improving relationships with mental disability among individuals and across campuses. As an ongoing subject of interest in writing studies, transfer, simply understood, is the process of adapting new or prior knowledge for use in a current or future context by making connections between that knowledge's use in one location and its use in another. I trust in transfer scholarship to support disability literacy because it is concerned with mobilizing knowledge and

how such knowledge is taken up as well as transformed from context to context. Additionally, transfer research has been concerned with the role of writing courses in fostering knowledge transfer through the acquisition of genre knowledge and practice of metacognition which I discuss further below. As such, I am curious about the ways in which students learn, incorporate, and transfer knowledge about mental disability in the writing classroom and beyond, and what influences variations in how they take up and transfer such knowledge or make connections in moments of learning and articulating that learning. So, I demonstrate how knowledge about mental disability transfers on a macro- and micro-level—how it can be foregrounded in the writing classroom, how such knowledge shapes student learning and inquiry, how it gets taken up uniquely *as* students write, and how it can affect students' subsequent academic and non-academic literacy experiences in varied ways. In doing so, I've hoped to contribute to achieving one of disability studies' goals "of promoting disability literacy *throughout* the academy" (Samuels, 2013; emphasis mine), ultimately to the benefit of both disabled and normate students.

As part of the effort to support this goal, writing studies scholars currently use multiple pedagogical theories and resources to create accessible classrooms, including disability studies scholarship, universal design for learning (UDL), antiracist pedagogy, and multimodal composition. There is also no doubt that writing scholars agree with Brenda Jo Brueggemann and others' (2001) claim that "Issues of disability matter in composition studies and classrooms…because we have a long, proud history of making the invisible visible and of examining how language both reflects and supports notions of the Other" (p. 371). Further, Danielle Nielson (2013) claims that "Composition classrooms are often one of the first spaces where student 'reading, writing, and thinking practices' are interrogated by teachers and peers alike" (p. 4) meaning it is infused with possibilities for reading, writing, and thinking differently, in this case about how we engage with the subject of disability as well as those who are disabled. However, while these current pedagogical theories attune themselves to students' multiple and varied realities, structuring a course on these principles does not guarantee a deeper understanding of disability among students. In other words, an accessibly-designed classroom does not require nor guarantee critical thinking about disability.

Building on the work of transfer scholars as well as DS scholars such as Brueggemann et al. (2001), Margaret Price (2007), Shannon Walters (2010), and Amy Vidali (2017) who incorporate disability

texts and DS scholarship and perspectives to teach critical thinking and challenge students to consider the difficulties of disability research, I set out to address this concern. Below, I show that we, as writing instructors, are well-equipped to support critical thinking about disability and expand disability literacy because of our rhetorical skill and experience supporting critical thinking. Because the writing curriculum traditionally covers rhetoric, be that in the teaching of appeals and rhetorical analysis or in the teaching of rhetorical theory more deeply, writing classrooms can be a space for us to begin (re)presenting disability to respond to its physical and discursive exclusion from the university. When we recognize disability difference as, in part, a social, rhetorical construction, we create possibilities for examining where and how that construction occurs and for (re)constructing dominant discourses of disability that often frame it as deficit. In short, countering dominant negative disability representations requires a critical and rhetorical awareness that we can support in writing classrooms because we are already equipped with the tools to do so.

My confidence in the role of writing instructors and classrooms in this endeavor led me to include counterstories of disability and critical disability studies scholarship in my courses generally and for the two courses I designed to respond to these research questions. With Institutional Review Board approval I designed and conducted two qualitative studies in two separate courses I taught at the University of Washington in 2023: Critical Composition which served as a pilot study and Intermediate Expository Writing which serves as the focus of this project. I describe these studies in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3 but, to overview, note that I received informed consent to collect data from 10 students in Critical Composition and 15 students in Intermediate Expository Writing. This data included their formal and informal in- and out-of-class writing as well as their responses to two surveys. In addition, three of the 10 and six of the 15 students agreed to participate in one-on-one interviews with me which I conducted once throughout the term with each student around week seven out of 10 apart from two follow-up interviews (one from each course) which took place after students' enrollment. In general, my study data was analyzed first through open, *in vivo* coding which allowed me to identify patterns across students' writing. For the study in Intermediate Expository Writing and with those patterns, I have developed five overarching themes and used thematic and discourse analysis to offer rich descriptions of students' transfer processes on the micro-level in Chapters 4 and 5. This involved identifying how students define

concepts, themselves, others, space, and time which I describe as *boundary-work* in Chapter 4 when I begin introducing case studies.

To ask "what happens?" in the writing classroom means to wonder how students write about, conceptualize, resist, welcome, or otherwise respond when engaging with discourses of disability and disability studies' lexicon, theories, and goals while doing the work we ordinarily ask of them in the writing classroom. However, one cannot fully anticipate the array of student responses nor chart them as some are affective, masked, or otherwise hidden in ways a researcher cannot observe. In addition, and as will be demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5, these discourses also influence students in embodied ways, impacting how they move within and between varied spatio-temporal planes and therefore come into contact with others in ways that reinforce or counter dominant power dynamics. Thus, my understanding of "what happens" is ever-evolving as will be illustrated in those chapters. When I ask "what happens" of myself as a teacher; a few initial memorable moments come to mind: a student sharing that they learned they have and needed to seek help for bulimia as a result of their research paper; a group discussion including multiple disclosures of disability experience; a greater trust in those developing disability literacy[2]; a decision to write about misunderstandings of mental disability in the media; and many personal connections to the concept of *bodymind*.[3]

Overall, this chapter situates my work in conversation with writing studies, disability, transfer, rhetorical genre studies, and uptake scholars, emphasizing the potential of a disability studies-centered writing course and outlining a short history of transfer scholarship to illustrate how disability studies and transfer studies can connect to support one another. To begin, the following section offers a definition of DS and surveys some issues addressed by disability scholars, particularly as they pertain to the academy, its glorification of the mind, and the writing classroom. Following my discussion of DS and writing studies' relationship to it, I introduce the phenomenon of transfer, offering a definition, briefly

---

[2] In popular discourse, *literacy* is understood as one's ability to read and write. However, the Oxford English Dictionary also defines it as "competence or knowledge in a particular area" ("literacy," 2). So, this knowledge or competence about disability, a general awareness of its existence, is part of disability literacy. In this work, *disability literacy* is not only knowledge or competence of disability as subject, but disability as construct and disability as method for examining ableism and disablism. Thus, "competence or knowledge" equates to a critical literacy or ability to think critically about disability and about the ways we communicate with and about it.

[3] Informed by Price's (2015) reading in trauma studies, the term *bodymind* symbolizes the understanding that "mental and physical processes not only affect each other but also give rise to each other—that is…they tend to act as one, even though they are conventionally understood as two" (p. 269).

outlining its history, and connecting it to uptake theory. I further situate my dissertation within my personal disability and transfer experiences to demonstrate the ways in which the personal contributes to the phenomenon of transfer. These orientations will highlight the need for greater attention to transfer and uptake in DS (and vice versa), particularly if we design disability-centered writing courses that aim to teach frameworks for understanding disability beyond the dominant deficit and overcoming narratives within the academy. I therefore establish the exigence for combining these fields and lines of scholarship by outlining the prevalence of mental disability and deficit lenses within the academy, articulating the role of uptake in transfer studies and the role of both in writing courses, emphasizing a need for greater engagement with DS discourse in writing courses and across campus, and arguing for the utility of transfer theories and studies to achieve some of the goals of DS. Finally, I explain how my studies and dissertation build upon these conversations.

Defining Disability and Disability Studies

When I think of disability, I think of it as, in Jay Dolmage's (2017) words, "always-everywhere" (p. 73). I think of my mother—an alcoholic with PTSD and a heritable mood disorder. I think of the deaf boy in my high school who some girls labeled as "creepy" simply because of the way he spoke. I think of my brother with Asperger's syndrome and a former student who disclosed his same diagnosis to me though he was afraid to tell his peers. I think of the boy I knew who moved to Florida and died of suicide. I think of the young woman in one of the first writing classes I taught who was admitted to the psychiatric hospital as a result of her manic episodes and persistent bouts of paranoia. I think of my immunocompromised and chronically ill friends. And I think, too, of my grandma and late grandpa, at 90 and 92 respectively—the two hardest workers I've known shrinking, moving with walkers and sciatica, moving with the same screws and plates I have in my leg. I think of them and the ways in which "we will all become disabled at some point in our lives" (p. 62; access also Garland Thomson, 1997, p. 14).

I not only think of these people but the potential of their disabilities to act as openings, as catalysts, as questions asked about the future of disability, as it will always be present in our future. Thus, I think about desires to erase disability from our present and futures, the tendencies to exclude, punish, correct, and ignore disabled people, to push them to the margins and out of institutions. I think about ableism and its persistence in our discourse and ideologies—consequently I think about structural

violence and the intersectional nature of disability and how disability would have been experienced differently were the above individuals, for example, women of color. I think of accommodation and access, of misfitting, of the productivity of discomfort in that speaking our discomfort becomes a source of discomfort for the normate.[4] Disability, to me, is a way of knowing and being; it is an identity and a rhetorical construction (in both the material and discursive sense); it is social; it is a call for coalition and community building and a call to critique normative constructions of the body, the mind, time, space, and movement. It is all of this and much more and my understanding of it is always developing though there are some dominant perspectives of disability within the field of disability studies—these perspectives are some we discussed in my classes and therefore some I find necessary to engage on the path to enhancing disability literacy. Within this section, I provide overarching definitions of disability studies as well as an overview of some issues and topics covered by DS scholars to place my study alongside them and to demonstrate the exigence for the work I hope to do in our classrooms.

Within DS, disability is understood as both individually experienced and socially constructed through disabling environments. The social model of disability was a much-needed perspective arising out of the disability rights movement—it frames disabilities as social justice issues rather than medical issues (Seibers, 2019, p. 40) by turning our attention to the world's disabling structures and away from the medical model which emphasizes the need for individual cure, pathologizing and individualizing disability. It therefore puts pressure on society to change rather than putting the onus on disabled individuals to conform to normate subject positions and ways of being. In terms of mental disability, Dan Goodley (2014) notes that "It is important not to settle psychopathology within the individual. The psyche should be configured not in terms of the inferiority of a human being but as an entity, often associated

[4] "Comfort is about an encounter between bodies and worlds, the promise of a sinking feeling" or a stretching of the world and environment around particular bodies (Ahmed, 2012, p. 40) whereas "Discomfort involves [the] failure to fit" (p. 41). To Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, "Fitting…is a function of relations of power, for a person's fit or misfit is 'sustained' or not by changing contexts and attitudes" (qtd. in Price, 2007, p. 271–2). A person can fit one day and not the next depending on the context, relationships, and affects involved in the situation. Despite the experience of discomfort, "the cost of fitting is perhaps complacency about social justice and a desensitizing to material experience" (Garland-Thomson, 2011, qtd.in Goodley, 2014, p. 105). To misfit, then, holds productive potential for bringing to light social injustices while also putting one at risk of not being heard or being heard and being made into the problem because of the discomfort of those who experience the sinking feeling (Ahmed, 2012, e.g., p. 145).

with attitudes, desires and feelings, that comes to be known and felt in the culture, communities and relationships in which we live" (p. 55). Further, Elizabeth Donaldson (2011) argues that mental illness must be thought of as social, to an extent, to detract from this incredibly un-beneficial pathologization that takes place when societal relations and ideologies are not taken into account. The social model recognizes that biology alone does not create disability. Rather, people are disabled by physical and ideological environments which instate and reinforce norms about whose bodies and minds belong (Dolmage, 2017, p. 128). In short, the social model of disability persists in that there is a common understanding that disability is constructed through our built environments, ideologies, and discourse. This perspective has been essential for me as a scholar and a disabled person to be able to place discussions of disability within academic spaces and to reject the idea that it is reserved for the personal and private spaces of home.

Despite the appropriate attention given to the ways in which physical structures and rhetoric create disability, DS scholars have challenged the social model, claiming that placing full responsibility of the existence of disability on a cultural or social system can diminish the individual agency and experience of those who are disabled therefore ignoring the role of the body (Seibers, 2019, p. 40) and acting "as a method of silencing", of drawing political power away from individuals who identify as disabled (Dolmage, 2017, p. 54). To expand, Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley (2019) argue that a total rejection of the medical model ignores the realities of particularly vulnerable racial minorities who "are actually yearning for not only care but treatment and cure" (p. 28). Price (2013) expands on these conversations in her argument on the realities of mental and physical pain, highlighting the need to view disability as, at moments, both individually painful and socially constructed (p. 276). In other words, relying on both the social and medical model, which fixates on responding to or "curing" and "treating" individual pain, helps us recognize the importance of the body and also acknowledges the systemic oppressions that place some bodies apart from others along raced, classed, and gendered lines. These claims suggest that medical treatment, be it Western or alternative, can serve as a form of social justice—thus, we need both perspectives of disability to truly account for the nuances of disability experiences. Such a merging of perspectives was what I aimed to transfer to students to influence their own thinking about their and other's disabilities.

So, including DS scholars' voices was essential in that DS offers us a language and the tools needed to account for these nuances and to examine constructions of disability as well as ableism and disablism in various facets of our lives because, according to Dolmage (2014), "Disability studies challenges the idea that disability is a deficit or defect that should be cured or remedied, disrupts the idea that an individual with disabilities can be defined solely through her disabilities, and critiques representations of disability as pitiable, inviting charity, to be compensated for, made invisible, or overcome" (p. 20). Additionally, Margaret Price (2011) states that "DS concerns itself with human difference, and emphasizes the ways that people with disabilities are ostracized, medicalized, heroized, and otherwise pushed out of the societally defined space of the 'normal'" (p. 29).

Disability is also understood as a method for understanding or critiquing normative structures rather than only a subject. This shift involves scrutinizing social norms that define attributes as impairments and the structural norms that punish cognitive and physical variation and how they are stigmatized (Minich, 2016). Disability as a method and methodology draws us away from focusing and finding an object of analysis and urges us to focus on a method of analysis or a way of examining any number of objects. At issue is that "one can study disabled people and not be doing critical disability studies and one can be doing critical disability studies and not be directly studying disabled people" (Schalk, 2017). A methodological perspective of disability does not require the presence of disabled people, and focuses on issues of power, privilege, and dominance (Schalk, 2017; Minich, 2016). It is a tool with which we can locate ableism and analyze it versus telling stories of disability for inclusivity without attention to underlying assumptions about disability. Such a perspective is useful for students for breaking external and internalized stigma and building better relations with oneself and others.

Disability scholars, therefore, participate in what Rosemarie Garland-Thomson calls "retrieval" or the process of "finding analytical potential in work not explicitly deemed to be feminist disability studies scholarship" (Goodley, p. 47). For example, scholars address the experiences of mentally disabled researchers (Green et al., 2020), normative constructions of time (Wood, 2017; Kafer, 2013; Dolmage, 2017), accommodation and accessibility generally and in writing classrooms and writing program administration (Dolmage, Helquist, and Wood, 2020; Ho et al., 2020; Kerschbaum et al., 2013; Simpkins, 2018; Vidali, 2015; Dolmage, 2017), connections between queerness and disability (Clare, 2015; McRuer,

2006; Kafer, 2013; Erevelles, 2011), the ways in which academic writing perpetuates disability (Vidali, 2008; Hitt, 2021), disclosure (Uthappa, 2018; Walters, 2018; Kerschbaum et al., 2017), rhetorical constructions of disability (Brueggemann, 1999; Yergeau, 2017; Cherney, 2019; Dolmage, 2016, 2017; Hitt, 2021; Price, 2011; Hanganu-Bresch and Berkenkotter, 2019), disability as a method and perspective (Minich, 2017; Schalk, 2017; Linton, 2005), and the intersectionality of race and disability (Schalk and Kim, 2020; Cedillo, 2018; Pickens, 2019). These scholars recognize that negative experiences with disability "can be created" through the aforementioned constructions (Dolmage, 2017, p. 123) and actively critique and combat such constructions to build a world and institutions not in which disabled people are expected to conform, but within which they are welcomed, acknowledged, and seen as offering something valuable to their multiple and varied communities. My study aims to bring such analytical frames into students' lives so that they can better advocate for and understand themselves and others, particularly in discussions of mental disability.

In Margaret Price's (2015) article, "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain", she notes that "feminist DS tends to rely on examples and experiential evidence that pull from the realms of the physical and sensory, consistently skirting examples that would bring mind more centrally into our debates" (p. 271). Star Ford echoes this argument with the belief that examples of UDL have "skirted acknowledgment of the sensory and cognitive" (Dolmage, 2017, p. 118). Challenging the dichotomous relationship between body and mind and truly adopting *bodymind* requires grappling more directly with mental disability. I center mental disability in my studies because I advocate for this call to action as a result of my own experiences as someone who is mentally disabled and my recognition of the ways in which mental disability is ignored, suppressed, or demonized in our everyday lives, particularly within the academy. As mentioned earlier, I distinguish and define *mental disability* as "cognitive, intellectual, and psychiatric disabilities, mental illness, m/Madness and a/Autism, as well as brain injury and psychiatric survivorship" (Price, 2015, p. 280). Such a term and definition is capacious and is more inclusive than terms such as *mental illness* or *mental disorder* in that it less so connotes a formal diagnosis or a need for a cure. Clinical terminology such as this can be exclusionary and leave out the realities of those who do not have the privilege of diagnosis (i.e., access to mental healthcare). In contrast to physical disabilities, mental disabilities, in this definition, relate to differences in mental and emotional experience that can

impact one's quality of life on any given day or differences that are constructed by normative expectations of time and cognition that make it difficult for someone to "perform" in a way that allows them to comfortably "fit" within a particular environment. The difference from physical disability is not that the mental disability cannot be "seen", especially since you can see some mental disability behaviors or impacts outwardly, but that physical disability relates to differences in embodiment that have not been accounted for in the construction of normative material space therefore limiting one's ability to physically engage. However, when I speak of disability broadly, I speak of both physical and mental disability (unless otherwise specified as in my use of "mental disability" alone), understanding that many physical and mental disabilities overlap, understanding that those with physical and mental disabilities experience the same injustices though to varying degrees at different moments in time. Such injustices are viscerally visualized within institutions of higher education where "all disabilities…are invisible [because] until an accommodation is granted, they have no legal reality" (Dolmage, 2017, p. 117). The following section elaborates on these injustices and is followed by an account of how rhetoric's history constructs and perpetuates negative perceptions of disability.

Addressing Disability in the Academy

Though already common in the academy, mental disability and mental disability symptoms became more of a concern in 2020 at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic as educators and administrators worried about the effects of social isolation, online schooling, greater attention to structural violence, and a hostile political climate leading them to develop initiatives for the benefit of student "well-being" and "wellness," for example, in the form of suggestions for self-care. Jina B. Kim and Sami Schalk (2021) show us that, following the 2016 election, "self-care" became a greater concern for the general population in that "The rise of searches for and references to *self-care* during and after the 2016 election season suggests that, in a frightening and divisive political time, many Americans were trying to figure out how to attend to their mental and physical well-being" (p. 326). Discussions of self-care, wellness, and well-being too often trivialize the issue by equating "good" mental health with surface-level solutions, euphemizing mental health as "wellness" and "well-being" —words that imply we do not speak about disability considering "The normative demand in academia is that disability must disappear" (Dolmage, 2017, p. 84) —and individualizing initiatives to improve student wellness which conforms to the medical

model of disability. The responsibility, then, of student self-care and avenues toward wellness and well-being is placed on students because the institution idealizes what Goodley calls the "neoliberal-able" student who is able-bodied and minded, who "will progress through life via individual merit and hardwork" (p. 27), and who is always "making and repairing itself" (p. 30).

University programs and initiatives aim to teach students skills for coping with stressors and provide support in the form of counseling, group services, and pamphlets but many offer suggestions in ways that minimize disability experiences such as "get more sleep," "manage your time," "practice mindfulness," and "talk to a friend" —these suggestions exclude not only those with serious mental illnesses (SMIs), but also full- and part-time student workers, students in less-than-ideal living situations, and students struggling to find community, all of which could overlap in complex ways. These programs and initiatives ask disabled students to be able-bodyminded and reinforce a university design informed by a vision of an ideal human and student; pushes for improved wellness and well-being on an individual level are a desire for disabled students to achieve that ideal position. Therefore, students with disabilities are still kept out of the university despite the programs and initiatives that are developed in the name of diversity and inclusion (Dolmage, 2017, p. 26). This minimization, pathologization, and expectation that students can "fix" their mental health on their own causes students to "avoid speaking up" (Price, 2013). Because those within the university are believed and expected to live "the life of the mind" (Pryal, 2017) and because the university persistently structures its practices upon the logic of cognitive ableism,[5] being mentally disabled as a college student seemingly falls out of the realm of possibility. An increased and enhanced disability literacy on the part of students, instructors, and administrators and its manifestation in educational spaces can counter the implicit belief that mental disability does not belong and allow us to reshape institutional ideas about a "right" way to exist within academic spaces.

Asking "what happens" when we incorporate disability studies perspectives in the writing classroom is, in part, inspired by this recognition of the academy's habit of reinforcing constructions of disability that place it within the realm of disbelonging, emphasizing the ways in which, at its foundation, the academy was not created with disabled students in mind. In his comprehensive analysis of rhetorical

[5] Cognitive ableism, as understood by Carlson (2001), is the bias toward the interests of able-minded students or students with certain cognitive abilities, the bias against those who are "believed not to possess them" (qtd. in Goodley, p. 30).

constructions of disability, *Academic Ableism*, Dolmage (2017) begins with a dismal and discouraging account of the ableist realities of the university. Initially, the revelations resulting from his analyses leave little hope for an academic future designed to be proactively and continually inclusive of non-normative bodies and minds. For example, Dolmage highlights a number of jarring, yet not-so-shocking, statistics including the percentage of graduate students with depression and the percentage that contemplate suicide as well as the rate of mental illness for academic staff in comparison to the general public. He states that "In no other profession is this stress better camouflaged behind other, supposedly inviolable, and more important 'values' like autonomy, flexibility, and creativity" (p. 56). This statement is embedded within a broader argument about the elitism and eugenicist logics that inform the structure of the academy both materially and intellectually which consequently excludes and/or flushes out certain bodyminds by reinforcing the "adversarial, normative, very physically demanding, very time sensitive and urgent, very high stakes nature of the entire curriculum and pedagogy of the university" (p. 169), "educationally construct[ing]" disability (p. 165). Dan Goodley's (2014) argument coincides with Dolmage's as he states that "Ordinary, mainstream public schools are arguably the quintessentially most ableist of all institutions" (p. 100). As such, those within the university should be concerned with student mental health and the normative constructions of ability, cognition, time, and space that disable students and funnel them out of our classrooms. Incorporating critical disability perspectives into our classrooms, as I did for the studies at the heart of this project, is a way of bringing these realities to the fore and of encouraging a larger group of supporters for improved disability literacy, particularly a literacy that includes increased attention to invisible disabilities. The next section provides one account of rhetoric's history to demonstrate how rhetoric and disability are intertwined to further highlight the role of rhetoricians and compositionists in achieving the goals of my project.

Rhetoricity and Disability

To define rhetoric, I follow theorists such as Dana Cloud (2018) who establishes "an idea of rhetoric as *mediation*, as occupying the middle space between knowledge and meaning, inevitably shaping what can be known and how it can be known, as well as defining what counts as true and real" (p. 16). In this view, rhetoric is an ever-present filter through which all information is transmitted—no piece of information can be communicated by humans without rhetoric because rhetoric shapes how

information is presented, interpreted, received, and circulated. All communication about disability is rhetorical. Laurie Gries (2015) notes that for something to be rhetorical it must have the "ability to induce change in thought, feeling, and action; organize and maintain collective formation; exert power, etc.; as it enters into relation with other things (human or nonhuman)." How we speak about disability, then, is rhetorical in that, when we speak of disability it shapes how disability is understood and how we interact with those in the disability community—inducing changes in thought, feeling, and action. The rhetorical force of disability discourse has and continues to construct disability as something other-than and, although shifts toward embodied and material rhetorics (Chavez, 2015; Barnett & Boyle, 2016; Stormer & McGreavy, 2017; Boyle, 2018; Gries & Brooke, 2018; Cedillo, 2018; Cooper, 2018) respond in necessary ways to the ableist histories of rhetoric, classical rhetoric contributes, in part, to these negative constructions of disability and places disabled people outside of the rhetorical.

Plato and Aristotle are credited with forming the foundation of the Western rhetorical tradition; within that tradition, Plato made a distinction between the rational and irrational or the rational and appetitive parts of the soul. According to Agnieszka Iskra-Paczkowska and Przemyslaw Paczkowski (2016) "Plato…considered *psuche* [the mind] as distinct from the body, ultimately assign[ing] feelings and passions (such as lust, anger, courage) only to the soul, namely its lower parts: appetite and passion" (p. 22). Because passion or emotion was seen as associated with the body and passion was seen as "independent of rational knowledge," the body, too, became associated with "cognitive error…[and was seen as] a mistake of reason" or as opening one up to the possibility of misconception as was articulated in Plato's *Protagoras* (p. 22–23); therefore, good or rational speech could only be achieved by those who do not subject themselves to feelings and emotions that could lead to false speech resulting in a disdain for the body and its ability to subject us to negative passions and desires.

Following Plato, Aristotle believed in rightly felt and wrongly felt emotions or "improperly felt emotions" (p. 24) and proper responses to emotion for achieving good as well as the necessity of controlling one's emotions to be a good man; however, he saw the body and mind as more deeply connected than Plato. His distinction between good and harmful responses to emotions or passions deemed the latter an "*intellectual* error in appreciation of what is good" (p. 22; emphasis mine). However, he saw the body and mind as inseparable in inspiring action as every bodily organ was attached to some

mental action or action of the soul apart from the highest type of mental cognition (p. 22). This *right* way of responding to emotion was what determined one's excellence and therefore anyone who experienced emotions counter to what was seen as acceptable or good was viewed with a deficit or excess lens, as other, and as lacking goodness. Expanding on the idea that one with difference of mind might be perceived as less rhetorically effective, in his introduction to *Aristotle: The Art of Rhetoric*, Hugh Lawson-Tancred states that Aristotle believed that "first, the subject [speaker] must be in an appropriate state of mind to experience the emotion; second, there must be a stimulus of the right kind to induce the emotion; and, third, the object of the emotion must be of the appropriate kind" (p. 22) which negates the experience of emotions or states of mind opposed to that which is deemed rational and right. Moreover, Aristotle believed that "dialectic does not construct its syllogisms out of any haphazard materials, such as the fancies of *crazy people*, but out of materials that call for discussion" (p. 214), negating the experiences and concerns of those who do not support the interests of those in positions of power. Despite Aristotle's tendency toward the nuance of truth and persuasiveness, he believed in the necessity of *clear* and ordinary language stating that "clearness is secured by using the words (nouns and verbs alike) that are current and ordinary" (p. 237), implying that clearness is achieved by particular rhetors who can conform to the use of vocabulary and structures that are ordinary or standard, excluding the rhetoricity of those who may appear to develop a less clear and therefore nonnormative use of language. To him, "The use of *rational* speech is more of a human being than the use of his limbs" (p. 212; emphasis mine). In short, "rhetoric is what makes one human" (Yergeau, 2017, p. 6).

In his discussion of postconventionalist thought, Goodley (2014) notes that such theorists recognized that "what it means to feel human is…a matter of what and how one is meant to feel as a human in contemporary society" (p. 63) which is and has been determined by how we rhetorically present and engage with disability in our everyday lives and as stated, in the rhetorical tradition, one's degree of humanness was determined by their perceived level of rationality as "man is a rational animal" (Goodley, 1996, p. 400; qtd. in Stainton, 2001, p. 453). Christina Cedillo (2018) draws on this history, stating that "Individuals whose bodies [and minds] are perceived as non-normative are framed as unreliable rhetors who cannot speak to more than a thin sliver of experience" (n.p.; access, also, Dolmage, 2014, p. 24–25). Further, in his analysis of traditional rhetorical associations of reason and value with humanness, Tim

Stainton (2001) argues that there was a hierarchy or “scale of beings" established in the dialogues of Plato and Aristotle (p. 452) which was determined based on one’s ability or capacity to reason, to practice rhetoric. This is also illustrated by M. Remi Yergeau (2017) who examines rhetoric’s tradition of denying the rhetoricity of those who are mentally disabled. For example, they note that rhetoricity is denied to the schizophrenic person whose “schizophrenia causes the person to act" rather than the person exercising agency—“mental disability signals a kind of rhetorical involuntariness. Mental disability wields more agency than mentally disabled people" (p. 10). Moreover, associations of mental disability with violence, for example, is predicated on the assumption that those who are mentally disabled are arhetorical; the mentally disabled person is not acting or exercising agency, their actions are seen as devoid of a desire to communicate or exercise rhetoricity (Yergeau, p. 83). By claiming that rhetoric is what sets humans apart from other animals and denying the rhetoricity of the mentally disabled through silencing and invalidating rhetorical contributions through associations of mental disability with irrationality, the history of rhetoric denies that those with mental disabilities are fully human (p. 5–6; access, also, Brueggemann, 1999, p. 11). Despite this history, rhetorical scholars have developed theories that counter the Western, European, and ableist undertones as well as deny the traditional belief that rhetoric is a purely human act.

Scholars such as John Poulakos (1983) argued for a revival of Sophistic thought that centers the experiential and kairotic in its attention to the circumstantial nature of rhetoric. In Ancient Greece, the Platonists were combative toward the Sophists who believed in and practiced the theory of *dissoi logoi* which was the practice of valuing varied perspectives, giving equal space and weight to the realities and truths of multiple parties. They also held the belief that whether something was good or bad, seemly or shameful depended on the context, culture, and people involved. Thus, nothing was free from rhetoric and truth and reality were constructed through language which informs much of our understanding of disability today, as socially constructed through built environments and the language we use to discuss it. The Sophists were also “the first to appreciate and articulate the persuasive power of emotional appeal” (Glenn, 1997, p. 34) seen by the Platonists as irrational and of minimal influence in perceiving truth because it clouded judgment. However, *dissoi logoi* has become the more common underlying principle of thought in rhetorical theory today. Casey Boyle (2018), for example, claims that *dissoi logoi* is a way to sense disparate experiences (p. 86) which reads as opening up possibilities for diverse perspectives and

ways of thinking that have traditionally been excluded from Platonic and therefore current-traditional thought. This Sophistic reorientation gave rise to the feminist rewritings of the rhetorical tradition by scholars such as Susan Jarratt (1991) and Cheryl Glenn (1997) who question who gets heard in Western philosophical thought. Pushes against the Western rhetorical tradition also appear in the work of scholars advocating for ecological, public, feminist, material, and embodied rhetorics that attend to movement, difference, and rhetorical constructions of social relations and individuals. These scholars demonstrate that there are an array of rhetorics rather than *a/one* rhetoric and a multitude of ways in which we can make meaning, be in the world, and theorize through our experiences.

The field's turn toward embodied and material rhetorics also provided an opportunity for scholars to critique the ableism and compulsory able-bodiedness inherent in rhetorical thought and teaching practices. As Cedillo (2018) notes "Rhetoric privileges movement—emotional, ethical, physical. Hence, composition pedagogy aims to teach students to move others toward particular stances or courses of action. These goals often rely on normate standards of emotional engagement and activity, based in standards of white eurowestern ablebodiedness that associate certain kinds of movement with agency and expression" (n.p.). Thus, she argues "that we must strive for critical embodiment pedagogies, or approaches that recognize and foreground bodily diversity so that students learn to compose for accessibility and inclusivity" (n.p.). Karma Chávez's (2015) work, for example, challenges normative embodied assumptions claiming that if rhetoric wants to be a field of resistance, it must grapple with bodies—beyond the normative—rejecting ideas and values of civility, respectability, and normative identity that center the white, male, cis, able-bodied, heterosexual body—the unspoken ideal body. And it is only through bodily difference in contrast to this ideal that particular bodies come to matter (p. 242). Embodied rhetorics make valuable moves in the field of rhetoric and new materialism takes us one step further, locating meaning making and rhetoricity in the more-than-human realities of the material world. In other words, materialism seeks to validate the rhetoricity of the nonhuman on its own terms rather than in terms of Western thought, theory, and bodies. Extending rhetoricity beyond humans can also expand our understanding of human rhetoricity, particularly in response to the association of rhetoric with humanness and as a counter to the dehumanization of those who are mentally disabled.

Because disability and ability (along with normality and abnormality) are constructed socially and discursively, disability injustice becomes an issue for rhetoricians. Disability is not only constructed but also *used* as a rhetorical device to inscribe meaning as well as disable other minoritized groups. To be concerned with rhetorical constructions of disability is to be concerned with what Sara Ahmed (2012) calls a "politics of stranger making: how some and not others become strangers; how emotions of fear and hatred stick to certain bodies; [and] how some bodies become understood as the rightful occupants of certain spaces" (p. 3), all of which occurs through the rhetorical force of disability representations which, as the next section covers, have already been taken up and responded to by writing scholars in a variety of ways.

Approaching Disability in Writing Studies

Informed by these lines of thought and prevalent within the academy specifically are rhetorics of overcoming which are "dominant discourses of disability that focus on diagnosis, disclosure, and accommodations" (Hitt, 2021, p. 19) which Alison Harper Hitt argues "[are] ableist process[es] that [position] disabled student writers and disabled embodiments as less than and normative composing practices as ideal. When people engage in rhetorics of overcoming, they reinforce the stigma of disability as something bad that has no place in higher education and must instead be overcome for a student to succeed within that space" (p. 59). Craig A. Meyer (2013) notes that "The theme of overcoming is problematic because it suggests that disabled people should overcome their disability through hard work and extreme effort, ignoring the need for accommodation and cooperative efforts in the production and distribution of knowledge in our profession." In her article examining the relationship between rhetorical constructions of disabled students and basic writers, Amy Vidali (2008) critiques deficit theory and rhetorics of overcoming, cure, and the individual ability to work hard and conquer one's illness—arguing that there should be an acknowledgment of how material conditions, lack of support, and institutional barriers construct both basic writers and disabled students. Such narratives remind us that "ableism is everywhere" (Dolmage, 2017) which does not mean we should invalidate our teaching or the good that education can do, but that we need to keep looking for ableism, finding it, and attempting to change ableist structures that inform our own, our colleagues, and the University's practices (p. 31). These overcoming narratives have been a concern for writing scholars such as Hitt who investigates how and

where rhetorics of overcoming show up in writing pedagogies and practices, making the presentation of alternative representations and constructions of disability the responsibility of writing instructors. Scholarship on disability representations in the academy asks writing scholars what role we play in such constructions and challenges us to reconstruct narratives through pedagogy.

Consequently, writing scholars have responded by adopting accessible pedagogy and UDL processes. Ronald Mace defines UDL as "the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible without the need for adaptation or specialized design (qtd. in Dolmage, 2017, p. 115). Dolmage elaborates, stating that the three tenets of UDL are providing "multiple means of student engagement…multiple means of delivering content…and multiple ways for students to express themselves and act" (p. 124). In other words, UDL "provid[es] students with multiple access points, modes, and media to engage and produce content" (Hitt, p. 45). Some ways in which writing instructors engage in the process of UDL is by sharing electronic readings as Word Documents and sharing prompts and other materials in multiple modes such as online and on overhead projectors (Nielson, 2013, p. 12). Danielle Nielson (2013) also practices UDL by providing both written and verbal instruction, offering multiple opportunities to speak privately, multiple modes of sharing information through genre translation, and multiple options for participating in class (e.g., "group work, individual work, and class discussions," p. 17; access, also, McAlexander, 2003; Dolmage, Helquist, & Wood, 2020). Accessibility is also closely tied to UDL in that, as Sushil Oswal states, accessibility is "the ability to use, enjoy, perform, work on, avail of, and participate in a resource, technology, activity, opportunity or product at an equal or comparable level with others" (qtd. in Gonzales and Butler, 2020, n.p.).

Similarly, Dolmage (2013) argues that we should "[make] space for the unexpected and extraordinary insights, interactions, embodiments, and cognitive and communicative styles that disability promises" rather than making a list of functions that the ideal student should complete and enforcing them as instructors of writing. Valuing these extraordinary insights provided by disability allows instructors to participate in the "microrebellions" that help change what the academy is and what it means to be a part of it (Price, 2011, p. 7) through re-presenting disability in our classrooms. For example, "people who experience depression often suffer from memory loss. When you're depressed, growth of brain cells in your hippocampus…is suppressed" (Pryal, p. 43). This is particularly important to consider when

approaching the work of writing students who may not meet our expectations of what it means to remember concepts from a session or text or who might not be able to piece together memories in normative ways. Seeing these differences as contributions rather than deficits allows us to rebel against normative expectations of writing. Pushes toward accessibility and considerations of disability have directed us toward multimodal approaches because multimodality has the potential to help us "recogniz[e] that communicative practices are fluid, emergent, always in flux" (Gonzales and Butler, 2020, n.p.). Multimodality, in its acceptance and celebration of multiple ways of composing, allows students to use the tools that work best with their capabilities and interests, stories, and for producing with a variety of means that work for the time frames which are most generative for them (also access Hitt, 2021). However, scholars such as Shannon Walters (2018) explore normative constructions of writing and what writing should or can be, critiquing the normative assumptions underlying pedagogies of multimodality related to wholeness, coherence, and closure.

In addition to multimodality, Tara Wood (2017) proposes the method of "cripping time" in the writing classroom, stating that the academy is a time-bound institution, arguing for crip time which was coined by Alison Kafer as "flex time not just expanded, but exploded; [requiring] reimagining our notions of what can and should happen in time, or recognizing how expectations of 'how long things take' are based on very particular minds and bodies…Rather than bend disabled bodies and minds to meet the clock, crip time bends the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds" (qtd. in Wood, p. 268). Normative constructions of time and productivity reinforce ableist and disablist structures within the writing classroom. Wood is thus concerned with issues of time and productivity and the hold that these things have on the university as well as the injustice that ensues as a result for those who do not fit into normative views and ways of thinking about and doing writing.

For example, metacognitive activities standardize a certain way of *thinking* about one's own writing by asking students to think about their thinking which may prove difficult for some students with mental disabilities, such as those who experience depressive symptoms since recollection of our thinking processes can be more complicated. Further, though contested with approaches such as ungrading, assessment practices based on both correctness and labor ignore disabled realities by standardizing a way of engaging with content and not accounting for the additional labor disabled students have to

complete to fit into the university; additionally, writing tends to privilege written word as a meaning-making practice and, although multimodal approaches counter such roots, “the emphasis on coherence and wholeness and celebration of completeness and clarity that is expected and accepted in multimodal composing environments can be inhospitable to disability experience” (Walters, 2018, n.p.; discussed further below). In this discussion, Walters argues that disability has radical and productive potential for redefining multimodality and our relationship to multimodal writing and disabled students. A disability focus on coherence and wholeness allows for a greater inclusivity of students who are mentally and physically disabled.

Currently, writing studies is experiencing a decolonial and equity-oriented turn toward alternative ways of knowing, doing, and being in direct opposition to Western dominance. Cedillo (2018) states that “In the composition classroom, systematic oppressions function to construe Othered ways of knowing and writing as deficiencies, as rhetorical offenses to be corrected” (n.p.). She argues for more embodied approaches to writing that recognize the role of the body in our writing practices, particularly bodily diversity because the invisibility of whiteness and able-bodiedness implies these are normative stances or positions from which to experience the world and do not require disclosures of markers of difference. Moreover, Wood claims that *time* within the writing classroom should be constructed in ways that do not conform to compulsory able-bodiedness (p. 270). Crip time, then, serves as a way to flexibly work with students to design individual approaches to writing.

While UDL, accessible pedagogies, and multimodal approaches appropriately and admirably attune themselves to the realities of our students’ disability experiences, structuring a course based on UDL principles or even accessible pedagogy does not guarantee an understanding of UDL, its purpose and goals, or a deeper understanding of disability for students. UDL, therefore, may be more broadly effective and generally applicable if framed by course assignments and readings with the goal of engaging students with disability studies. In other words, a universally designed classroom does not require nor guarantee critical thinking about disability. But the rhetorical roots of mental disability discourse highlight the need for writing instructors to not only teach students accessibly and universally but to teach students about the ways in which our language and actions contribute to constructions in order to counter them, to more deeply understand how constructions work or more generally how things

and worlds are constructed, to find innovative and alternative ways to represent disability, to inspire more sustainable relationships not only between disabled and non-disabled individuals but between individuals and their symbol use. Though these approaches to difference do make writing classrooms more inclusive and accessible as well as more open to valuing the unique insights offered by disability, they don't engage disability discourses in ways that challenge and ideally change dominant views of disability as deficit.

The way difference is imagined is a result of how we construct difference rhetorically (e.g., through language and media) and "To say that something is constructed…is to denaturalize the way that difference is imagined, opening up the possibility of imagining and perceiving not only difference but also differently" (Hannabach, 2007, qtd. in Goodley, p. 58). Thus, rhetoric, and the teaching of it in writing classrooms, is one avenue from which we can begin imagining disability differently or re-presenting disability. Removing ourselves from the oppressive language of dominant disability representations requires a critical, rhetorical awareness and an expanded lexicon and literacy that we could introduce within writing classrooms as writing instructors are already equipped with the skills and tools needed to examine the rhetorical nature of disability. Because the writing curriculum traditionally covers rhetoric be that in the teaching of appeals and rhetorical analysis or in the teaching of rhetorical theory more deeply, disability studies scholars direct us toward ways of using disability studies to teach about rhetoric and the circulation and production of knowledge through discourse. As inherently dwelling in the rhetorical, the writing classroom and writing instructors have a role to play in emphasizing how constructions come into being through the production of dominant common sense which could inform students of their own roles in constructions of mental disability in addition to their commitments to UDL and accessible pedagogy.

So, I share Goodley's sentiment that "One of the most powerful things we can do around dis/ability and ab/normality is to have conversations about them" (p. 135). The convergence of scholarship in disability studies, rhetoric, and writing studies provides frameworks and examples for how we can do just that, how we can engage in the teaching of disability and disability studies discourse to provide students the critical vocabulary needed to gain literacy and advocate for oneself and one another by reconstructing narratives of deficit and overcoming (Samuels, 2013; Simpkins, 2022; Gonzales and Butler, 2020). This is made possible through the teaching of writing and research generally through the

specific lens of disability studies which can contribute to wider campus literacy. Incorporating this framework enables students to see how they and others are disabled by the built environment (by physical space, by prompts, by degrading and inane interactions) within the university and other social spaces (Brueggemann, 1999, p. 73). Frameworks for understanding mental disability allow students to recognize this pathologization and individualization and their subsequent erasure of disabled realities. This emphasizes the ways in which teaching about disability studies and disability as a framework through which we can view the world will be beneficial for students and contribute to the movement for destigmatization across campuses.

As Price (2007) argues, "the task is not simply to include *disability*; it is to include *disability studies*" (p. 54). Price thus "incorporated disability studies discourse" (p. 53) into her writing course as a "means of fostering critical thought" (p. 70), analyzing one student's writing to examine how multimodal methods foster deeper and more long-term critical thinking for both disabled and non-disabled students. She is concerned, as many writing teachers are, with helping students become "better thinkers, who are better able to articulate their thinking, at the end of the semester" (p. 56). Walters (2010) also used multimodality and UDL to respond to disability critically as well as "impairment-specific approaches to disability" in the classroom and in technical communication more specifically (p. 427). Using these theories and methods, she aimed to "guide students toward understanding both the experience of impairment and the social process of disability" (p. 433). Walters is concerned with *preparing* students in technical communication to communicate in multiple modes with individuals of different abilities, implying a concern with engagement of multimodality, UDL, and more critical understandings of disability beyond the classroom. Further, Ho et al. (2020) argue for teaching disability as methodology in our courses, claiming that this is "not (just) about teaching particular content that is identified as political; it is about helping students identify the ways that disability comes to have meaning socially and how that process impacts all people in ways that students can *transfer* beyond the classroom" (p. 136; emphasis mine). To teach disability as only a subject is to teach about and tell stories of disability without the critical lens of disability studies. To teach disability as a method is to use disability to critique normative structures, to identify them as disabling. Thus, I present, and express my interest in, Price's (2007) second research question: "If we mean to incorporate disability as a critical modality, how will we know when we are

successful?" (p. 54–55) and expand it as such: How do we facilitate this success? If "critical thought is a process" and if it "occurs continually, unpredictably, and recursively" (p. 70) should we not also ask "where does critical thinking *go*?" and "where does it *appear*?" Finally, and consistent with my concerns, Price declares that this work begs us to consider "not only *what* we are teaching our students, but *how*" (p. 72). Responding to these questions is possible through the adoption of transfer theories in courses designed to teach disability as a tool for critical thinking, such as I did in the courses I report about in this dissertation. Because we want to extend knowledge about constructions of disability and build disability literacy, transfer studies and theories provide DS scholars methods and language for design that will help achieve these goals. Transfer studies and theories help build transferability in the classroom and assist in observing where disability knowledge goes once engaged through course readings, assignments, and discussions. In the following section, I argue for "[a] theoretical alliance" between DS and transfer studies because "disability studies cannot go it alone" (Goodley, p. 19). I begin by defining transfer and reviewing a short history of transfer studies, briefly connecting such studies to rhetorical genre theory, which will be discussed further in Chapter 3; I then pair discussions of transfer and uptake scholarship, tying concerns with transfer, uptake, and disposition into my own disability experience to argue for the necessity of a disability literacy for all students.

Transfer Histories and Pathways to Transfer

Transfer scholarship paints transfer as and proves it to be a complex phenomenon, but also one that occurs frequently, to varying degrees, despite repeated results showcasing learners' lack of ability to or lack of conditions that support the transfer of knowledge. The work of educational theorists David Perkins and Gavriel Salomon (1992) has been foundational in developing our understanding of knowledge transfer which they define as an instance "when learning in one context or with one set of materials impacts on performance in another context or with other related materials" (p. 3).[6] Dylan Medina (2017) expands on this concept, stating that "Transfer…happens because people find themselves in

[6] These scholars have also distinguished between positive and negative transfer, high- and low-road transfer, and near and far transfer. "Positive transfer occurs when learning in one context improves learning in some other context." Negative transfer is the converse: when learning impacts negatively on performance in a new context (p. 3). Low-road transfer is transfer that occurs with a high degree of automaticity whereas high-road transfer requires "mindful abstraction from the context of learning or application and a deliberate search for connections" (p. 8). Finally, near transfer involves transfer of knowledge between similar contexts; far transfer is when knowledge transfers across dissimilar contexts (p. 4).

situations to which they need to respond, and to do so they must draw on the resources they have at their disposal, largely knowledge and skills stabilized in their physical and cognitive memories" (p. 18). Transfer involves making connections and recognizing subtle differences between situations, contexts, tasks, and pieces of information (e.g., Perkins and Salomon's concept of near vs. far and high vs. low road transfer; Beach's understanding of consequential transitions occurring "across social space and time"; Yancey et al.'s theory of remix and repurposing information for new contexts and purposes; and Tuomi-Gröhn and Engeström's boundary crossing which involves facilitating "interaction between and across systems"; "Elon Statement," 2015).

Despite seemingly clear and direct definitions of transfer, scholars continue to expand what transfer is, what it looks like, and where it can and does appear because, as Elizabeth Wardle (2007) states, "how we define 'transfer' will influence what we look for (and find) in any study of it" (p. 66) which I believe has limited our ability to see where transfer occurs. For example, transfer scholars work toward improving conceptualizations of transfer in part by shifting the terminology used to speak about it. In writing studies, transfer has been referred to as *transition* and *generalization* (Beach, 2003), *recontextualization* (more closely related to low-road transfer) and *integration* (more closely related to high-road transfer) (Nowacek, 2011), *remix* and *assemblage* (Yancey et al., 2014), *adaptation* (Blythe, 2016), and *transformation* (Donahue, 2016). Many of these conceptualizations require some degree of movement *across* dissimilar contexts in order for transfer to be "successful" (e.g., Yancey et al.; Beach; Perkins and Salomon) which Tim Becker (2023) claims is a form of terminological baggage—"a systematic spatial metaphor that frames transfer as transportation of learning between contexts" and which "influences our ways of thinking and communicating about learning continuity and change" (n.p.). Although Becker notes that *transformation* is preferable over these terms, including *translation,* to me transfer is a translation of information upon making a connection between ideas or concepts whether that be in the current or different contexts regardless of their similarity seeing as any "site of transition" is "an opportunity for transfer" (Yancey et al., p. 20). These translations can occur on both the micro- and macro-level and transfer does not only occur across contexts; it can occur, rather *as* students write, as

articulated by Medina's concept of micro-transfer.[7] Transfer is not only broad, easy-to-see translations or applications, but also the small shifts in how students take up, adapt, and draw boundaries around knowledge. Because Wardle notes the importance of defining transfer when approaching data and any study of transfer, my research requires and has led me to argue for identifying a definition of transfer that is expansive enough to account for more easily identifiable moments of transfer, those subtle micro-transfers that lead to "macro level transfer" (Medina, p. 6), and the nuances of students' varied transfer acts influenced by individual histories and dispositions. Further, because my study asks what happens in the writing classroom broadly and how knowledge about mental disability transfers specifically, micro-transfers are a necessary unit of analysis (or necessary action to conceptualize) because traditional far- and high-road transfer is not observable over a 10-week period. What happens *in* the classroom and in student writing occurs at the micro-level and is the necessary engagement with knowledge that may inspire transfer traditionally understood.

Transfer matters broadly because Perkins and Salomon note that "the entire educational enterprise of formal education depends on transfer" (2007; qtd. in Donahue, 2016, p. 109). Kathleen Blake Yancey, Liane Robertson, and Kara Taczak (2014) agree, claiming that "education as an institution is predicated on the assumption that transfer of knowledge and practice is possible" (p. 12). Thus, because "formal education aspires to transfer," "[its] prospects and conditions are crucial educational issues" (Perkins and Salomon, 1992, p. 3) and scholars across many disciplines have recognized the crucial nature of this phenomenon. According to Rebecca Nowacek (2011), a "preoccupation with transfer of knowledge" can be traced back to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in his attention to both general and specific topoi, the former of which is believed to be largely transferable (p. 13). However, Edward L. Thorndike (1923) and Thorndike and Robert S. Woodworth (1901) are cited as a starting point for transfer research, particularly negative findings of skills transfer which have persisted in transfer studies throughout the years. For example, in their study of Latin language learning's influence on performance in other areas,

[7] These are "the moment-to-moment interactions where dispositions form" (p. 3) "and people live transfer" (p. 5) which focus on the "accumulation of moment-to-moment interactions between people, things, and places" (p. 5). Medina notes that "While on a macro level transfer might look like moving knowledge and skills or transitioning from one context to another, more specifically it is a series of micro-transfers that occur as the world fluctuates and develops across time" (p. 6) meaning transfer involves more than those instances in which students recognize similarities across contexts, but also involves transitions, translations, and transformations that occur as students are writing and engaging in class which could result from any number of factors.

Thorndike and Woodworth found that there was no correlation. Similarly, Stephen J. Ceci and Anna I. Ruiz (1993) and Douglas K. Detterman (1993) conclude that transfer, or at least far transfer, is rare.

Based on this history, Perkins and Salomon (1992) review that, in many, if not most early transfer studies "the hoped-for transfer from learning experiences do not occur" (p. 3). There is, in Jose Misko's (1998) words, "no guarantee that being able to perform a skill in one context always means being able to transfer the skill to another context" (p. 298)—a commonly held belief about knowledge transfer. It is also commonly understood that when transfer does take place, "it is highly specific, and must be cued, primed, and guided; it seldom occurs spontaneously" (p. 19). As a result of negative findings of transfer, Perkins and Salomon (1992) argue that, instead of asking whether transfer occurs, we should ask "under what conditions transfer appears" (p. 6). Nowacek (2011) places the onus on researchers and instructors, stating that "The inability to *recognize* students' acts of transfer has far-reaching consequences in individual classrooms and beyond" (p. 11). Similarly, John D. Bransford and Daniel L. Schwartz (1999) argue that we need to "reconsider…what constitutes a valuable demonstration of transfer" because "prevailing theories and methods of measuring transfer work well for studying full-blown expertise" but "represent too blunt an instrument for studying smaller changes in learning" (p. 66). They propose instead a "preparation for future learning" approach which recognizes that the effects of learning experiences "cannot be reduced to the mere replication of a particular experience" or "one-shot task performance" (p. 74), advocating for teaching that centers "abilities to learn in knowledge-rich environments" (p. 68) or the understanding that students need to be better prepared for future learning to increase the likelihood of transfer.

Transfer researchers therefore ask the question of "how we can support students' transfer of knowledge and practice in writing" (Yancey et al., p. 2) and respond by teaching us how to design courses that encourage transfer. Throughout transfer research, many factors have been identified as supporting knowledge transfer. Wardle (2007) identifies teacher feedback, peer interaction, and previous experience as influential; further, she looks to issues of motivation, value, and self-efficacy. Yancey et al. (2014) make a similar argument, stating that "Belief that what a student is learning in a writing context will be useful in the future thus motivates students, and the reverse is true—that if no connection can be seen, students do not value the opportunity" (p. 27). The value students place on writing knowledge was

also a concern for Dana Lynn Driscoll and Jennifer Wells (2012) and Linda S. Bergmann and Janet S. Zepernick (2007). Driscoll's work maintains this focus with collaborative and individual work focusing on students' dispositions and their impact on transfer (Driscoll, 2011; Driscoll and Wells, 2012; Driscoll and Powell, 2016). Threshold concepts (Adler-Kassner et al., 2019), cueing (helping students make connections to future contexts) (Driscoll, 2011; Nowacek, 2011; Bransford, 1979), metaphor and analogy (Perkins and Salomon, 1992), meta-awareness (Nowacek, 2011; Driscoll, 2011; Perkins and Salomon, 1992; Reiff and Bawarshi, 2011), and engagement with prior writing knowledge (Driscoll, 2011; Reiff and Bawarshi, 2011) have also been identified as contributing to transferability for students. Informed by Perkins and Salomon's belief that we can create conditions in which transfer is more likely to occur, Yancey et al. argue that "if transfer of knowledge and practice is to be successful, students need to have future occasions to which they can bring their knowledge of composing and composing practices" (p. 16) meaning we need to *help* "our students make connections across writing tasks" —this, they claim, "is a key to transfer" (p. 31). This resonates with the aforementioned theory that mindful abstraction must be cued, primed, and guided. Reviewing the history of transfer studies along with what is believed to support or affect transfer, provides a structure for making and understanding study and course design choices. These theories and studies paired with rhetorical genre studies scholarship support and guide me toward my goal of better understanding how knowledge of mental disability can transfer within writing classrooms and across campus by informing the structure of both my studies and my courses. The design of my courses was largely informed by these beliefs about what supports successful transfer which will be discussed further in Chapter 3. Moreover, these scholars demonstrate how to trace transfer, therefore informing the design of my studies and approach to data analysis as will be covered in depth in Chapter 2. My data analysis was also informed by uptake theory which has been adopted by rhetorical genre studies scholars and creates greater possibilities for embracing more subtle micro-transfers.

First introduced by J. L. Austin (1962), uptake was described as the instance when an illocutionary force inspires a perlocutionary effect. Adopted for genre theory by Anne Freadman and further conceptualized by Mary Jo Reiff, Anis Bawarshi, and Dylan Dryer, uptake has taken on an expansive meaning in relation to genre. Freadman, for example, "draws attention not only to the relations between genres but also to how individuals move and translate across genres" (Reiff and Bawarshi,

2016, p. 11). In “Accounting for Genre Performances: Why Uptake Matters,” Bawarshi (2015) defines uptakes as “complex performances that take place in-between and around genres” (p. 188). They are rhizomatic “lines of motion that connect genres” (p. 195) or the “interconnections, translations, and pathways between genres” (Reiff and Bawarshi, 2021, p. 152). If we understand genres as utterances, we can see them as existing “at the intersection of the typified and novel, as perceived by the participants coming to terms with each new moment” (Bazerman, 1994, n.p.). In other words, genres are and inspire typified responses but also respond to “the dynamics of the moment” (n.p.) which, in part, determine the set of possible uptakes for responding to an utterance. Genre uptakes are the interplays and interconnections (crossing of paths) that occur between genres such as the way in which habituated responses to a particular genre intersect with other possibilities for responding as well as affective, emotional, and relational elements of the context in which the genre is engaged; they are opportunities for (and the result of) making connections.

Uptakes, in other words, “hold genres together” (p. 11) because they are more or less common paths we take to respond to one genre in the form of another. The more habituated the uptake or pathway, the more secure or predictable the genre produced in response. However, less habituated uptakes are also opportunities for connecting one genre to the next and may be acted on or followed based on other elements of the context in which the genre is engaged. Uptakes both result from genres and act as coordinators for the resulting effect of a genre. Because uptakes hold genres together, they are pathways that make transfer possible. Reiff and Bawarshi (2016) state “The seams between genres that uptakes weave…make movements and translations between and across genres possible” (p. 11). Uptake pushes us to consider an array of factors that influence genre performances such as “history, materiality, embodiment, improvisations, [and] emotion” (Bawarshi, p. 12). I join these uptake conversations to more deeply tie its possibilities to what we desire of transfer research. I do so because micro-transfer involves concern with the smaller, moment-to-moment interactions that facilitate or interfere with “successful” transfer. Paying attention to these pathways increases the likelihood of observing micro-transfer, understanding students’ transfer differences, and expanding how we conceptualize transfer. Uptake allows us to ask how things are being held together, to pay attention to the elements that

contribute to the resulting enactment in response to receiving a piece of knowledge, to value and explain the unique connections students make between learning and adaptation.

Dryer's (2016) refined vocabulary for uptake assists in looking for these uptakes in student writing. Discussing various factors that influence uptakes, Dryer identifies: (1) uptake affordances or "the opportunities and constraints in the conventions that precede and shape the uptake encounter" (p. 70); in other words, the conditions that make uptake possible, for example, being handed an assignment prompt. (2) Uptake captures—"the way repeated encounters with genres have lingering effects on what writers see or are even *able* to see" (p. 72) or how certain genres, the assignment prompt, becomes internalized over time and influences what writers see as possible for responding to the genre. (3) Uptake artifacts or "The genres that result from uptake" (p. 71). (4) Uptake enactments or the resulting action, perlocutionary effect, or "*act* of producing an utterance or text in response to uptake affordances" (p. 71) which may, for example, take the form of questions, emails, and or brainstorming activities to produce the uptake artifact; and (5) uptake residues which are "the accretion[s] and sedimentation[s] of memory that condition uptakes," making some uptakes more likely and more habituated. These social sedimentations may be the affective or collective memories attached to particular genres or even the energy of repeated interactions and performances of genres that habituate uptake artifacts. These terms not only help conceptualize micro-transfer in their attention to the subtle energies that shift in relation to receiving knowledge but also help researchers know what to look for if they are aiming to expand how we understand transfer and blur the lines between initial learning and far- or high-road forms of transfer. Dryer's vocabulary for thinking about uptake allows for greater attention to those micro-level elements of transfer because it directs our attention not only to the *uptake artifact* but to the dispositions, events, and occasions that might facilitate transfer within and across learning tasks and contexts. Because uptake processes happen *in-between*, they are often overlooked and neglected in transfer studies apart from the attention given to students' prior genre knowledge and writing experiences.

Transfer studies often focus heavily on uptake enactments and artifacts as sites and indicators of transfer although there is some attention to dispositions (Wardle & Clement, 2016; Driscoll, 2011; Driscoll and Wells, 2012; Driscoll and Powell, 2016; Reiff and Bawarshi, 2011) and alternative manifestations of transfer (Nowacek et al., 2019). For example, most transfer studies identify evidence of transfer solely in

the uptake artifact, but uptake affordances might influence our concern for a course design and how it directs students' energy. Further, uptake enactments such as those questions or comments in response to a genre are less commonly seen as transfer but are still translations of information that shift students' relationship to knowledge and therefore how they might come to engage in more traditionally recognized forms of transfer. To truly account for micro-level forms of transfer, we also need to consider uptakes as contributing to the transfer of information in those moment-to-moment interactions. Uptake offers transfer studies a more precise vocabulary with which to examine the relations between moments of high-road transfer and what might contribute to knowledge transfer from one context to another. As such, pairing uptake with transfer scholarship allows us to pay greater attention to the micro-transfers or transfers that may not present themselves in a traditional sense as well as the possibilities students see for transfer. The implications of transfer studies and uptake theory in directing study and course designs will be discussed further in Chapters 2 and 3, respectively. In Chapter 2, I further describe my use of micro-transfer in my analysis as well as my application of Medina's boundary-marking terms which I pair with the concept of micro-transfer and uptake in Chapters 4 and 5.

Personal Transfer Story

When I reflect on the personal experiences that inspired my dissertation journey, I admire the persistence of transfer, the way it occurs when we aren't expecting it, especially when we are moving through difficult moments that make us unaware of our own learning. Through these reflections, I have also come to understand transfer as more deeply tied to disposition, reflection, access, opportunities for authority, and timeliness. During my undergraduate education, I felt like the only things that had been transferred to me were my mental disabilities. I believed I could only transfer what negative and undesirable energy and actions stemmed from those disabilities. But being disabled is a way of knowing the world differently, and knowledge transfer happened to me unexpectedly, in ways deeply tied to my identity. As I struggled to make sense of my disability symptoms and dealt with them in ways that interfered with my education and social life, I was lucky to be in classes with some professors who were understanding, making accommodations to complete coursework over nearly two months of absence—though accommodations should not be a matter of luck. Despite some professors being accommodating, others were not, requiring me to withdraw from classes. However, being white, cisgender, and female, I

was more likely to be listened to and accommodated and have access to appropriate and affordable healthcare than other students. Some students with similar symptoms and experiences would be more likely to leave academia behind entirely considering it has historically been structured around the experiences of white, normate bodyminds.

As knowledge linked to trauma and distress, what I learned from this experience could have created a hard boundary between initial learning and a desire to intentionally adapt knowledge, but that knowledge was also meaningful and, in order to transfer knowledge, it must be knowledge that is meaningful, knowledge that we value. Transferring this knowledge of mental disability experience also required a disposition that viewed my experiential learning positively (whether that learning hurt or not); it required a disposition of reflecting on knowledge and pushing knowledge forward, of searching for new spaces where it may fit because "dispositions determine students'...willingness to engage transfer" (Driscoll and Wells). However, at the time, I did not have the "requisite authority to accomplish the task" of transferring my experiences into new, more productive contexts (Bawarshi and Reiff, p. 103). Early in my graduate studies, where I was gifted greater opportunities to advocate for myself, I became interested in how the writing classroom, as it is believed to be a space in which students can write to learn or write to make knowledge (Yancey et al., 2014, p. 18), might be an ideal location in which this work could be done. I found an occasion for transfer, connecting what I learned in my experience to the operations of the composition classroom. And so began my intellectual journey of creating spaces for discussions of mental disability in institutionalized settings initially by taking up my personal experiences—what I learned about researching my own disabilities and how I was informed by others—and transforming them into an ability to advocate for myself and others within the academy. This enabled me to translate my experiences into a term paper and, subsequently, a course design—making a connection between my own research and learning and the research, writing, and learning that students do in the writing classroom.

My embodied knowledge was being repurposed and, for my first composition theory course at Western Kentucky University, I wrote a research paper on incorporating discussions of mental disability and providing resources for students in first-year writing classrooms. As Bawarshi and Reiff note, "the writing prompt…establishes a kairotic relationship by providing the student with a timeliness and an opportunity that authorizes [student writing]" (p. 91) and therefore transfer which is what I was offered in

this class. During this time, I was teaching as a master's student and, although I did not ask students to disclose their disabilities, developed the writing course I had envisioned—one in which mental disability was fronted as salient to the experiences of those enrolled in my course, even those who identify with normate subject positions. Students rhetorically analyzed documentaries about mental illness and chose disorders to explore in their research (looking back, Amy Vidali's study teaching the risks and difficulties of disability research would have been invaluable). During my final semester teaching at WKU, a student told me the class helped him realize he needed to seek help for bulimia. This assured me that there was a need for students' mental health to be more central to literacy and research practices in the academy or at the very least acknowledged in ways that inspire greater accessibility, care, and destigmatization.

Neil Simpkins (2022) notes that students' lack of vocabulary to talk about their and others' disability difference can cause frustration and lead to their inability to share these issues and translate information about them into conversations with others (p. 143). I was able, at the time I was struggling with my symptoms, to share that I was struggling, but I was a student who needed disability literacy—a vocabulary and theoretical basis from which to understand disability. Without disability literacy, I was unable to adequately advocate for myself, and others were unable to develop a space in which it was safe to disclose disability without facing negative consequences. I knew back then that there needed to be more kindness extended to mentally disabled students, particularly those who fill multiple marginalized subject positions. Upon reading the work of scholars such as Price (2007, 2011, 2015), Dolmage (2016, 2017), Elizabeth Donaldson (2011), Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (2011), Ai Binh T. Ho et al. (2020), Amy Vidali (2008), Karen Elizabeth Jung (2011), and Tobin Siebers (2019) (to name a few) who value and emphasize the social model of disability without negating individual experience with disability, I came to develop a language with which to understand my disabilities not as failures of which I should be ashamed or try to overcome, but as both individually painful and socially constructed through environmental barriers as well as desirable and offering possibilities for different ways of knowing and being in the world. As Goodley notes "For many of us engaged with the politics of disablement, the social model gave us our 'aha moment' [and] a new disability lexicon" (Goodley, p. 7). Like Goodley, I was offered, through this literacy, a way of reading and writing my disabilities differently. This required having a language and literacy with which to communicate with and about my mental disabilities as if entities

worthy of care and compassion, entities with something valuable to offer my academic and personal life, entities that provided gifts in the form of experiential knowledge. Through my engagement with these scholars, I realized that kindness itself is not enough. There needed to be spaces generated for conversations about mental disability, education on mental disability and disability resources, and progress toward destigmatization. In short, I recognized that disability knowledge is necessary. Frameworks, theories, and discourses for communicating about disability are necessary. A critical vocabulary and literacy are necessary for the well-being and empowerment of all students. The findings and studies that span my remaining chapters are inspired by this starting point, exploring my interests and curiosities through the development of writing courses centered on building disability literacy through sharing disability discourse and emphasizing disability as methodology—with a particular focus on inspiring the transfer of mental disability discourse—in the form of course readings, assignment choice and design, rationales, reflective writing, and meaningful individual research. Such courses are designed to respond to openings in the above literature which I discuss in the following section.

Interventions

The role of subject matter in transfer studies has yet to be thoroughly explored despite writing about writing (WAW) approaches claims that teaching for transfer should focus on content related to writing and writing theories. Further, many of the studies outlined above are concerned with the transfer of writing skills and practices, with some focused on the transfer of genre-specific content. Very few are concerned centrally with subject matter knowledge and none, to my knowledge, attempt to examine how the act of writing and the context of the writing classroom may be tools which facilitate the transfer of non-writing-related knowledge. Although Yancey et al. claim that the influence of content on transfer of writing knowledge is undertheorized, WAW approaches focus on teaching writing studies content to help students conceptualize writing through the acquisition of key terms and vocabulary related to theories of writing under the belief that content *does* influence writing knowledge transfer specifically. They claim that "students need a vocabulary for writing in order to articulate knowledge and ensure more successful transfer" (p. 101). This vocabulary is meant to engage students intentionally with their pre- and misconceptions about writing (p. 138). Similarly, my dissertation demonstrates the need to develop a vocabulary with which to understand mental disability and aims to invite students to narrate their

relationship to mental disability by engaging with DS scholarship. I respond, therefore, to transfer scholars' desire to more fully understand the role of subject matter within the writing course.

I also draw and build on transfer scholars' concerns with uptake and its role in disrupting habituated ways of responding (habituated uptakes), particularly as this role pertains to responding and writing about mental disability. Dryer proposes the idea of "*disruptakes*" or "uptake affordances that deliberately create inefficiencies, misfires, and occasions for second-guessing that could thwart automaticity-based *uptake enactments"* (p. 70) which are important because repetition of uptakes and deeper sedimentations of memory limit the possibilities of engagement with uptake affordances therefore limiting transfer-ability. Bawarshi (2015), for example, argues that one way to increase transfer is to slow down uptakes, to create spaces for students to contemplate their habitual uptakes and reliance on habituated genres. This "slowing down" of uptakes resembles both Laura Gonzalez's (2018) "translation moments" and Ann Cvetkovich's (2012) argument for the usefulness of an *impasse* which follows Lauren Berlant's (2011) work in *Cruel Optimism*. Cvetkovich's main argument is that negative feelings or "bad" feelings cause us to enter an impasse; she approaches the impasse as a state of both stuckness and potential, maintaining a hopefulness about the possibility that slowing down or not moving forward might not be a sign of failure and might instead be worth exploring" (p. 21). The impasse, in other words, holds potential for slowing down uptakes, for exploration, for more possibilities for engaging with feelings, genres, and so forth. Slowing down or delaying habituated uptakes would provide students enough time to "critically examine their sources and motivations" and "consider what is permitted and what is excluded by these uptakes" (Reiff and Bawarshi, 2011, p. 331–2). The goal then, is to create uptake affordances or conditions that inspire alternative uptake enactments and artifacts to counter the status quo seeing as "the more normalized the *uptake affordance*, the more instantaneous the moment of *uptake captures*; the more powerful the *uptake artifact*, the more habitual the *uptake enactment*, and the more deeply sedimented the *uptake residues*" (p. 66). Chapters 4 and 5 showcase the sort of sources and motivations that influences students' uptake of mental disability knowledge, sometimes in the face of discomfort with it.

The writing classroom is an ideal location for disrupting these uptakes because we are granted the opportunity to introduce various genres and engage students in reflective practices. This attention not

only responds to transfer's concern with uptake but draws on the DS concept of crip time and the ways in which it can be used as a method for challenging habituated uptakes. Disability scholars' concept of *crip time* can greatly inform the ways in which we think about pauses, impasses, or slowing down uptakes to promote transfer. Because normative constructions of time and productivity reinforce the ableist structures in the writing classroom, there is often little time or room for questioning why we respond to certain utterances in particular ways. Crip time offers a method by which we can disrupt uptake, in one way, stretching out uptake captures, asking for reflections on habituated ways of responding to an utterance related to mental disability. Further, disability itself offers an opportunity to pause or intervene in our habituated behaviors and ways of thinking. As writing course subject matter, disability asks us to question our responses and their resulting actions. In relation to uptakes, I aim to expand conceptualizations of transfer, paying closer attention to micro-transfers which serve as the scaffolding toward more high-road forms of transfer, though such high-road transfer may not be "achieved." Throughout my analyses, students' reflections on readings and class discussions often revealed the unique interactions that guided them down more or less habituated uptake pathways, making such reflective activities or acts of slowing down even more influential.

Further, to my knowledge, no DS scholars have explicitly adopted the values and theories of transfer scholarship to increase accessibility and respond to Ho et al.'s and Samuels' et al.'s calls as well as Price's (2007) and Walters' (2010) implicit calls for transferring DS discourse throughout the academy. This aim coincides with my desire to build student agency and advocacy through the introduction of DS discourse and theories that help build disability literacy. One such way writing instructors can begin doing this work is to push toward what Hitt argues for which is "a version of accessibility that is rooted in students' material experiences, that is collaborative and reflective—accessibility driven by social justice and student agency rather than accessibility driven by obligation" (p. 42). Here, Hitt is problematizing the medical model of disclosure, diagnosis, and accommodation which puts the onus of combatting oppressive social structures on the disabled student by pathologizing their disability. When students are asked to seek accommodations to gain access, the responsibility to make the university more accessible is removed from officials and instructors. Also central to Hitt's argument is the idea that accessibility is driven by student agency. Though the ability to seek accommodations may seem to give students more

agency, this institutionalized version of agency does not account for the privilege of receiving a diagnosis that acts as a gateway into accommodation access. As Nowacek (2011) states “The word agency emphasizes a student’s ability to act and make change in the world” (p. 39) and little change occurs for those with disabilities when students continue to have the responsibility put on them to ask the world to be accessible. Dolmage (2017) argues that “agency [is] autonomy—how we can come to have a shaping role in the event or class, as well as the right to define our own identity and involvement.” It is being “able to ask our questions, make our ideas known, and share in discourse in a shaping way” (p. 119). Rather, an accessibility driven by student agency means creating accessible classrooms with the goal of inspiring student agency and ability to act and make change in the world. I argue that this agency can be supported through the acquisition of a disability studies vocabulary and literacy that will help students make sense of their disabilities in ways that do not conform to dominant narratives of overcoming as well as understand the ways in which disability narratives circulate to counter those that are dominant. This is why writing studies needs disability studies.

Finally, and broadly, this work expands and builds on writing studies’ valuing of difference to include, more comprehensively, disability difference. The attention given to and welcoming of difference in the field of writing studies demonstrates why the writing classroom is an ideal location for this work. Writing studies’ history of embracing difference through linguistic justice and multimodal approaches (Gonzales and Butler, 2020; Shipka, 2011; Haas, 2007) makes me optimistic about the possibilities of increasing inclusion and accessibility for those with mental disabilities in our classrooms. Turning toward the racial realities of the classroom (Young, 2014; Baker-Bell, 2020; Condon & Young, 2016; Inoue, 2019; Pimentel et al., 2016) influenced an investment in embracing and valuing difference in ways that hold great potential for the acceptance and welcoming of other differences such as disability differences. Additionally, translingual approaches (e.g., Bou Ayash, 2019; Gonzales, 2018; Lu & Horner, 2016) and perspectives offer insights for addressing or discussing mental disability in the classroom because, if deviation in linguistic resources and writerly practice can be viewed as the norm, then “deviation” from the perceived norm in cognitive processing, meaning-making strategies, conceptions of time, organization, connections between ideas, cohesion, and wholeness should be seen as the norm as well. As conditions that are more common and more embedded in our daily lives than we may realize, mental disabilities

should be viewed as offering opportunities for different ways of constructing and presenting knowledge for writing students. Joining conversations with scholars attuned to difference means furthering discussions on which differences should be valued in the classroom, expanding possibilities for accessibility and equity. As I will illustrate later, my work reinforces the value of difference, particularly those differences that often go unnoticed as weighing on student responses and decisions.

Chapter Overview

The following chapter more thoroughly introduces my research studies, reviewing and theorizing them through what I've learned of transfer and uptake. In particular, I emphasize how I approached my course initially with the understanding that "the presence of disabled faculty in the classroom always already constitutes a political argument about the rights of disabled people to exist in public space, to be educated, and to receive reasonable accommodations at our places of employment" (Ho et al., 2013, p. 129). I also outline my coding and analysis processes informed by grounded theory, thematic analysis, and discourse analysis. My own position as a researcher and instructor is examined through an intersectional lens and approaches to teaching disability were cognizant of these complex realities and relations with disability. Throughout this chapter, I also explain how some design and research decisions were informed by findings from my pilot study in English 110. My third chapter provides a detailed account of the context of my studies and my course designs. I review some connections between transfer and mental disability then explain the geographical and spatial context of the classroom alongside information about the student populations and my own positionality. Further, for each study course, I provide a teaching philosophy, text selection overview and rationales, and course assignments overviews and rationales all of which are informed by transfer and genre studies, counterstory, disability studies, and the values and learning outcomes of the Program in Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) at the University of Washington. I also review some limitations of my course design, approaches to instruction, assessment, and participation for which I propose alternatives that I intend to adopt in future courses. I share my course design and proposed alternatives hoping that others see their potential for adaptation and improvement.

Chapter 4 introduces my first two analytical themes: Relationships to Mental Disability and Adapt and Transform. Within this chapter, I tell the stories of students whose instances of boundary-marking

illustrated shifts in their relationships to mental disability and their unique ways of taking up and adapting information that they found to be meaningful and appropriate within the context of our class. Expanding on these stories, I turn, in Chapter 5, to my final three themes: Class Environment, Rhetorical Awareness, and Agents of Change. As above, this analysis involves tracing students' boundary-marking activity to better understand their micro-transfers and, therefore, the nuances of their transfer acts. My final chapter discusses the implications of these findings for the fields of transfer, writing, and disability studies while highlighting the limitations of my study and future questions and directions for this work.

Chapter 2. Uncovering the Elusive: The Methodological Complexity of Studying Transfer

The Trouble with Transfer

As noted in Chapter 1, the purpose of my dissertation is to understand how knowledge about mental disability transfers and to wonder about how and where such transfer can best be facilitated and recognized by asking the broad question "what happens in the writing classroom when we center discourses of disability and mental disability specifically?" To define transfer, I turn to transfer scholars such as Dylan Medina who argues that we must pay attention to micro-transfers, or "the moment-to-moment interactions that…accumulate to become what we have traditionally seen as transfer" (p. 34); I discuss further below how such attention requires looking, first, at the observable boundary-work performed in student writing and dialogue. Traditional views of transfer suggest that it involves an explicit act of "carrying" information from one context to another, the carrying model which Becker (2023) claims is a form of "terminological baggage." I agree with Becker in claiming the carrying model places limits on transfer research and seeing as others (e.g., Bransford & Schwartz, 1999) have argued that we need to expand how we conceptualize transfer and redefine what it means for transfer to be successful. In Chapter 1, I define transfer as a *translation* of information upon making a connection between ideas or concepts whether that be in the current or a different context regardless of their similarity. I do so while continuing to use the term *transfer* in my discussions of *micro-transfer* so as to remain consistent with transfer studies across disciplines and as a way to value how cross-disciplinary conversations can benefit transfer research, as explained by Rebecca Nowacek, Rebecca Lorimer Leonard, and Angela Rounsaville (2024). Additionally, redefining what it means for transfer to be successful might involve seeing success as variable—dependent on individual dispositions, positionalities, and histories—and incremental. We might need to view it as an act of "trying out" knowledge or shifting one's relationship to it in everyday and minute-by-minute encounters and taking advantage of opportunities to use that knowledge in a given context.

In looking at micro-transfer, I argue that transfer is successful as a result of small shifts in learning about and thinking and engaging with content that can lead to high-road transfer through shifting student dispositions and relationships with particular subject matter. Similar to Medina, I am not initially concerned with "capturing major changes over time," which is a traditional approach to studying transfer; rather I am

interested in the small shifts students make as they engage with disability studies and mental disability specifically within the classroom because I believe traditional transfer studies have unjustly categorized less-typical transfer processes as negative or zero transfer rather than identifying the parts of transfer processes that might lead to these differences and allow us to value varied student incomes and therefore develop a more nuanced understanding of transfer. Attention to these small shifts might also reveal for us the sort of necessary interactions we should facilitate in our classrooms as well as the tools we can use to inspire greater critical disability literacy within individual and collective consciousness.

In Chapter 1, I also note that to observe "what happens" is admittedly difficult and has its limitations. In their argument about the ephemerality of transfer, Nowacek et al. (2024) refer to Lobato (2008), suggesting that "researchers, by choosing a particular learned behavior to trace, may miss the transfer phenomena occurring beyond the researchers' delimited gaze" (p. 348). This means an understanding of "what happens" must be ever-evolving and cannot be determined using a single method. As stated, many transfer studies rely on longitudinal observations to trace transfer across varied contexts or major changes over time. However, these attempts limit how we conceptualize transfer and recognize or appreciate the transfer work students do in smaller, moment-to-moment interactions within the classroom. In line with Nowacek (2011), I believe that "the traces of the phenomenon of transfer are often subtle and hard to identify" (p. 3). Medina follows Nowacek, arguing that longitudinal studies do not allow for the sort of rich description that observations across a shorter span of time allow or even require. Looking at the parts that make the whole of a transfer act is a way for us to embrace this subtlety and, in some ways, better identify where larger transfer acts are coming together or, from a researcher's perspective, falling apart.

In determining which methods would help me best account for transfer and respond to my research questions, I turned to transfer scholars who commonly use surveys, interviews, and student writing to observe transfer. Not only are these methods and selected data common, but they are most effective for observing what changes occur and how students might be better prepared to engage with mental disability discourse later. Student writing and dialogue, through discourse analysis, can also help researchers identify where interactions are occurring that contribute to the broader transfer acts. Moreover, these methods were the most feasible for my study given my position as the researcher and

teacher of the study courses. In my first stages of coding for my pilot study in English 110 and after some trial and error with a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), I was inspired to use a method that resonated with transfer as an ongoing process which I describe further below. Following my analysis of the pilot study data, and for the study I conducted in English 281, I attempted to adopt a similar method of process coding; however, this coding work was abandoned in favor of thematic analysis which, again, arose out of a grounded theory approach and into the discourse analysis presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

Therefore, the goal of this chapter is to demonstrate not only how my methods align with my research questions but how they also come closest to addressing the challenge of defining transfer and tracing micro-transfers, boundaries, and transfer processes overall. I begin with a section surveying my study design and data collection methods, including a general overview of who my participants were, my methods of recruitment, the materials collected, and the labor asked of participants. I follow that section with details on my theoretical positioning and the steps taken to analyze my data in English 110 and English 281 respectively. I conclude by returning to the methodological challenge presented in any study of transfer and describe my researcher reflexivity and intersectional approach to data collection and analysis, as well as offer an overview of how Chapter 3 will expand on the discussion presented here by describing the study site, my role in it, and the curriculum I designed to address my research questions.

Study Design and Data Collection

Shifting Research Questions

The research locations for these studies, for which I received Institutional Review Board (IRB) exemption, include the assigned English 110 and English 281 classrooms on the University of Washington (UW) campus. When I began this research during Winter Quarter (January to March) 2023, I wasn't certain if I'd be conducting one study, two, or more. I thought I'd be teaching English 110 during both study terms, that is, Winter and Spring. I was pleasantly surprised to learn I'd be teaching English 281 despite how much I grew as an instructor teaching the English 110 stretch course. Teaching English 281 required not only designing an entirely new course given the program requirements and student majors—which were largely business—but designing a course that facilitated transfer in ways the former had not and designing a revised study, with adapted research questions, and new, if similar, goals.

Thankfully, my pilot study in English 110 assisted in this new design, informed my research questions, interview questions, assignment prompts, and my course readings. Although English 110 focused on genre, audience awareness, mental disability, and specifically research, my interviews revealed little about students' transfer experience. I was asking the wrong questions, repeating those from my surveys, and leaving little room for thinking about where their knowledge could go, had gone, and in what form as well as how that knowledge was used *within* the classroom for students developing literacy. I wasn't focusing on getting them to tell the story of their learning in English 110. For example, some interview questions that were removed were (1) What was your experience like engaging with the content of the course readings? What feelings or thoughts did you experience when reading or during our discussions? And (2) What were your initial thoughts when you heard we would be discussing mental disability in our English 110 course? and replaced, for example, with (1) Where and when has knowledge from our course and course readings been useful for you throughout the term? What information has been useful to you? (i.e., from which readings, discussions, interactions, etc.) When and where did you find opportunities to expand your engagement with the course content? (certain genres, modalities, etc.). What made that possible? And (2) How has the way you have learned to think about disability affected your writing?[8] Further, and arguably most important, my 110 study revealed that I needed more specific research questions as I was still deepening my learning about micro-transfer and developing a better foundation for it as a framework for studying transfer. Initially, in my dissertation prospectus, I wrote that

> The purpose of this research is to better understand the value of centering mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and research frameworks in the first-year composition course. I want to examine the impact such rhetorics and frameworks have on students' writing, research, and critical understanding of mental health and illness. Further, I am curious about the extent to which frameworks for thinking critically about mental health, disability, and illness transfer outside of the composition classroom as a result of writing about and with such frameworks. I am also hoping to develop a greater understanding of how writing about and with such frameworks might contribute to student agency and self-advocacy outside of the composition classroom and in everyday discussions about mental health and illness. Ultimately, I aim to understand why and how rhetorics of mental health, disability, and illness should be a concern for composition studies and what makes composition classrooms the best place for this work.

Although many of my interests and concerns remain the same, the overall question I was working with at that time was "how can discussions of mental and psychiatric disability, as both individual and social,

[8] For a full list of interview questions for each study, see Appendices X and XI.

expand these equity-oriented conversations to further critique Western dominance and compulsory able-bodiedness and their manifestations in composition scholarship and classrooms?" I came to learn from my experience in English 110 that I needed questions that more specifically addressed transfer and micro-transfer, that directed my attention to those small moments that matter in the development of student literacy, and that encompassed what else happens when we have these discussions in the writing classroom. I wasn't yet reaching a point of responding to my concern for the lack of attention to varied presentations of transfer, how we can support critical disability literacy *within* the classroom, and what the actual impact was within the confines of the classroom. So, as stated above, my central research question became "what happens in the composition classroom when we center discourses of disability and mental disability specifically?" as well as two broader sub-questions serving as parent questions for further sub-questions which I repeat here from Chapter 1:

1. What changes occur when students are reading and writing about mental disability?
    a. What happens to student writing as a result of this engagement?
    b. In what ways do thoughts, ideas, or concepts related to mental disability translate or reappear in student writing and dialogue?
    c. What anticipated and perceptible knowledge application and micro-transfer occurs within the course?
    d. What new words, perceptions, relations to knowledge, and concepts do students demonstrate a knowledge of?
    e. In what other ways might we find indications that the composition classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate transfer of mental disability knowledge?
2. To what extent can these changes prepare students for future engagement with mental disability?
    a. In what ways does confidence with course content contribute to student self-advocacy and agency?
    b. What genre possibilities do students see for engaging the content we have covered in the course?
    c. What changes can we trace to the boundaries students construct about mental disability discourse?
    d. What changes can be observed in students' perception of their relationship to disability?
    e. Where do students see this information being useful for them beyond the course?

Study Design

Although I will talk in much more detail about my English 110 and English 281 curricula in Chapter 3, here I briefly discuss my study design as the researcher and instructor within both courses. At UW, English graduate students' third year of study includes reading for their Ph.D. candidacy exams. My exam reading began during Spring of my second year (2022) and continued from then into the following Autumn and Winter of 2023 which was followed by my Ph.D. candidacy exam in late February 2023. Seeing as my research studies took place in Winter and Spring 2023, my pilot study design was completed during Autumn 2022 and the course was taught and studied in Winter 2023 with the first session being held on January 3, 2023. My IRB protocol for the pilot study was written and submitted in November 2022 and revised, resubmitted, and approved as exempt during December 2022. I present these dates to demonstrate the process of active learning I was in at the time I developed the IRB protocol and course for my English 110 study which, to some degree, informed changes made between the English 110 and English 281 curricula since my English 281 IRB protocol was produced, submitted, and approved as exempt during Winter Quarter 2023.

That said, to engage my research questions for each study, I designed two versions of one curriculum that centered mental disability discourse: one for English 110 and one for English 281. I knew a central component of the course needed to involve telling mental disability stories—especially those linked to individuals within the academy—alongside critical disability studies scholarship. As the instructor of the course, my study design was dependent on the goals and outcomes for each course. English 110, the second part of a two-part stretch course sequence in UW's Program in Writing and Rhetoric (PWR), is meant to guide students through lines of inquiry to produce a research project that is then adapted into a symposium poster and presentation at the end of the term. For this reason, in English 110, I selected course texts (e.g., journal articles, podcasts, blog posts) that could be used to not only tell mental disability stories but also serve as illustrations of research and analytical frameworks that would help students approach their own research project. Students' research project topics in English 110 were entirely flexible as long as they addressed an issue related to one of the student's communities of practice and they were encouraged to exercise their rhetorical agency by selecting a genre consistent

with their topic, intended audience, and overall goals. Some of these genres included supplemental materials that enabled all students to meet the program requirements.

English 281, on the other hand, is a course that can begin with a sequence on rhetoric and rhetorical analysis which then leads into a sequence on research and inquiry. So, although many of the readings between the courses overlapped, those read at the beginning of English 281 were more focused on establishing a nuanced understanding of rhetoric, rhetorical constructions of disability, and rhetorically analyzing artifacts related to mental disability. In English 281, students also produced a research project, but its guidelines were a bit more restricted. All students were asked to build a website for their research project which was determined based on this genre conforming to the business writing focus of the course which resulted from most students' majors being in the field of business as well as transfer studies' confirmation that writing for real-world audiences and within real-life contexts helps facilitate transfer. Although students all had to produce the same genre, they still had some freedom with which to choose their topics given it related, at least loosely, to one of our course readings or discussions.

Within both courses, students completed free writing exercises for all the course readings. Since my core data source was students' writing, these free writing exercises allowed me to develop daily prompts that inspired reflections on the readings and granted students an informal, low-stakes space to engage those texts rather than feeling pressure to engage them in a particular way as they might have with the larger assignments. In other words, these free writing exercises were assigned in the hopes of providing more authentic student responses to the readings and tracing their understanding of concepts as well as feelings toward the texts which helped respond to my questions on changes made when students are reading and writing about mental disability, what happens to their writing during this engagement, what ideas or concepts reappear in student writing, student confidence and advocacy, and where they might see this information as useful for them. Additionally, because micro-transfers occur at a moment-to-moment level, these quick, five-minute writing assignments offered a way to document students' in-class interactions with the text that might reveal shifts in their dispositions toward mental disability whereas, for English 110, the Weekly Assignments were less specific to the subject of mental disability. Though some of the Weekly Assignments in English 281 were focused on mental disability, as

students selected their own research topic, the Weekly Assignments, in some cases, were less focused on mental disability.

Using the course assignments and student writing as the core data source for both studies meant not asking students to do more labor for the study and could inspire more students to participate although only some students signed up to complete interviews (three in English 110 and six in English 281) that would more specifically reveal their engagement with the subject matter. This, therefore, meant designing in-class and Weekly Assignments that could cue students to apply their newly acquired mental disability knowledge. As expected, not all students presented engagement with the course texts or subject matter in their Weekly Assignments but the assignments typically hinted at ways students might apply said knowledge (e.g., in the use of examples or in questions asked in Writer's Memos). In addition, making these choices was also necessary to respond to my role as the researcher and instructor who would already be reading student work and who would have a limited capacity for transcribing field notes during our class sessions.

The study, then, was designed to trace students' ongoing engagement with the subject matter which was made possible through the design of the above assignments as well as an opening and closing survey which asked similar questions to gauge students' entering and exit attitudes and beliefs about mental disability. These design choices and rationales are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. For the remainder of this chapter, I address the process of recruitment and my data collection before discussing my data analysis for each study and close with statements reiterating the ephemerality and variability of transfer processes.

Student Populations

Though I will talk more about my participants in Chapter 3 and, in even more detail, Chapters 4 and 5 as I introduce select participants alongside the data and within the context of their own story, I will briefly introduce the general population of each course, including demographic information in two tables before discussing my recruitment process. Individual student biographies for English 110 and English 281 are included in Appendices I and II.

The initial pool for participants for both studies included all students enrolled in English 110 and English 281 during Winter and Spring Quarters of 2023, respectively. For English 110, the research

participants consisted of only students enrolled in the English 109/110 stretch course titled Critical Composition I and II which is capped at 15 students. These students included first-years admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Student Support Services (SSS), or Student Athlete Academic Services (SAAS), and other low-income, first-generation, historically marginalized individuals whose qualifications for enrollment are determined by their Universal Placement Test Scores. The English 109/110 writing sequence, which takes place over two quarters, is designed to offer more individualized support to those enrolled, particularly those whose backgrounds might prevent them from feeling as supported on their academic journey than those more privileged. Some students choose to enroll in this sequence to gain better access to tutors and academic counselors. However, it's important to note that the English 109/110 sequence is *not* a remedial course, but an adapted, stretch model of the most populated first-year writing course at UW, English 131. The UW course catalog description for English 109 is "Approaches writing as social action and language as tied to identity, culture, and power. Centers students' diverse language resources and discourse traditions. Builds rhetorical capacities for composing ethically, critically, and impactfully across different contexts, audiences, genres, and goals within the university and beyond. Emphasizes inquiry." The English 110 description is identical except for "Emphasizes inquiry" being replaced with "Emphasizes research." With the goal of better supporting students in English 109/110, the PWR attempts to ensure that students in English 109 have the same instructor for English 110 the following term. Therefore, some English 110 students were previously enrolled in my English 109 course and had spent 10 weeks learning with me prior to their English 110 course. Only students who were 18 years or older were included in the study. And, of the 15 students enrolled in my course that term, 10 agreed to participate, meaning they agreed to have their formal and informal in- and out-of-class writing collected for analysis. Despite this, all students in the course were asked to complete the Initial and Closing Surveys related to their perceptions of mental disability. This decision was made for reasons stated above: I did not want those who agreed to participate to have to put in more labor than they would normally for the course unless they chose to complete an interview. So, all students completed the surveys. Additionally, the Initial Survey was distributed prior to recruitment, so it was unclear at the time who would need to complete it if it were distributed selectively.

Given the time constraints of the study and my desire to interview students *after* they had engaged with the majority, if not all, of our texts related to mental disability (approx. week seven of 10), I limited the number of possible interviewees to five; this decision was initially made because I had intended for the interviewed students to be the case study students presented in the findings chapters and therefore saw five as the maximum number of cases I could address per course. I later found that interview participation did not necessarily mean that those students' contributions would respond to my research questions. For English 110, only three students agreed to interviews, one of which was completed on paper rather than in a face-to-face setting. The other seven participants' data was still analyzed alongside that of the interviewees. I discuss follow-up interviews further below, but express gratitude for Eight who participated in a follow-up interview five months after they completed English 281. Table 1 (below) provides non-exhaustive demographic information for all English 110 study participants with interviewees being marked by an (I) following their name and follow-up interviewees being marked by an (F) following their name. I include all participants, even those who did not complete interviews, because the only additional data collected from interviewees was the interview itself whereas the bulk of the data overall was data collected from students' assigned writing.

In English 110, this student demographic data was collected in multiple ways: first, many disclosed their gender, race or ethnicity, and linguistic resources in their assignment titled Positionality Statement for Poster. In response to the question "What words would you use to describe yourself? In what stable or unstable identity categories would you place yourself?", for example, Natasha wrote "I identify as a Mexican-American, female, cisgender." She also disclosed in the same assignment her bilingualism. In addition, student pronouns and first-generation status were collected in our Introductory Survey through which I learn more about who the students are and their histories in writing classrooms. Other students also disclosed demographic information via research and reflective assignments. For example, as he wrote about Puerto Rico's precarity as a U.S. territory, Ermin disclosed his own position as Puerto Rican to explain why the project mattered to him. Similarly, when enrolled in English 109, Tanner disclosed his experience being stopped and questioned frequently at airports due to his Latino appearance and his family's use of Portuguese in response to Vershawn Ashanti Young's "'Nah We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching." Students' year of enrollment was determined based on

data provided in the course roster for that term. In short, students disclosed these aspects of their identities variably in response to introductory assignments and reflections on their relationship to language and their chosen research topics. For the most part, students' own descriptions and terminologies were used to describe them within the table. An example of one exception is Zion's ethnicity which is listed as "East Slavic" since having described himself as being from Belarus. Despite these demographics being listed in a table which suggests students' identities are static, I want to acknowledge that their identities, like all others, are ever-evolving as will be demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5.

Name	Year	Race/Ethnicity	Gender Identity	Education	Linguistic Resources
Ermin	Freshman	Puerto Rican	Male	First-generation	Multilingual
Ed (I)	Freshman	African American	Female	Not first-generation	Multilingual
Tanner (I)	Freshman	Latino	Male	Not first-generation	Multilingual
Zion	Freshman	East Slavic	Male	Not first-generation	Multilingual
Gillian	Freshman	White	Female	First-generation	Undisclosed
Emma	Freshman	Undisclosed	Female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Natasha	Freshman	Mexican-American	Female	First-generation	Bilingual
Eight (I) (F)	Freshman	Latinx	Nonbinary	First-generation	Multilingual
Jay	Freshman	Middle-Eastern	Male	First-generation	Undisclosed
Angelica	Freshman	Latina	Female	First-generation	Undisclosed

Table 1: English 110 student demographics including students' year of enrollment, race/ethnicity, gender identity, first generation status, and linguistic resources. Those students whose names are followed by (I) participated in optional interviews and those followed by (F) participated in optional follow-up interviews.

For English 281, participants consisted of only students enrolled in the Intermediate Expository Writing course I taught in Spring 2023. English 281's catalog description is brief and nondescript, stating simply "Writing papers communicating information and opinion to develop accurate, competent, and effective expression." So, the structure of the course is relatively open and left to the discretion of the instructor, making its inner workings initially hidden from the students who enroll. Because English 281 is the 200-level version of English 131: Introductory Expository Writing, it's common for English 281 to be populated by upperclassmen and, coincidentally, Foster School of Business majors who need an additional writing (W) or composition (C) credit for their major to graduate. The students enrolled in my section of English 281 were largely business majors pursuing degrees in finance, information systems (IS), and marketing. In addition, most students had already completed their first year of college with some having taken college-level English courses prior to their enrollment in English 281. English 281 is capped

at 23 students and our section that Spring was full, with 17% of the students being IS majors, 16% in finance, 11% pre-majors in the arts and sciences, 9% in business administration, and 7% in marketing. The remaining students majored in disciplines from economics to anthropology.

Of the 23 English 281 students enrolled, 14 consented to participate in the study as general participants. “General participants” would include those who completed the basic work assigned to all students in the course and their agreement to have their writing collected as data. In other words, “participation” meant they granted permission for their writing to serve as data. Interviewed participants contributed an additional hour of their time to complete one interview outside of class time and assigned coursework. However, one student was disqualified from participation due to class inactivity, making the final total participant count 13. With the time constraints of the 10-week quarter and need for thorough engagement with the subject of mental disability prior to completing interviews, the number of interviewees was also capped at five for my second study. Six students consented to complete the optional interviews—an opportunity offered to all general participants. One student completed a written, asynchronous interview and another, Hilda, completed an interview in March of 2024, almost one year after her enrollment in English 281. Although I do not discuss this interview in my project, I want to honor and express gratitude for Hilda and excitement for the opportunities provided by students who complete post-enrollment interviews. Table 2 provides a non-exhaustive list of demographic information for the participants of the English 281 study with initial interviewees being marked by an (I) following their name and Hilda’s with an (F).

Similar to English 110, students’ demographic information in English 281 was collected in a variety of ways. Students were asked on the first day of class to share their pronouns as well as in their Introductory Email assignment which served a similar purpose to the Introductory Survey in English 110—to get to know more about students and their writing history. First-generation status was also requested within the email. As for race/ethnicity and linguistic resources, students disclosed this portion of their positionality in a variety of ways without being asked or required. For example, Yeni disclosed his multilingualism in a free writing exercise as he mentioned the struggles he faced with translating knowledge about rhetoric and said, “my first language is Mandarin”, and Polly noted in a writer’s memo that “English is my second language.” Another example is Peter’s disclosure in his Final Website that he

is “white, male, lower-middle class to middle class” as he spoke about his relationship to the lack of educational resources available to marginalized communities. Other, similar information was included in the Introductory Email as students, such as Ethan, disclosed their racial or ethnic backgrounds or, even, in interviews, as was the case for Lorraine. Students’ year of enrollment was collected from Introductory Emails or the UW-provided course roster. Like Table 1, this demographics table is not comprehensive and not meant to flatten the identities of those enrolled in the study.

Name	Year	Race/Ethnicity	Gender Identity	Education	Linguistic Resources
Hamilton	Sophomore	Undisclosed	Male	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Ethan Heiss (I)	Junior	Polish	Male	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Peter	Senior	White	Male	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Mason	Freshman	Undisclosed	Male	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Yeni	Junior	Asian	Male	Not first-generation	Multilingual
Foster (I)	Freshman	White	Gender queer, female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
JT	Junior	Undisclosed	Female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Cara (I)	Freshman	White	Female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Hearts	Sophomore	Undisclosed	Female	First-generation	Multilingual
Polly	Senior	Undisclosed	Female	First-generation	Multilingual
Lorraine (I)	Senior	Chinese, American	Female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed
Tosh (I)	Senior	Undisclosed	Male	First-generation	Undisclosed
Hilda (F)	Senior	Undisclosed	Female	Not first-generation	Undisclosed

Table 2: English 281 student demographics including students' year of enrollment, race/ethnicity, gender identity, first generation status, and linguistic resources. Those students whose names are followed by (I) participated in optional interviews and those followed by (F) participated in optional follow-up interviews.

Recruitment

While recruiting students for my research studies with an in-class recruitment script, I participated in the act of disclosure. This does not mean asking students to disclose their disabilities or talk about their mental disabilities. Rather, it responds to Ho et al. expressing that “the presence of disabled faculty in the classroom always already constitutes a political argument about the rights of disabled people to exist in public space, to be educated, and to receive reasonable accommodations at our places of employment” (p. 129). Disabled bodyminds themselves hold immense rhetorical force. Following Meleo-Erwin (2012), Goodley writes that disabled bodies “[disrupt the] norms about how bodies are supposed to look and how they are supposed to function” (Goodley, p. 60). In other words, they ask us to question how conceptions of the idealized bodymind are made; they also “[demand] new vocabularies and new ways of

understanding and valuing the ways which enact being human" (Goodley, p. 39). Thus, disclosure is a way for us to re-story ourselves into the university, to develop narratives that run counter to those of normative ideas of reason and rationality or the dominant narratives about the unreliability of mental disability. Similarly, Cedillo and Bratta (2019) argue that "positionality stories allow instructors to present academic counternarratives that contest educational conditions and assumptions while opening space for students to consider their own positionality within the academy" (p. 216). These counternarratives inspire students to think critically about assumptions resulting from dominant narratives within the university and to more deeply examine their own relationship to those narratives. So, my explicit presence in the classroom and disclosure as a mentally disabled instructor who has the skills to teach a college-level course was a rhetorical move and one meant to preface the arguments that followed as we read the course texts about rhetoricity, constructions of disability, and the exclusions of mental disability from the university. As part of the study design, this move was made to, hopefully, welcome students into the study through humanizing me as a researcher and to reinforce my later teachings and belief that all research is personal. Additionally, the potential discomfort that could arise within students at such a disclosure was hoped to be a productive way of emphasizing the exigence of the issues to which my work is responding as well as those presented in our readings. Given that most students who participated in the study disclosed some experience with mental health challenges, I assume this choice was effective in increasing students' comfort with participation in the study.

Immediately following my disclosure and within the same in-class recruitment document, I presented the study to students in both courses (Appendices III & IV), allowing them to ask questions and request further information to ensure informed consent prior to agreeing to participate in the study. Students in both courses were recruited in the same fashion. Further information was offered in a consent form which was provided to students on paper (in class) and online (on Canvas). Students chose to participate in the study via the consent form. All students who consented were recruited for the general study (10 students in English 110 and 14 students in English 281). The general study included permission for me to use and analyze all their in- and out-of-class writing in the findings chapters of my dissertation and required no additional work outside of the assignments needed to meet the outcomes for the course. The interview students (also "focal students") were determined based on their interest in participating in

interviews during weeks six and seven of the term, though this timeline shifted depending on student availability. Interest in interview participation was indicated through a response (written or verbal) to an email I sent to all general study participants informing them of the opportunity to complete optional work for the study. Upon indicating interest, they were asked to complete a separate consent form (Appendices VI & VIII).

Following the initial recruitment and with additional IRB approval, former participants from both English 110 and English 281 were contacted during Autumn Quarter 2023 for follow-up interviews. Students who expressed interest in follow-up interviews were provided and asked to complete an additional consent form (Appendices VI & VIII). Compensation was offered to these students in the form of gift cards. Of the 23 contacted initial participants, only one English 110 student and one English 281 student responded and completed a follow-up interview. My decision to request follow-up interviews was inspired out of my interest in students' long-term adaptations of mental disability knowledge and their ongoing development of a critical disability literacy. Although my observations of the data (student writing and dialogue) was limited to the work they completed during each given term, my second research sub-question asks "To what extent can these changes prepare students for future engagement with mental disability?" This question is difficult to answer given the circumstances of the study and, admittedly, few of the data sources revealed an answer to it apart from students' ratings in their closing survey that indicated their preparedness to respond to stigmatizing comments and any other individual comments suggesting future uses of the information. However, this question is still one of importance and the knowledge gained from the follow-up interviews will assist me in responding to this question further in future publications.

Data Collection

In thinking about unique manifestations of transfer and where transfer might happen, I want to return to the challenge of studying transfer and acknowledge that any act of data collection and analysis is an act of selection and is inherently incomplete. However, the combination of data collected and analyses through grounded theory aim to respond to this issue if not in a complete way, then in a productive way. The data collected from both studies were all the participants' in- and out-of-class writing. This included all formal and informal writing assignments including introduction assignments, free writing

assignments, discussion posts, major papers and their drafts, scaffolding assignments, the course final, an initial and closing survey, posters, presentations, relevant email or conference correspondence, and, when applicable, interviews. Table 3 (below) lists the assignments and data collected for each respective study.

Collected Data	
English 110	*English 281*
Initial Survey (in class, handwritten)	Initial Survey (Google Form, anonymous)
Introductory Survey (Google Form)	Introductory Email (online, via Outlook or Canvas Inbox)
Free writing exercise responses (in class, handwritten or online submission)	Free writing responses (in class, handwritten or online submission)
Discussion post responses (at home, online submission)	Discussion post responses (only one as a practice genre analysis)
Burrowing Exercise (invention exercise)	Definitions of Rhetoric Email
Genre Translation of Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain"	Rhetorical Awareness Letter
Audience and Genre Reflection for Research Project	Rhetorical Analysis Memo Draft
Proposal of Conversation (synthesis for Research Project)	Rhetorical Analysis Memo
Research Project Draft	Project Proposal
Research Poster Draft	Website Sketch
Revised Poster	Source Synthesis
Positionality Statement for Poster	Final Website Draft
Revised Research Project	Final Website
Final Critical Class Reflection	Final Presentation
Closing Survey (Google Form, anonymous)	Final Critical Class Reflection
Informal, relevant correspondence via email or one-on-one conferences	Closing Survey (Google Form)
Interviews, when applicable (in person or written)	Informal, relevant correspondence via email or one-on-one conferences
	Interviews, when applicable (via Zoom or written)

Table 3: All collected data from English 110 (left) and English 281 (right).

One exceptional opportunity offered to me as a teacher of English courses is to regularly be able to observe and be curious about how students' writing and writing choices shift from the first to last week of the term. The same opportunity is offered when exploring potential representations of transfer. Writing not only increases the likelihood of transfer, but also creates possibilities for identifying micro-transfers in that shifts in discourse and rhetorical choices can indicate changing relationships with content and concepts—that is, students' writing about a subject gives them opportunities to display boundary-marking

activity. In “Accessing Disability,” Price (2007) notes that it is through the “combined analysis of her [student’s] essay and supplementary, multimodal texts that a fuller story of her critical process of thought becomes apparent” (p. 69) arguing that combinations of texts and modes allows us to more thoroughly observe students’ unique transfer processes. Moreover, Price argues that “We must recognize that critical thinking is not something that can be absorbed and then enacted in a single, final text. Instead, it emerges in the relationships between parts of a palimtext” (Price, 2007, p. 71) and the same can be said about gauging students’ transfer processes. It is something that occurs over time rather than something we can observe at large in a single and final student artifact. Looking across students’ compositions can also enable a better understanding of the impact of genre and context on transfer processes and what students see as possible within a given context. However, it’s important to note that, although genre can be assigned to encourage students to imagine varied audiences and contexts, they are still always writing within the context of the English course as well which inevitably impacts their selection process.

Most of the students’ writing was collected via Canvas. For English 110, students’ Initial Surveys (Appendix XII) were collected on paper and Closing Surveys (Appendix XIII) were collected via Google Forms. For English 281, both surveys (Appendices XIV & XV) were collected via Google Forms for ease and accuracy of analysis. All other student writing was collected via Canvas submission portals apart from some participants’ hand-written free-writing exercises and two students’ hand-written interviews (one in English 110 and one in English 281). The option to hand write free-writing exercise responses was provided as a means to accommodate students who preferred writing by hand to think through the texts. My decision to offer a hand-written interview option was made with the intention of encouraging more students to participate in the interviews. The interview questions (Appendices X & XI) asked to all other students were provided, in these cases, to participants via a Word Document that was sent and received over UW Outlook or Canvas Inbox. Although this was preferred by two of the students, it did present complications in that there was not an option for real-time clarification about any of the questions which, in the case of Tosh (English 281), seemed to deter him from responding to some of the questions entirely. In other words, this was not as effective a method of collecting interview responses, and it is likely I would forgo providing this option in future studies. Table 4 (below) outlines the students interviewed, their

course of enrollment, number of interviews completed, the modality of the interview, and the date(s) on which they were interviewed.

Conducted Interviews				
Student Name	*Course*	*Number of Interviews*	*Interview Modality*	*Date(s) of Interviews*
Ed	English 110	1	On paper, asynchronous	March 5, 2023
Tanner	English 110	1	In person	March 9, 2023
Eight	English 110	2	1, in person; 2, Zoom	March 7, 2023 Nov. 8, 2023
Ethan Heiss	English 281	1	Zoom	May 12, 2023
Foster	English 281	1	Zoom	May 5, 2023
Cara	English 281	1	Zoom	May 3, 2023
Lorraine	English 281	1	Zoom	May 8, 2023
Tosh	English 281	1	On paper, asynchronous	May 22, 2023
Hilda	English 281	1	On Zoom	March 28, 2024

Beyond student writing, students' in-class interactions were documented in as much as I was able to reflect on them following the class session though these did not end up being coded. These notes were taken in an ongoing Google Document with headings label by the date on which we had the discussion I was reflecting on. Collecting field notes from in-class interactions and conversations was particularly complicated considering my positionality as both the researcher and teacher of the courses. Rather, these brief occasional reflections typically followed class discussions about disability-related readings and were used for reflecting and making initial claims and observations about the data. For example, on Tuesday, January 17, 2023, after one of our English 110 class sessions, I wrote

> Today, we talked about Margaret Price's "The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain." Students' discussion board posts mostly paid attention to the utility of the personal experiences in clarifying what Price was saying. Though most of them struggled with the jargon and density of the text, the majority understood the main idea that DS needs to consider the *mind* more deeply in *bodymind*. I have a recording of the class session but my general sense was that students were hesitant to speak about it with me although very talkative in their small groups. I heard a lot of enthusiasm and agreement in their conversations and some community being built through their shared reflections on the personal experience. The personal seemed important to them not only in the sense that it made it easier to read but that it showed them the potential of the personal in our academic writing. I will be listening to the class recording, but one thing that is clear is the students' separation of themselves from "mentally disabled people." As if it is not us and we are not them.

For English 110 and during week 10, three students completed one interview each with one of those three completing a follow up the following Autumn, making for four interviews total. In English 281 and

during weeks six, seven, and nine five students completed one interview each with one additional student (i.e., a student who did not complete an interview during that term) completing an interview the following Winter, making for six interviews total. For the three initial English 110 interviewees, interviews took place in either my office in Padelford Hall (two interviews) or on paper (one interview). My office was a practical location to ask students to meet individually because it was familiar to them but they were offered the option of proposing a different location for their comfort. Those interviews conducted in my office were recorded via Zoom for transcription. As stated above, the one written interview was sent and submitted via email. Zoom transcription includes the speaker's name next to their dialogue based on the name the speaker has provided on their Zoom profile. Since the English 110 interviews were conducted with both the participant and me in my office and I was the only one logged into Zoom for recording, all of the transcript inputs included my name next to them, adding a bit of additional labor to parse out my dialogue alongside the student's. As a result, I decided to conduct all English 281 interviews via Zoom apart from one written interview. Interviews are commonly used in transfer studies to understand students' varied forms of transfer (e.g., near/far, high-road/low-road, and backward/forward). As the "Elon Statement on Writing Transfer" notes, "writing transfer studies use a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods to identify evidence of and measure transfer, including surveys, focus groups, interviews, classroom observations, text analysis, discourse analysis." What the interviews offered that the collection of students' writing did not was an opportunity to get a more informal, real-time sense of students' relationships to the knowledge and to give students an additional avenue for revealing boundary-marking (e.g., the boundaries they were marking and re-marking around their relationship to disability through redefinitions of *disability*). The interviews were also semi-structured, we were not restricted to only discussing the questions I had prepared, and students were also allowed to direct the conversation. The interview questions focused on students' perception of their own relationship to disability or mental disability, any changes in their perception of mental disability overall, the perceived utility of the course subject matter, which sessions were impactful and why, the likelihood of carrying any of the information forward and where they imagined it might be useful, whether they had discussions about our course outside of class, and the effects of the work on their writing (Appendices X & XI).

The interviews allowed me to capture responses to course content beyond what I would in students' writing and in a more organic manner. Verbalizing their learning gave students one more opportunity for them to story themselves within the course and academy as well as in relation to mental disability. Particularly, as it relates to understanding students' boundary-marking activity—definitions of self, space/time, and discourse—as well as answering research questions related to students' relationships to disability, storying is useful for seeing the small interactions of students' definitions of themselves and the world around them. These interviews were one more space for students to reveal the sort of interactions that were working together to produce uptakes of and then adaptations of the mental disability subject matter. Verbal communication may also reveal more micro-shifts, for example, in verbal revisions which includes rephrasing, providing alternative explanations, and rethinking concepts during the interview. It was my hope that a more real-time, low-stakes form of communication would uncover different boundary-work or, otherwise, further complicate the boundary-work being done in their writing.

All students enrolled (i.e., not only participant students) in both English 110 and English 281 completed an Initial Survey (Appendices XII & XIV) and a Closing Survey (Appendices XIII and XV). As demonstrated in Table 3, the Initial Survey in English 110 was distributed in class and written by hand while the Closing Survey was distributed on Canvas and completed via a Google Form asynchronously. The Closing Survey for English 110 was anonymous due to an oversight on my part. For the same reason, the Initial Survey in English 281 (which was a copied and edited version of the Closing Survey for English 110) was also anonymous, distributed on Canvas, asynchronous, and completed using a Google Form. The Closing Survey in English 281 was *not* anonymous, but was also distributed on Canvas, asynchronous, and completed using a Google Form. Conducting an initial and closing survey asking the same, if not similar, questions, helped trace broader, more general trends in student engagement as well as chart how definitions of terms, conceptions of appropriateness, and belief in one's ability to advocate shifted over the 10-week period. The surveys asked nearly identical questions with the Closing Survey using post-course frames. Through the surveys I asked questions related to mental health, disability, and illness definitions; general attitudes toward conversations about mental disability in various locations or in which locations they believed it was appropriate to speak about mental disability; what outside or in-class knowledge influenced their definitions; which readings influenced at least one of their research choices;

perceived levels of stigmatization in the academy; and preparedness to respond to stigmatizing comments. It was useful to conduct the Initial Survey to understand the positions from which students were coming into the subject matter and how closely their definitions related to those we'd discuss in class. Additionally, this survey gave me a starting point from which to gauge their learning about mental disability throughout the course, particularly the learning that influenced their space/time boundaries and their attitudes toward discussing mental disability in various contexts. I was hoping, through this survey process, to better understand how the course impacted their willingness to talk and be proactive about disability justice and to see how the work we did together complicated one-dimensional views of disability.

Coding and Analysis

The basis of my coding and analysis for both studies was informed by grounded theory: the process occurred iteratively, allowing the emerging theory to develop through observations of and engagement with the data. As a result, I break my description of the analysis into two sections—one for each respective course—since differences in study design, course design, student positionalities and dispositions, and my ongoing engagement with scholarship on transfer research influenced the methods I used to work through the data. In both analyses, codes were not created prior to analyzing the data; rather, they arose out of the data as would occur in research informed by grounded theory. This sort of open-ended analysis is necessary as Wardle and Clement (2016) note that many studies focus on predetermined data points, but "predetermining data points in this way entails making a number of faulty assumptions, including that we know what (and how well) students learned in a particular setting, that the subsequent setting is one in which students need that prior knowledge, that the subsequent setting requires prior knowledge from that previous setting, and that the prior knowledge a student draws on is actually drawn from that one setting and not some other setting not included in the study" (p. 164). As a pilot study, English 110 offered me an opportunity to "try out" coding, organizational, reflective, and analytical methods in a way that was beneficial for the analyses I did on the English 281 data.

English 110: Critical Composition II (Research)

All the participant students' written data (Table 3) was collected via Canvas or email or in person, given it was handwritten. To begin my analysis, I downloaded all of students' digitally submitted

assignments, labeled them according to their student number[9], password protected them, and organized them into the folder corresponding to their student number. All free writing submissions were included in a single file with each response being labeled with the title of the text or topic we were discussing that day. Discussion post responses were organized in an identical manner. Any handwritten assignments, including the Initial Survey, were transcribed by me and included in these folders as well. For focal students, their interviews were downloaded (when conducted on paper) or transcribed (when conducted in person) by me and added to the same respective folders. Zoom recordings were downloaded in video, MP4, and transcript format. Following this organizational process, I attempted to identify patterns across the data by looking at it by assignment first, for example, by reviewing all 10 students' Burrowing Exercises. However, this did not allow for the sort of tracing required to answer my research questions regarding students' shifting relationships to the subject of mental disability. So, from there, I worked through the data student-by-student. My open coding for each students' work involved completing analytical memos in a Google Document where I reflected on the data, made initial interpretations, and shared my own reactions. I assigned my reflection of each students' work to a separate Google Document which I first copied and pasted the order of our completed assignments. The titles of the assignments were bolded and included all assignments in the order of their completion within the timeline of the course. Under each bolded title, I typed out reflections on the individual assignments as I read them, noting any detail I thought might be useful or relevant later. After reading through and responding to individual assignments, I added a broader reflective paragraph above the list as an overview to the students' work.

The second round of coding involved an attempt at *in vivo* coding which required making a second pass of the data with attention to the specific language students used to talk about mental disability and that might relate to transfer by reading and copying said language into a separate document reserved for each student. At the time, seeing as I was attempting *in vivo* coding for the first time, I restricted myself to the belief that the *in vivo* codes must be words and phrases consistently repeated across most students' work and, because I was also trying my hand at code quantification for the pilot

[9] This was a number assigned to each student based on when they signed up to participate in the study. For example, the first students' consent form I received would have been labeled 16581. The next would be 16582 and so forth.

study, I was hyper-focused on terms related specifically to mental disability rather than looking at what students were doing and saying *in response to* the subject matter—be that it is related to the subject matter or not. So, as I read, I decided against *in vivo* coding; it wasn't clear to me yet how it could serve as a *step* in the coding and analysis process and felt restrictive in its dedication to students' own words. Though, as I discuss below, this was not the case when approaching my data for English 281. Instead of sticking with *in vivo* codes, I made a list of examples of various forms of micro-transfer that seemed to occur in the course.

For my third stage of coding, I took a new path, turning to Saldaña (2011) whose discussion of "process coding" resonated with me. Process coding "uses gerunds…exclusively to capture action in the data" (p. 96). Students were certainly *doing* things in their writing and in relation to the subject matter and it felt necessary to use this form of coding to examine transfer since transfer is an *act*, involving some form of movement and micro-transfer is attentive to movement resulting from an interaction. Based on my observations from stages one and two of the coding process, I developed 13 codes to identify micro-transfers. The 13 codes included Reflecting, Feeling, Defining, Desiring, Advocating, Summarizing, Paraphrasing, Quoting, Repeating, Connecting, Arguing, Expanding, and Boundary-marking and are defined and abbreviated as indicated in Table 4. These codes were useful for responding to my research questions because they showcase the various relationships and responses students had to the knowledge they were gaining in class. Specifically, these terms served to point toward micro-transfers occurring in the course in that each term indicates an action resulting from a micro-transfer. In other words, they were meant to help me show what occurs as students interact with mental disability knowledge as well as serve as markers of where and why changes, shifts, or adaptations occur and how the pathways between interactions and resulting enactments differ for students. For example, one student's act of Reflecting on the reading, or thinking back on their past experiences to work through their current learning, could lead to an adaptation of that knowledge in the form of a positionality statement or rationale for a proposed project. In such a case, the micro-transfer (e.g., student's experience interacting with the course reading) enabled an uptake as a reflective tool and then a resulting transfer act of uptake enactment that demonstrates the students changing relationship to the subject matter. With these codes, I approached the data once more, using superscripts that corresponded with the numbers next to each

code in Table 4 to indicate where each action was taking place. Additional codes were added as I engaged with the data (e.g., Expanding was added after I recognized a difference between students expanding on ideas that they were summarizing), and some codes were combined or merged because of my difficulty distinguishing them in my analysis and difficulty defining them as something distinct from the other codes; for example, Desiring was a part of the act of Advocating and so they were combined. This resulted in a final nine codes. Following the coding of each students' work, the codes were quantified within an Excel spreadsheet where I calculated individual and collective instances for each code. Analytical memos were completed to reflect on the frequency of codes in each students' work.

From there, I developed two umbrella categories under which to place the nine final codes: (1) Developing Understanding and (2) Relationship Building. The first, Developing Understanding, encompassed codes that responded best to my first research sub-question—"What changes occur as students are reading and writing about mental disability?"—and included Summarizing, Defining, Repeating, and Expanding. These codes respond best to that question (and those which fall under it) in that it includes concerns with student writing, perceptible transfer, reappearances of ideas and terms, demonstrations of concept knowledge, and the composition classroom as an appropriate or ideal location for this subject matter and disability literacy goals. The second category, Relationship Building, similarly responded best to my second sub-question—"To what extent can these changes prepare students for future engagement with mental disability?"—and included Reflecting, Feeling, Advocating, Arguing, and Boundary marking. These codes respond best to my second overarching question and those sub-questions that fall under it because these questions relate to concerns of students' relationships to mental disability based on confidence, perceived utility, and the boundaries they draw in the process of their learning. Part of my decision to identify two phrases that encompassed the codes was informed by my plan to write two findings chapters combining findings from English 110 and English 281, using one category for the first chapter, Chapter 4, and the second for Chapter 5. However, as will be discussed further below when I present my divergence from the coding processes used for the pilot study, the English 110 data does not make an appearance in my findings chapters which have been reserved for English 281 and for which I took a different analytical approach.

Code	Definition	Examples	Connection to (micro) transfer definitions	Research questions addressed
Reflecting REF, 1	Moments when students are thinking back or thinking about a memory, moment, or idea that connects to what they are currently learning. Connecting past or current events and relationships. This could also be a forward or current reflection. Connecting a current moment to a future context, specifically as it might resemble past experiences.	“In my family, we avoid talking about our feelings…” “I’ve had peers come to me…” “As a Latino trying to get into a predominantly white field…”	Backward transfer; application of new knowledge into other contexts or moments in time; used to develop new understandings of a past moment or current situation disconnected from the current context	1d, 2, 2a, 2d, 2e, 1c
Feeling FL, 2	Emotional responses to the readings and course conversations	“I’m not really comfortable talking about it” “I loved how she talks about the importance of treating breakdown as meaningful experiences..." "I was shook..."	Part of disposition forming; relationship to disability shifting, increasing potential for future empathy and engagement	1d, 2d, 1c
Summarizing SUM, 3	Moments of overviewing main arguments or ideas from a text; referring to the text as a whole rather than specific portions of the text; articulating ideas from the text in	“This is also similar to what Crow talks about pain and suffering where she mentions the importance…” Basic quoting practices	Making sense of ideas, digging more deeply into ideas (expanding initial learning) Connecting with another person in relation to disability; making meaning about	1c, 1e, 2d

	one's own words; using some of the same terminology or ideas/making sense of it on their own; recognizing merit in another's ideas about the topic, meaning-making with the text	"We have to look at the desire and pain within disability studies…" "Body and mind, they go together and it's hard to not talk about one without the other…"	others' disability ideas	
Paraphrasing PA, 4	Merged up with SUM upon third stage of coding			
Quoting QU, 5	Merged up with SUM upon third stage of coding			
Advocating AD, 6	Recognizing oneself as implicated in disability activism, having goals to advocate for disabled people; sharing information about how to be an ally to disabled people; hoping for particular outcomes for disabled people	"…because I might use this when I see someone around me going through these challenges" "I think mental health should be talked about more often…" "I hope I can become a better ally to them, and support them in any way that I can, and apply that lens to my work in the future" "the academy at this point should do better of a job to make it an even playing field" "if we have more people just implementing it	Shifting position toward those with disabilities; potential for forward, successful or negative transfer	1c, 1d, 2, 2d, 2e

		into their everyday lives, we can get to a point where this is something that we can discuss freely"		
Desiring DES, 7	Merged up with AD			
Defining DEF, 8	Mention of what they associate with disability, attempts to define disability, includes references to disability symptoms, experiences, etc.	"Mental health, just like physical health…" Associating disability with "suffering", "challenges", a type of "going through" "this problem" "this issue" "face challenges"	Making sense, forming a relationship of understanding with disability; transferring past knowledge about mental disability into their new understanding and vice versa	1c, 1d, 2, 2d,
Repeating REP, 9	Repetition of key terms and ideas	"Bodymind" "experiences as real" "body and mind"	Adopting others' thoughts and ideas and applying them elsewhere; taking them on as one's own for potential use later on	1c, 1d, 2, 2d
Connecting CN, 10	Merged down with EX			
Arguing AR, 11	Making claims about one's own learning in the context of learning in the course	"This article educated me a lot…"	Metacognition; making sense of what was learned and its utility for future contexts	1, 2d, 2e, 1c
Expanding EX, 12	Expanding on the ideas of others; making claims based on ideas of others, adding one's own thoughts (beyond paraphrase)—more like joining	Statements such as "I think…" followed by claims related to a text or in addition to ideas in the text. Expanding on the thoughts of others	Applying ideas and concepts to understandings of others' ideas	1c, 1d, 1e, 2, 2e

	the conversation; recognition of stake in the arguments in DS. Synthesizing sources and ideas between texts or topics	in this way. Ed, for example, connecting Bailey and Mobley's text to her research project topic despite it being seemingly disparate		
Boundary-marking BD, 13	Boundaries around where and within which genres conversations about mental disability belong	"belongs in a social sciences class…"	Micro-transfer involves boundary marking activity that forms dispositions	1c, 2b, 2c

Table 4: The exact coding glossary used for my third stage of analysis for the English 110 data.

The Central Study: English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing

As with English 110, all the participants' written data (Table 3) in English 281 was collected via Canvas or email or in person, given it was handwritten. All digitally submitted assignments were downloaded and labeled according to each student's number, password protected, and organized into folders that corresponded with the same student number. For each student, free writing submissions were compiled into a single file with each response labeled with the title of the free writing exercise as it was listed on Canvas. The responses were organized in order of their completion within the course. Handwritten assignments, in this course only some students' free writing exercises, were either transcribed by me or photo documented and placed in the student's file. Students who completed interviews, in this class only over Zoom, had their conversations downloaded in video, MP4, and transcript format and added to the respective folders. The interview transcripts downloaded from Zoom were edited according to my listening and correcting any mis-translated words. During my downloading and organization process, I created a spreadsheet page, within my protected spreadsheet including the students' names, pseudonyms, and contact information, to track what data was collected for each participant.

I began my coding of the English 281 data immediately after the code quantification and reflections for English 110 which I had, at that point, decided would not take center stage in the dissertation seeing as it was largely a learning experience. My first round of open coding for the English

281 data involved reading through the data student-by-student and identifying patterns across student experiences, for example, in students' phrasing, concept use, and methods of responding. However, I also realized during this time that I was restricting myself in this analysis, holding onto the same goals of quantification and generalization as I did for English 110 despite my claims to the study's rootedness in grounded theory. One example of this stems from my observation that, for English 110, I spent a lot of time concerning myself with students' use of mental disability-related terms and how that might reveal students' definitions of mental disability or what their relationship to mental disability is. But upon my initial open coding phase for English 281, I recognized that there was little, if any, consistency with which each student used the terms *mental health* (*issues, challenges, problems*), *mental disability*, *mental illness*, and *mental disorders*. I wondered more about the importance of not only some of the more common terms we use to talk about mental disability (illness, disorder, mental health) but other "buzzwords" students might associate with conversations of mental health. Ethan Heiss, who you will meet in Chapter 4, provided good insight into this when he mentioned his disdain for the term *mental disability* in our interview; he preferred *mental health issues* because he didn't see his diagnoses as disabilities but as "extra-abilities." That said, my attention at the beginning of the English 281 coding process was misdirected—the terminology was much less important than the students' unique engagement and the messages underlying statements rather than individual words.

Similarly, I had a desire, at first, to also develop a coding glossary much like the one seen above (Table 4) for this second study. I believe this attachment restricted me from learning more openly from the English 281 data as I internalized the process codes from the pilot study and ended up using some of the same terminology (e.g., summarizing and reflecting) to talk about my observations in English 281 in my first phase. So, despite many of the same actions presented by the process codes occurring in student writing and dialogue in the 281 data, I started from scratch, ignoring the original coding glossary—though a different coding glossary was developed later—and turning back to *in vivo* codes which I had given up on in the previous study. This required another round of open coding and identifying codes that arose out of students' own language, words, and phrases. I read through the course assignments on a student-by-student basis, creating a single document for each student dedicated to my reflections and notes from the different assignments and in the order of their completion within the timeline of the course. These smaller

notes, quotes, and reflections from the students' work was followed by a broader, overarching reflection that I inserted at the beginning of the document. In addition, I added a section where I copied and pasted my research questions under the overarching reflection and responded to the questions according to what I observed in the individual student's work. After my open coding for the first seven students (17491-01 through 17491-08; that is, Hamilton through Foster; Table 2), I was able to recognize and identify some significant themes emerging from the data. Both stemming and diverging from students' own words, the themes that presented themselves were Rhetorical Awareness, Adapt and Transform or Making Meaning, Personal Experience, Specialized Knowledge or Beneficial Experiential Knowledge, Relationship to Disability, Intersectionality inspiring attention to Nuance, Agents of Change or Problem Solvers, and Environment and Class Discussions. As I identified the themes, I defined them based on my observations of students' writing and using students' writing as examples. Using thematic analysis (TA) or the identification and analysis of those meaning patterns, I further reflected on the data, using color codes and capitalized, red text to indicate which portions of students' writing fit within each theme.

Throughout this process, I was asked by committee member, Stephanie Kerschbaum what the themes tell me about transfer. I mentioned that it's difficult to explain because "transfer is everywhere" but Stephanie said I should narrow down what that means to be able to show transfer in my study, that I can say that it is the case that transfer is everywhere but need to show what that means through the presentation of my data. In other words, I needed to ask what I could say about transfer within the confines of my study since we all have transfer capacities that allow us to function with the world. I wasn't yet sure how to respond to this and revisited the analytical memo-ing space where I worked to explain my themes' relationships to transfer, and I realized that I had reverted, to some degree, back to the traditional carrying definition of transfer, slightly abandoning micro-transfer in my analysis. The traditional definition of transfer is still true but the steps that get us there need further examination, and they vary significantly for each student despite the patterns across the data set. Students bring to the classroom their own anxieties, memories, experiences, hopes, and questions which impact how they (and others) gain new knowledge and what that knowledge means to them; this is how the world and the members of the classroom develop across time and space. If micro-transfers occur in such development, then they are embedded into the classroom, particularly a classroom in which students intentionally and frequently

interact, one where conversation across similarities and differences is necessary. This is not to say that all interactions lead students to transfer, but it is true that some do which is the evidence I came to find in my data set, but not until I explained the relationship between each theme and transfer.

However, I needed to think about the themes as connected to the micro-transfers not just how they assist in transfer, but what micro-transfers they arise out of. In other words, I needed to determine what the class-facilitated interactions were that resulted in those responses within student work. This meant revisiting Medina's work on micro-transfer to secure my definition from Chapter 1 which goes beyond the "moment-to moment interactions." Medina notes that "learning [can be seen] as a series of micro-transfers that gradually ossify boundaries defining what we're learning" (p. 204). And, in his work, "What appeared…was that the boundaries, or how things were defined in space, time, and discourse, seemed to have a tremendous effect on the interactions, and before I could effectively discuss the interactions, I needed to have a better understanding of these boundaries" (p. 81). Additionally, boundary-marking moments "might be considered micro-transfer because like transfer, but on a moment-to-moment scale, it involves the effects of past experience on present and future contexts" (p. 198-9). Although there is a bit of a chicken-and-egg phenomenon occurring between micro-transfer and boundary-marking, I determined that the rich features[10] in the text must be relevant to students' boundary-marking and should relate to the boundary types and fields outlined by Medina (discussed in more detail in Chapter 4). From there, and within the rich features, I could determine which interactions are shaping the boundaries. This would not mean that that interaction developed the boundary, but that it led to the articulation of it although the new knowledge, in some cases, defined/redefined/reinforced boundaries that already existed for students or that were significantly permeable for them entering the class.

Once I was able to define and decide to replicate this method, I refined the themes listed above within the framework of micro-transfer, ending up with five themes for which I developed a coding glossary with headings and paragraph-style definitions. Those five themes are Relationships to Disability (combined with Personal Experience and Specialized Knowledge), Adapt and Transform, Class

[10] "a rich feature offers a cue to the reader, who can then make a connection between a text and the context from which it arises…Such features must possess, according to Ellen Barton, both 'linguistic integrity and contextual value' (p. 24). That is, they must appear often enough in the text to warrant the formation of generalizations, and they must contribute in a 'significant' (p. 24) manner to the way that text makes meaning" (Price, 2011, p. 30).

Environment, Rhetorical Awareness, and Agents of Change. The theme of Intersectionality inspiring attention to Nuance seemed to be more of an indication of a future direction for the research—a pattern that inspired questions unrelated to the current study. The themes were categorized for presentation in the findings chapters (Chapter 4 and 5) based on their closeness to individual and social micro-transfers and boundary-work. However, I acknowledge in Chapter 4 that this distinction is difficult to make based on the inability to separate the individual from the given context. From the identification of which portions of the students' work fit which theme, I had to narrow the excerpts to the ones that indicated acts of boundary-marking. Because the "series of micro-transfers" that leads us to defining, redefining, or reinforcing a boundary has no beginning and because I do not have information on all the students' daily happenings, thoughts, and feelings, it was impossible to account for all the micro-transfers occurring. So, I was restricted to those within the confines of the classroom and the students' writing. Rather, the important thing was identifying the marking of the boundary (boundary-work) and then tracing the interactions and encounters (micro-transfers) that led to or assisted in marking that boundary. These instances of boundary-marking and their directing us toward micro-transfers allows us to make sense of the possible uptakes (pathways between the receipt of knowledge and the resulting utterance, action, or artifact) students choose from and, thus, the varied forms of their transfer acts or adaptations of the knowledge they were learning in the course. I discuss the connection between boundaries, micro-transfer, and uptake in more detail in Chapter 4 along with those boundary types and fields mentioned above.

Through identifying these boundaries, I was beginning my process of discourse analysis (DA) which involves dissecting "what is said, but also how something is said within a certain structure" and "trying to understand complex relationships involving social interactions, structures, systems, and everyday lives" (Souto-Manning 2014, p. 160). In other words, paying attention to discourse allows us to dissect what is being said and how and explain what that might say about the experience informing such choices as well as what that might say about the micro-transfers that occur as students write. However, like Price (2011), I did not look at my data in a "microlinguistic" sense as traditionally done by those such as Norman Fairclough; rather, I took an approach more closely related to Ellen Barton who Price quotes as follows: "Discourse analysis involves looking at texts, inductively identifying their rich features and salient patterns, and then using these features and patterns as examples in an argument in support of

some generalization(s) or claim(s) about the meaning relations between features, texts, and their contexts" (p. 30). As such, I identify rich features in student writing that are indicative of the sort of micro-transfer resulting from shifts in boundary-marking to help describe what does happen as students engage this content in their writing within the composition classroom. Like Price (2007), I believe discourse analysis was best suited for this study "because of its ability to uncover the micro-shifts in language that signal larger critical shifts" (p. 63). My analytical process, then, involved (1) selecting student excerpts related to the themes listed above, (2) attending to individual words and phrases within the excerpts to determine if they demonstrated the marking of a boundary (e.g., "I *liked* her discussion of mental disability" versus "I *identified* with her discussion of mental disability as someone who has struggled with my mental health" with the latter indicating a marking of an identity boundary or the way a student defined themselves after interacting with the new knowledge), (3) identifying the interactions that occurred prior to the marking of said boundary as indicated by the students' reflections or assignments for which they were composing (e.g., the reading of a text with the students' prior experience, the openness of their peers in discussing it, my own revelation of disability status, and so forth), and (4) explaining why that boundary and those interactions matter within the context of my study. The final three steps occurred as I drafted the findings chapters, and the findings were revised according to feedback from my dissertation chair and re-engagement with the data. Only some students' stories were included in the final findings chapters given the scope and conventions of the project.

The Transfer Challenge, Reflexivity, and Intersectionality

In this section, I return to my early claims about the subtle nature of transfer. Following Barbara Schneider (2006) and Eileen E. Schell and K. J. Rawson (2010), Mandy Macklin (2019) writes that "Scholarship on how to do ethical research is vital for those wishing to study uptake as it requires interpreting what happens beyond what is completely tangible" (p. 46) and the same is true for studies of transfer, making all the more important an articulation of researcher biases and positionality to account for my own connections to the research process and participants. In one reflective memo, for example, I note that my empathy for one student's experience might impact conclusions about their data or my depth of engagement with their data. Further, my positionality as a cis gender, white female is particularly fraught within the English 110 classroom, making my handling of and engagement with student data more

precarious in that I must recognize issues of power and privilege in my interpretations and analyses of their writing. I imagined my position as teacher and researcher would have a significant impact on my data analysis. However, the teacher-researcher condition is one that pairs well with a study aiming to be attentive to nuances of students' experiences. The participants, in this case, were already first and foremost students and teaching is always a relationship, one built on a foundation of reciprocity that made communicating clearly about the study feel natural and necessary. Beyond this, it allowed me to see myself as part of the context in which students were learning; my interactions with them were also micro-transfers that could have contributed to the boundaries they drew and the dispositions they formed. One issue though is the fact that, as students in my course, those who were participating in the study, whose success was ultimately dependent on a grade, might have felt obligated to appease me or to make claims and reflect in ways that they felt were consistent with my own goals. To prevent this as much as possible, I made a point not to immediately communicate what I *thought* I might find in the data, making it a point to say that there is always uncertainty when analyzing data and that you never *really* know what you will find. Finally, my emotional connection to the subject of mental disability may have impacted what I searched and hoped for within the data and, as you will see later, some of these hopes were disappointed throughout my analyses though this disappointment was nowhere near negative.

With this reflexivity regarding my own positionality, I also dedicated myself to a feminist disability studies framework that valued the diverse and varied subject positions of those enrolled in the study and was therefore intersectional. This lens of intersectionality gives appropriate attention to the intersecting markers of difference that further complicate individual and collective student experiences of and with mental disability as well as researcher-participant interactions and is ideal for engaging with the intersections of our identity and ways in which issues of gender, disability, and race intersect and complicate one another. Not only does Simpkins (2022) remind us that disability is contextual and deeply connected to our positionality and cultural norms (p. 34), but Pryal notes "while all who are psychiatrically disabled are subject to stigma, privilege can make stigma easier to bear" because of race, economic background, gender, sexuality, and other markers of difference, one who is psychiatrically disabled can more or less likely pass as normate (p. 17). This is to say that an intersectional approach to both teaching and research is entirely necessary to engage issues and methodologies of mental disability in the

classroom. Engaging these frameworks in class and fronting my own privilege in relation to disability might assist students in thinking intersectionally about disability in their everyday conscious or subconscious critiques of disabling structures. Because disability is concentrated in communities of color to reinforce white supremacy (Minich, 2016) it's important that students engage these concepts with an understanding of how disability contributes to the multiple marginalization of disadvantaged groups. Intersectionality creates possibilities for more complexly engaging disability and considering the complexity of knowledge transfer in the composition classroom. Finally, intersectionality is an ideal theoretical framework for those who desire an expansion and deepening of conceptualizations of transfer in that, when we consider the varied and multiple experiences, realities, and discursive resources of those within our classrooms, we are more likely to be attentive to unique manifestations of transfer, to remain open to discovering where transfer happens.

In my analysis and presentation of the data, I was careful not to flatten the students or pretend that I knew all of their motivations, challenges, interests, and histories, keeping in mind that there are always elements of their identity and experience to which I am not privy. As for my data collection, this intersectionality was acknowledged in my encouragement for students to use whatever meaning-making strategies and resources were most useful for them in achieving their goals or expressing their ideas which sometimes took the form of alternative genre proposals for assignments or various methods for notetaking and free writing responses. Students were also provided content warnings for the readings as an opportunity to refuse engagement with texts that might be re-traumatizing for them. This was a way of respecting their diverse backgrounds and, also, accepting as a researcher that I do not deserve access to all student knowledge. I was lucky to have been trusted with many students' vulnerability, their stories of harm, and their dynamic identities which made it less difficult to keep in mind the multitude of factors contributing to their unique manifestations of transfer. Having demographic information and reflections on how they introduced themselves in introductory assignments and positionality statements gave me tools for not reducing an observable outcome to a single moment in their learning journey, but as something molded by that information and more which resulted in an acknowledgement of the uncertainty involved in studying transfer, accepting that I am not an objective observer but a limited one.

This intersectional approach was also important in my teaching methods and engagement with students in the classroom and course design. In the following chapter, I will provide a more detailed account of what happened within the English 110 and English 281 classrooms, including the rationales informing my choice of course readings and assignments and an explanation of how my design shifted from one course to the next. Although the courses were designed with knowledge about what is known to support transfer of learning, they are admittedly imperfect and certain improvements could be made to create more opportunities for students to demonstrate micro-transfers. These improvements are also discussed further in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3. Constructing a Disability-Centered Transfer Pedagogy

As stated in Chapter 1, I recognize that any solution to disability-related inequities has the potential to "[create] problems by concealing the problems in new ways" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 142) and that "The major 'defeat device'[11] in teaching…may be our own magical thinking, or self-congratulation, or willingness to insert ourselves as more expert than students or disability officers" (Dolmage, 2017, p. 74). With this I acknowledge developing an imperfect course for my transfer study, but imperfection provides an abundance of potential. To frame the discussion and analysis of my findings in the following chapters, here I describe my course design, which provides details on the context of my studies, curriculum decisions, student projects, course readings, and the rationales provided to students for readings and assignments. These details, along with the later findings, provide an example of a transfer-informed, disability-centered curriculum that others can engage with, adapt, and improve within their own contexts. As such, this chapter is a place to begin, not a formula or recipe; it is one demonstration of how this work might begin and an invitation for others to explore these same questions, similar questions, or entirely new, yet related, questions. Its purpose is to provide the context for my studies and classroom as well as my aims for the course, assignments, and other course materials. The following section presents the institutional context of my studies, where the studies took place, and the associated programs and departments. I then introduce the pilot study, including how the course fits into the writing program, my teaching background, and a description of the course readings and the goals they were meant to achieve. The subsequent section introduces the central study and provides a timeline of the course's readings and their rationales. The remaining sections include the English 110 and English 281 course assignment trajectories. Because of the overlap in some of the English 110 and English 281 course readings and assignments, I refer to English 110 as I discuss the central study; in other words, the information in these sections is presented as a more back-and-forth conversation between English 110 and 281 to highlight how the former impacted the latter. Finally, I discuss a few of the limitations of my course design, not to include the limitations of the research which will be discussed in Chapter 6.

[11] According to Dolmage (2017), this is "a retrofit that is actually designed to hide an inequity or mask a problem by offering a fake or deceiving solution" (p. 144).

Institutional Context

The pilot and central classroom-based studies which serve as the basis for this dissertation were conducted on the University of Washington (UW) Seattle campus. UW is a large, urban university on a 700-acre campus serving over 60,000 students and offering over 180 undergraduate majors and over 300 graduate degree programs. Previously titled the "Expository Writing Program" —which received the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) "Writing Program Certificate of Excellence" in 2020—the Program in Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) is located within the English Department. The English Department includes almost 200 undergraduate courses and over 60 graduate courses in its course catalog. Of those nearly 200 undergraduate courses, the PWR has 11 course offerings ranging from a supplemental writing studio to special topics courses. Approximately 6000 students complete the university composition requirement by taking a PWR course. These writing courses are largely taught by English graduate students, who enter the PWR training and mentoring community two weeks prior to beginning their first term at UW, with additional courses taught by part-time lecturers (mostly department graduates). All new graduate instructors teach English 131 and complete an orientation prior to and a pedagogy seminar during their first term of teaching. The PWR also offers ongoing professional development and mentoring. With each additional course they teach in subsequent years, graduate students complete a course-specific orientation and receive support and resources from program directors, assistant directors, and other English faculty and graduate students. In other words, the PWR adequately and successfully supports its teachers and students throughout their scholarly careers and education.

All 100-level PWR writing courses have the same outcomes according to the program goals and mission and allow students to fulfill their Composition "C" credit and/or their Writing "W" credit. These outcomes include the following abridged items:

1) To compose strategically for a variety of audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university
2) To work strategically with complex information in order to generate and support inquiry
3) To craft persuasive, complex, inquiry-driven arguments that matter

4) To practice composing as a recursive, collaborative process and to develop flexible strategies for revising throughout the composition process[12]

During my preparation for teaching English 281, I was informed that there are no formally defined outcomes for English 281; rather, this course will delve deeper into the outcomes assigned to the 100-level expository writing courses. Each of these outcomes is achieved through varying means not only across course levels and numbers, but also across individual sections of each course seeing as instructors have a significant amount of freedom to select course themes and employ their own teaching philosophies. The following section introduces the context of the pilot study and traces the timeline of the course through the presentation of course readings and their rationales.

The Pilot Study: English 110

The pilot study took place in the English 110 classroom (Critical Composition II; Appendix XVI) which is a course linked to the UW Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Student Athletic Academic Services (SAAS). Most students enrolled in English 110 are historically marginalized, including but not limited to those with low-income status, students of color, and first-generation immigrant students. English 110 courses are described as "Approach[ing] writing as social action and language as tied to identity, culture, and power. Center[ing] students' diverse language resources and discourse traditions. Build[ing] rhetorical capacities for composing ethically, critically, and impactfully across different contexts, audiences, genres, and goals within the university and beyond." English 110 is also the PWR "stretch" course which is preceded by English 109 (Critical Composition I). It's important to mention that the English 109/110 sequence is not a remedial course but rather an extended version of the most commonly taken FYW course on campus (English 131) as students complete similar, if not the same, assignments over a longer period of time. These stretch courses are capped at 15 students and provide instructors and students the opportunity to work one-on-one more frequently. Ideally, students from English 109 will have the same instructor for English 110 which allows them to transition into the course assignments and discussions more easily in the second term. Many of the students enrolled in my section of English 110 in 2023 were students who had been previously enrolled in my English 109 course though a handful of them

[12] For a complete list of the PWR outcomes for 100-level composition courses see Appendix XL.

had worked with other instructors. The pilot study was conducted during the students' second semester as first-year students at UW.

Before teaching English 110, I had a year of experience teaching the English 109/110 sequence before which I taught a year of English 131 and, as a master's student, taught equivalent writing courses at a different institution (for more information on the pros and cons of serving as both researcher and instructor in these courses, see Chapter 2). In many English 131 courses, students spend the first half of the quarter developing rhetorical awareness and the second half of the term developing a line of inquiry that leads to a final research paper which is, by program requirement, followed by a portfolio of their revised work along with a critical reflection that surveys and makes an argument for their learning throughout the term. Because English 109 and 110 are the "stretched" version of this course, students in English 109 often spend most of their time building rhetorical awareness while discussing topics that engage their critical thinking about their writing and/or the world. In the English 109 course preceding my pilot study course, we began the term by exploring the topic of linguistic justice and definitions of rhetoric in relation to language use. The course description stated "we will discuss the ways in which academic discourse and literacy are never value-neutral and how they are embedded in complex power relations…we will then focus on expanding your understanding of rhetoric by problematizing traditional rhetoric and resting with scholarship on non-Western rhetorics and knowledge systems."[13] Students completed a rhetorical awareness assignment before being introduced to the tools and resources they would need to conduct the research paper they'd be assigned in English 110. I recap this experience to demonstrate where my pilot study research participants began their instruction from me. Seeing as English 110 is the second half of the stretch course, we spent most of our time responding to student research questions, reading texts, gathering and synthesizing sources, working collaboratively through peer review, considering the politics of citation, and translating genres for presentation to publics.

The Course Readings

In 2014, Yancey et al. responded to the under-theorization of the impact of content on the writing knowledge transfer by studying how writing and composition theory content impacted students' ability or likelihood of transferring writing knowledge (p. 5). At the time, they claimed that "to date, there have been

[13] For the full course description see Appendix XVI.

no studies inquiring into what difference, if any, the content of a composition course…makes" (p. 32). Since, writing about writing (WAW) approaches have proven that teaching writing theory *does* influence the transfer of writing knowledge specifically. According to Yancey et al., "students need a vocabulary for writing in order to articulate knowledge and ensure more successful transfer" (p. 101). This vocabulary and key terms are meant to engage students intentionally with their pre- and misconceptions about writing (p. 138). Similarly, my approach to incorporating mental disability knowledge from the disability studies perspective emphasizes the need to develop a vocabulary with which to understand mental disability and aims to invite students to consider general and specific pre- and misconceptions of mental disability by reading and discussing disability studies theories as well as representations of mental disability within the university as something beyond deficit.

As a result, my course content was chosen with the goal of helping students develop a critical vocabulary and literacy of mental disability, and with the goal of encouraging the transfer of that vocabulary and literacy. In terms of the scholarship that informed my course content, I first approach these courses and studies with a goal of *desiring disability* which does not mean "wanting to be disabled;" it means desiring its potential for difference, for change, and for coalition (Price, 2015; McRuer, 2006). I began valuing difference in the classroom through storying by assigning course readings that run counter to narratives about who belongs within academic spaces; rhetoric, composition, and disability studies have all practiced and proposed *re*storying, rewriting, and countering university, cultural, and disciplinary narratives that construct the other, defining difference as deviant and deficient. Aja Martinez (2020) claims that critical race counterstory "functions through methods that empower the minoritized through the formation of stories that disrupt the erasures embedded in standardized majoritarian methodologies" (Martinez, p. 3). Counterstory, in the future work of disability studies and writing studies, can be used to empower those who are mentally disabled within the academy. Further, pairing actual stories with the more abstract disability studies concepts was meant to show students the real-life application and relevance of such theories. So, these stories were read in the hopes of disrupting the continual erasures of mentally disabled students and faculty in our classrooms. Their seeming connection to students' futures as individuals within the academy and the consistencies in the content and theories across the texts were meant to inspire connections or future occasions for transferring the subject matter, and the

repetition of definitions and concepts helped form the basis of the mental disability knowledge I had hoped they'd transfer. In other words, many of the readings served as occasions for transfer through their repetition and expansion of disability studies concepts, building on one another in a way that aimed to inspire students to *think back* to the previous reading, therefore applying and adapting the new knowledge. These interactions between the texts are particularly important according to the theory of micro-transfer. Below, I present the readings students and I discussed together in English 110 to demonstrate how each responded to my goals as a teacher and scholar while still serving to reach the PWR outcomes.

We began the term by listening to two episodes from Alice Wong's *Disability Visibility* podcast which were also available to read as a transcript posted on Wong's website. The first episode was titled "Disability Studies" and featured a conversation between disability studies scholars, Sami Schalk and Subini Annamma. This was followed by an episode titled "Intersectionality" including a conversation between Wong, Jean-Luc Pierite, and Sandy Ho. These podcast episodes served, in part, as accessible introductions to disability studies and frames for entering the scholarly, peer-reviewed text that followed: Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley's (2019) "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework." My rationale for the first episode stated that it was an opportunity for students to observe "[how] academic topics or topics that we write about and engage within the university can be translated into more popular texts for the general public to access."[14] The rationales paired with each reading and assignment were not read or discussed together in class for English 110 but were meant to serve as another site for supporting students' knowledge transfer. The rationale, in other words, was a place for me to prime, cue, and frame the content of the readings for students to use in other assignments or contexts and, in the case of the assignment rationales, to prime, cue, and frame for the use of particular skills or application of knowledge from the course readings and discussions.

To follow the first podcast, the latter episode served as an introduction to intersectional perspectives and research frameworks because we should teach using "frameworks that help students work toward social justice by recognizing their *overlapping* and *interlocking* experiences of privilege, oppression, and in/ability to access communication in relation to their peers, instructors, families, and

[14] For the full list of English 110 reading rationales, see Appendix XIX.

communities" (Gonzales & Butler, 2020, n.p.; emphasis mine). The rationale states that "this concept is important for approaching the questions you ask in your research, engaging with research participants, and for reading the work of your classmates. It is one more demonstration of what it means to use and apply a research framework" and emphasizes how it will be useful for their future writing assignments and research.

These episodes were followed by Bailey and Mobley's "Work in the Intersections" which was not only assigned with the goal of demonstrating what a research framework is and further engaging students with the concept of intersectionality, but also for showing students how disability is not a stable marker of difference; rather, Bailey and Mobley provide background information on disability studies, the social and medical models of disability, and apply their Black feminist disability framework to critiques of how race and disability intersect, for example, when Black people are perceived as physically "too strong" to be disabled and, at the same time, intellectually disabled by their race. In the reading rationale, I write that "by providing these examples, they introduce you to the idea that something like *disability* can be used [to] critique broader oppressive structures that are, in the simplest terms, *disabling*, oppressive, and exclusionary." This text also falls in line with my goal of re-storying disability; in *Black Madness: Mad Blackness*, Therí A. Pickens (2019) asks, "How might we read race and disability outside the confines of the scripts heretofore provided?" (p. 3) which means we must create our own scripts for race and disability by rereading and rewriting representations and discourses of race and disability. Similarly, Yergeau (2017) claims that "storying" is their "method…[because] autistic stories…resist the cultural inscriptions that autism as a diagnosis suggests" (p. 24). Alternative stories that counter and rebel against the dominant narratives are necessary for the empowerment of those who are negatively affected by the cultural scripts they are asked to repeat through the stories of others. Counterstories were the tools used to disrupt common mental disability meaning frames and illustrations of perceptions of mental disability that I hoped would transfer rather than the "supports" for the act of transfer, which was aimed for more through the repetitions and reading rationales that framed and cued for connections across texts and the usefulness in assignments. For example, in the rationale for Bailey and Mobley's text, I stated that this article provides "one genre in which information about mental disability can be communicated which we will compare to other genres we engage."

We then went on to read Margaret Price's (2015) "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" which served as another demonstration of how to apply a critical disability studies framework as well as encouraged students to think more about how the body and mind are connected, experiences of mental pain, and what feminist disability studies could do better. To expand on Bailey and Mobley's critiques and to further demonstrate the genre possibilities for discussing and presenting information about mental disability, students turned back to the topic of "Black Mental Health" in episode 65 of Wong's podcast in which Imade Nibokun discloses her experience as a depressed Black woman, addressing the "strong Black woman" archetype and arguing for greater representation and therefore opportunities for support and connection in mental healthcare for Black people. This podcast was paired with an infographic titled "Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health" from the LGBTQ+ Behavioral Health Equity and African American Behavioral Health Centers of Excellence. These texts further reinforced the concept of intersectionality, positively complicating disability's relationship to other markers of difference. Three additional readings followed these: excerpts from Katie Rose Guest Pryal's (2017) *Life of the Mind Interrupted: Essays on Mental Health and Disability in Higher Education*, M. Remi Yergeau's (2013) "Clinically Significant Disturbance: On Theorists Who Theorize Theory of Mind," and Sara Ahmed's (2013) "Making Feminist Points." Pryal's text was important because it provided a list of disability studies terminology with accessible definitions and showcased the ways in which critical disability perspectives can be applied in less formal, more personal forms of writing, particularly as they relate to critiquing institutions. In retrospect, Pryal's list of definitions would have been more effective if it were read at the beginning of the quarter since many of her terms would have given students entry into disability discussions and would have been crystallized in the other course readings. Along similar lines, as I framed to students, Yergeau's text "shows us that valid intellectual work and arguments can be completed in nonstandard ways" and challenges us to "think critically about academic definitions of 'sense making,' coherence, organization, [and] professionalism" (Appendix XIX). Considering its lack of disability-related content, Ahmed's blog post was not necessarily meant to provide additional information on or tools for thinking about and building relationships with disability. Rather, her work can be broadly applied to what they learn about mental disability in that we must consider who is excluded in the practice of citation and how we can shift who "fits" within academic conversations and therefore who is seen as

"able" to produce knowledge. The loose connections between Ahmed, Pryal, and Yergeau's texts were articulated in the reading rationale; however, less explicit was the connection between excluding mentally disabled people from the academy and how more conscientious citational practices can serve as part of the movement to counter such exclusion.

The Daily Class Structure

Throughout English 110, students were asked to reflect on their experiences with the readings through their completion of discussion posts as well as produce genre translations of Price's article ("Course Assignments" below) which was the only Weekly Assignment[15] that required direct engagement with a course text. I discuss the course assignments further in a later section. Each reading or set of readings was given its own discussion board and students were asked to respond to one or two questions in a list of questions related to the readings. Initially, the discussion posts were assigned and restricted for students to see posts only after they posted themselves. However, around the middle of the term, I wanted to open the discussion board for students who missed class to respond to their peers' thoughts in meaningful ways even if they couldn't be there for the discussion. As stated below, in retrospect this didn't provide the sort of transfer support necessary for the learning to be perceived as meaningful nor did it generate the micro-transfers that result from peer-to-peer communication, so the form of engagement required for English 281 was free writing exercises.

During our in-class sessions, the discussion post responses were used as the foundation of our discussions. Each student would respond to the discussion board prior to class, I would read and take notes on the responses before our scheduled class time, students would pair and share their responses during the class session, and then we would begin our large group discussion. I often asked for volunteers to share first but other times I would draw someone into the conversation by beginning with a comment they made on the discussion board. Because there were only 15 students, we built community quickly in English 109 and that carried over, in part, to English 110. Therefore, our conversations tended to flow smoothly. It also helped that many of the students had either been friends prior to the class or become friends in English 109. In addition, we would reinforce a level of comfort by completing frequent

[15] These were longer, higher-stakes assignments that allowed students to further practice the skills we were practicing together in our daily lessons.

ice breaker questions. All sections of English 109 and 110 meet four times per week for 50 minutes. As a result, there was not enough time to complete ice breakers for every session but, on average, we completed one or two per week. Beyond this, students frequently worked together in class which seemed to reassure them that it was a supportive community. The ice breakers were asked at the start of class, often giving those who were running a bit late time to make it to class and not miss anything related to that week's reading(s) or skills practice. These were then followed by an overview of the class session, an agenda that was projected onto the wall, informing students of what we would do that day. On reading discussion days, students would either pair up immediately to share their discussion post responses or we would take time to define terms together, for example, when discussing Bailey and Mobley's text, we defined what a research framework is before diving into our discussion.

As can be seen in the course calendar (Appendix XVII), one to two readings or sets of related readings were assigned per week until Week 5. On days when readings were not assigned, we completed skills lectures and practice, though this sometimes occurred in conjunction with the reading discussions. To refer to our lessons on Bailey and Mobley again, we began comparing genres by reflecting on the similarities and differences, costs and affordances, of sharing information about mental disability in the podcast versus the academic article genre as part of our reading discussion. Halfway through the term, when students began producing more writing for their research project and conducting more research through the UW libraries, I did not assign readings for students to complete outside of class apart from one final podcast at the end of the term. Class sessions during those weeks were dedicated to research skills lectures, activities, and peer support workshops.

By promoting reading, analyzing, and applying research frameworks and critiques of mental disability in the composition course, I intended to offer students some of the tools and critical vocabularies they need to read disability differently in their everyday lives (e.g., throughout the university). Further, because we *make* disability through texts and discourse, we need to consider how we make and therefore *make room for* disability in our classroom since an absence is still a making of more or less space for someone or some ideology—a conforming to and acceptance of the commonplaces that appear in cultural texts whether those be spoken, written, material, and so forth. This goal of considering how we make room for and reread mental disability in the classroom was adopted as I assigned readings for the

central study as well; though some readings remained the same, others were added for the sake of discussing the rhetorical nature of disability. Other necessary curricular shifts revealed themselves in my reflections on and analyses of my English 110 data which I discuss briefly in the following section and in more detail within the final section.

The Central Study: English 281

The second study took place within the English 281 (Intermediate Expository Writing) (Appendix XXVII) classroom and included first- to fifth-year students who, as detailed in Chapter 2, were largely business, finance, and information systems majors who had already completed college-level English composition courses or equivalent. Because I joined the English 281 teaching community during Spring Quarter of 2023, no formal orientation was held—orientations were usually held prior to Autumn Quarter. Rather, I met one-on-one with a former instructor of English 281 for mentoring and guidance throughout the term. As stated in Chapter 2, because I was unsure about the number of studies I'd be conducting upon beginning this project, English 281 offered me the opportunity to revise various elements of not only my study design, but also my course design. These necessary revisions were revealed through my initial round of open coding for students' writing and interviews from English 110, general reflections about the course, and my continued reading on transfer studies. As for my reading assignments and assignment prompts, I became aware of the importance of reviewing the rationales in class with students. As Tanner,[16] one of my first interviewees, revealed, little time if any was given to the rationales when I assigned them to be read outside of class time. These rationales were used in the assignment prompts to (1) articulate the assignment's placement and role in the process of inquiry (e.g., For the English 110, "The purpose of the burrowing exercise is to help you begin and develop your line of inquiry or the set of questions you want to answer through your source exploration and engagement, collaboration, and writing."; Appendix XX); (2) point students toward the broad applicability of the assignment, for example, in personal and professional communication such as in the rationale for the English 110 Genre Translation assignment (English XXI) where I state "rhetorical awareness is needed for any and all communication because we are always selecting what information to share and how to share it when we

[16] All study participants were assigned their self- or researcher-chosen pseudonyms prior to data analysis which are used throughout all analytical reflections and chapters within this dissertation.

interact with different groups and individuals"; (3) emphasize other, more general skills and why we need them (e.g., "Your proposal of conversation is meant to help you practice both joining scholarly and public conversations… This assignment is also your first step toward your research paper draft because you will build on the conversation you develop in this assignment when you synthesize your sources in your paper draft."; Appendix XXIII); and (4) make statements about similarities across assignments to encourage skills transfer (e.g., "Similar to your genre translation of Margaret Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain," this assignment involves honing your audience and genre awareness skills."). Each assignment rationale is included in the assignment prompt in their respective appendices.

The English 110 rationales included more justification of the assignment because of my insecurities surrounding whether students would be able to perceive connections between the texts and assignments or how the texts were being used to learn more about research whereas the English 281 texts related to rhetorical constructions were more directly applicable to the skills students were practicing as well. Regardless, the "now and later utility" structure of the rationales was consistent across courses: just as the English 110 rationales first told students how the assignments fulfilled the course goals, the English 281 rationales began by stating a skill and/or goal that would be practiced or achieved by completing the assignment. For example, on the Rhetorical Awareness Letter prompt (Appendix XXXII), the rationale states "In short, through this assignment you will gain necessary analytical and rhetorical awareness skills that build knowledge and provide an opportunity to practice reporting on knowledge you have discovered." These statements were followed by claims about what the assignment would help them achieve, such as "It also enables you to think and look more critically and closely at the work of others to identify the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and motivations that inform their rhetorical choices." In place of or addition to these more broad statements, the rationales often made claims about the assignment's applicability to the students' life and, because students were asked to write in traditional business genres, each rationale included a statement on why that genre was chosen, for example, claiming that writing a memo is useful for learning the structure for use later in their business careers.

One other distinct change in the rationales from English 110 to English 281 was the focus on literacy. In English 110, I wanted it to be clear how the assignments contributed to attaining literacy to

justify how the focus on mental disability literacy was an *example* of how literacy can be achieved for other topics. One place this attention appears is in the Genre Translation rationale where I wrote

> To become literate or fluent in any topic or field of study, you must learn to communicate information using a variety of means and for a variety of audiences. This allows you to exercise that knowledge and recognize its possibilities for public engagement. In other words, seeing the ways in which information *moves* from place to place enables us to better implement that into our daily lives.

Shifting into English 281, I wanted to spend more time framing for transfer of specific knowledge rather than how to broadly attain and possess knowledge. For example, in the Rhetorical Analysis Memo prompt (Appendix XXXIII), I state that "Transfer studies identify composing in a number of public genres to be effective in inspiring the transfer of content knowledge. Writing in a variety of genres also makes it more likely that knowledge about a particular topic will transfer from one situation to the next in that genres are typically employed in specific social situations." This statement is informed by transfer scholar claims (e.g., McManigell Grijalva, 2016) about the need for students to feel as if they are writing for real-life audiences, contexts, purposes, and change. It's unclear how useful these explicit transfer statements were for students as, upon reflection, I am disappointed by my ability to convey the appropriate meaning. In addition, they may have felt out of place for students seeing as I did not explicitly say I was aiming to study students' transfer processes when I first recruited them. However, connecting the content explicitly to transfer principles for students (i.e., making the transfer theory visible) might not be as important as using the rationales to inspire repeated interactions between ideas, assignments, and students that continue to develop their understanding of the utility and applicability of the information. So, the most essential components of the rationales in English 281 were those that helped "students make connections across writing tasks" (Yancey et al., 2014, p. 31) and showed students they had "future occasions to which they [could] bring their knowledge" (p. 16). The explicit connection to specific future contexts (e.g., as business employees) was also a form of cueing for the transfer of genre knowledge which, combined with mental disability knowledge, could challenge uptake residues that tend to restrict what knowledge is appropriate in certain genres and contexts and what possibilities we see for meshing genres. In other words, the interaction of the subject matter and genre knowledge *could* inspire new uptake artifacts although there is not enough evidence to prove whether this *does* happen in this context (this limitation is discussed further in Chapter 6).

The greatest advantage in English 281 for the rationales was that the first half of the course was focused on rhetoric and rhetorical constructions in everyday life. This gave me the opportunity to teach about rhetoric broadly but also through disability studies scholarship. Therefore, each early assignment was more clearly connected to what we were reading and the skills we saw some of the authors using to critique dominant discourses of disability. For example, the Rhetorical Analysis Memo (Appendix XXXIII) followed our reading of Price's "Assaults on the Ivory Tower: Representations of Madness in the Discourse of U.S. School Shootings" in which she rhetorically analyzes how mental disability is constructed through media representations of school shootings and shooters. In addition, my increased awareness of the importance of creating occasions for students to transfer led to the requirement that their chosen research topic be, to some degree, informed by our course readings or conversations which conformed to the theory that students need to perceive a use for their knowledge for it to transfer (Wardle, 2007).

Beyond the rationales, my prompts and assignments changed drastically from English 110 not only due to the student majors and educational experience, but because of the relevance of the genres assigned for students to compose. This was further informed by the fact that English 281 is not a stretch course and, therefore, research would not be the only central component. I recognized this may have also been one limitation of the stretch course—our theme was only engaged in the context of research whereas rhetoric and rhetorical analysis (which were covered separately in English 109) are essential for understanding the making of disability in the academy. By this I mean that we can understand disability as more than a marker of difference or identity category when we examine how our understanding of and relationships to disability are constructed through and informed by rhetorical choices that dictate what we know about and how we interact with mental disability. This attention to rhetoric informed my decision to linger on our rhetoric sequence in English 281, adding texts by Jay Dolmage and Dana Cloud as well as a chapter from Price's (2011) *Mad at School* to build a stronger basis for working with disability concepts and topics in students' research.

The course goals in English 281 were similar to those in English 110, aiming to engage students' genre, audience, and rhetorical awareness skills as well as research skills such as searching for and citing sources, synthesizing sources, joining scholarly conversations, and so forth. Although English 110

didn't allow for a deep focus on rhetoric, one of the central tenets in my teaching is building rhetorical awareness which includes being continually attentive to the ways in which our biases, interests, values, beliefs, and histories can never be removed from our writing. I begin my lessons on rhetoric with definitions that include but don't restrict rhetoric to the use of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* which is the knowledge that most students tend to bring with them. Our journey to understanding our positionality in relation to our writing began in English 281 with these lessons which included excerpts from Cloud's (2018) *Reality Bites* and James A. Herrick's (2020) *The Theory and History of Rhetoric* which emphasize the inability to separate ourselves from rhetoric; Cloud also provides a lens for knowing disability as constructed and how truths about disability come into being. I note in the English 281 course description that "As we read, we will consider rhetoric's role in constructing our understanding and perceptions of disability broadly and mental disability specifically, a skill which can be applied to examining the ways in which other aspects of our worlds are constructed and how we construct worlds through our communication."[17] As such, course readings for the first half of the term included excerpts from Herrick, Price, and Dolmage's (2014) *Disability Rhetoric* as well as articles that were also read in English 110, such as Yergeau's "Clinically Significant Disturbance," Bailey and Mobley's "Work in the Intersections," and Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain."[18]

Because English 281 began with a sequence on rhetoric and more readings were assigned overall, these course readings were framed more from the rhetorical perspective than those used in English 110. However, those readings that carried over from the pilot to the central study maintained identical if not similar information. For example, the framing for Bailey and Mobley's text remained the same apart from the addition of its connection to a reading that was added in English 281. The intertextuality of the readings was particularly important in my framing as I prompted connections between ideas either explicitly or implicitly through the use of similar terms and phrases across the rationales. And, as with the assignment rationales, the reading rationales encouraged students to think about the applicability of the text beyond the classroom, for example, in the statement "Think about what it might look like to use this understanding of disability [the Black feminist disability framework] to 'look at' the

[17] For a complete course description, see Appendix XXVII.
[18] For a complete list of course readings, see Appendices XXVII and XXVIII.

university or your field of study." As we approached the research segment of English 281, connections to the earlier texts became less explicit and I offered small nudges toward the DS work we read earlier, such as hinting at the conversations surrounding what "counts" as knowledge within the university, who is represented in research, and who benefits or loses by representations of certain populations in research.

For the rhetoric sequence, beginning with Herrick's text was important to ensure students were on the same page regarding definitions of rhetoric. Generally, yet within the context of the study, I wanted students to know that rhetoric is inherent in all communication. This knowledge contributes to the goals of my study because our relationships to mental disability result from how we and others communicate about it and without an acceptance of the consequences of rhetoric we cannot as effectively disseminate reparative knowledge about mental disability. In other words, attention to rhetoric and rhetorical constructions has the potential to positively change how we construct mental disability in our own worlds. Thus, a focus on rhetoric is (1) central to my teaching philosophy, (2) necessary for helping students become more conscientious communicators, and (3) a potential catalyst for "changes…in students' perception of their relationship to disability": the concern of research question 2.d.

Presenting Herrick's more accessible, textbook introduction of rhetoric provided the context needed to engage with Dolmage's and Price's first chapters which problematize disability rhetorics and rhetorics of mental disability respectively; for the former, my rationale noted

> Dolmage claims that he 'want[s] to make two initial moves to align disability studies and rhetoric. First, [he] want[s] to explore the rhetorical history of the disability studies concept of normativity. Then, [he] want[s] to chart some popular and persistent disability myths.' What Dolmage offers us in this course is an examination of disability rhetoric or rhetoric that informs our definitions, understandings, and relationships to disability and the norm. Within this examination Dolmage poses questions, similar to Yergeau and Price, about the relationship between the body and rhetoricity which leads us to question our own assumptions about disability and capacities to reason. Beyond this, Dolmage offers us an introduction to the workings of disability studies and its goals and emphasizes the social model of disability. As you read, I want you to consider what it means for there to be multiple rhetorics, what it means to speak and write credibly, and what norms you want to construct through your own rhetoric in your writing and research.

Similar to Dolmage, Price's first chapter from *Mad at School*, titled "Listening to the Subject of Mental Disability: Intersections of Academic and Medical Discourses," presents a definition of rhetoric from a disability studies perspective and challenges us to think about issues of objectivity, reason, and rationality as they relate to our perceptions of mental disability and how discourse contributes to negative

perceptions of mental disability specifically within the academy. These texts help, as Goodley writes, “expose the ridiculous, stereotypical, abusive knowledge created by non-disabled people about disability” (p. 46). The common threads running through these texts inspire the sort of interactions or micro-transfers that might inform students’ acts of boundary marking and therefore how and where they use the knowledge later. Although I had hopes for the intertextual nature of the texts to inspire students to make their own connections between them in their free writing exercises, for example, this was uncommon and only explicitly valued by one student, Ethan Heiss, who I introduce at length in Chapter 4.

After reading the texts that connect rhetoric to mental disability, students were introduced to the concept of rhetorical analysis through Jack Selzer’s (2003) chapter “Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers.” This was then followed by another chapter of Price’s titled “Assaults on the Ivory Tower: Representations of Madness in the Discourse of U.S. School Shootings" which served as an example of a rhetorical analysis of a mental disability-related artifact—this coincided with their Rhetorical Analysis Memo assignment (discussed below). Not only did this serve as an example, but Price demonstrates how “the language we use about mental disability has very real consequences" as she breaks down the underlying assumptions that inform the media’s claims about the relationship between mental disability and violence; additionally, Price “offers a structure which [students] can follow to conduct [their] own analysis” (Course Reading Rationales, Appendix XXX). During this same week, students listened to the same “Black Mental Health” podcast episode and read the “Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health" infographic shared in English 110. These texts were not only meant to be informative, as they were for English 110, but were read with the goal of practicing analysis together in class, introducing students to the concept of genre, and showing how similar information can be communicated more or less effectively in different genres depending on the intended audience and purpose. Genre, then, became a core focus the following week.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, transfer researchers in composition wonder “how we can support students’ transfer of knowledge and practice in writing” (Yancey et al., 2014, p. 2) and propose ways in which we can design courses that support the transfer of writing-related knowledge in addition to examining factors that could inhibit one’s ability to transfer. Some of these factors include teacher feedback, peer interaction, prior knowledge and experience, genre-based instruction, motivation, value,

self-efficacy, dispositions, threshold concepts, cueing, framing, priming, meta-awareness, and metaphor and analogy. Traversing discourse communities, applying prior knowledge, and carrying information from one context to another has also been a concern for transfer scholars. Yancey et al. urge instructors to teach for transfer by using various forms and genres for metacognition, tying in relevant and interesting genres, and incorporating genres related to other classes and the student majors (p. 144).

According to Reiff and Bawarshi (2016) “genres help us define and make sense of recurring situations while providing typified rhetorical strategies for acting in recurrent situations” (p. 3); they are “complex social actions and cultural objects” (Bawarshi and Reiff, 2010, p. 78). In Charles Bazerman’s (1994) words, “over a period of time, individuals perceive homologies in circumstances that encourage them to see these [texts] as occasions for similar kinds of utterances” (n.p.). In short, genres are repeated social performances that instill meaning and respond to social needs within and across activity systems and also determine the conditions and requirements or expectations for response to another genre (Bazerman, n.p.). How genres speak to one another is what Bazerman calls “systems of genres.” Analyzing the genre system surrounding and including the U.S. patent, Bazerman describes systems of genres as “a complex web of interrelated genres where each participant makes a recognizable act or move in some recognizable genre” (n.p.); these recognizable genres are then proceeded by a “range” of “appropriate generic responses by others” (n.p.). In addition to the “complex web,” some terms that have been used to speak of genres are *relationship*, *interrelation*, *interaction*, and *constellation,* all highlighting the movement of genres and their world-building capacities. Nowacek (2011) argues that “Recognizing the existence of this constellation of genre associations…is central to understanding the relationship between genre and the phenomenon of transfer” (p. 19). RGS scholars understand genres as enabling access to and traversing activity systems which require the use of varied writing skills and knowledge. If recognizing the utility of and similarities between genres increases access to diverse activity systems, then having genre knowledge is likely to ease the act of transfer because connections will be more easily made.

Within English 281, this meant guiding students toward a theory of genre was important for showing them how information about mental disability can translate across genres and how they might be able to adapt information within those genres in the future. To leverage these connections, students read

Brent Henze's (2018) "Teaching Genre in Technical and Professional Communication" and Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi's (2016) "Introduction" to *Genre and the Performance of Publics*. In my rationales, I argue that "Both texts pay close attention to the context-dependency and situatedness of genre performances. An attentiveness to genre theory will allow you to make more conscious and effective decisions about genre and the elements therein. It will also make you more aware that genres are not stable categories but arise out of different social situations thus making you more aware of the relationships that genres respond to and inspire, emphasizing the social nature of writing broadly." Alongside Henze's and Reiff and Bawarshi's texts, students read "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain." The purpose of assigning this text was similar to the purpose above but was also used to examine the elements of the academic, peer-reviewed journal article genre which we did together in class.

The following week, students learned more about intersectionality, engaging with the aforementioned *Disability Visibility* episode and Bailey and Mobley's "Work in the Intersections." Additionally, students read excerpts from Chapter 1 of Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters' (2021) *Introduction to Intersectional Qualitative Research*. These texts were meant to complicate students' understanding of disability as intersecting with other identity categories as well as prepare them for writing their own positionality statement in their Project Proposal. Wong's podcast and Bailey and Mobley's article were the final counterstories students accessed for the term. Overall, the counterstories within these courses were assigned in the hopes of challenging our well-worn understanding of the university's history, who belongs, who gets heard, and what ideas are valued. In other words, stories that run counter to the dominant scripts of mental disability have the potential to override majoritarian stories and empower those with mental disabilities. In the classroom, this creates possibilities for empowering both students and educators alike. These scholars give us tools for the very necessary work of rewriting the university and world around and for mentally disabled individuals. Like Tanya Titchkosky (2007) we should be concerned with how we *make* disability through texts, and we must learn to read disabilities differently and with a disability studies lens.

For the second half of the term, students read texts on ethical research practices, citational politics, research and colonialism, Indigenous research, and community-academic partnerships which

were less focused on disability studies and mental disability. However, unlike English 110, students' final research projects (Appendix XXXVII) were required to be—to some degree, even loosely—inspired by something we spoke about, read, or learned in class. As with other assignments this is discussed in more detail below but is to say that most students did not abandon thinking about mental disability altogether as the term progressed. In addition, these later readings led students to engage with reflective questions that required an analysis of their own personal and disciplinary values and beliefs and how those values and beliefs informed their topic choice, source selection, research steps, and what information to include or omit. However, in a course revision, I would argue for dedicating more time to drawing those connections between the texts on mental disability with those discussing more general research skills.

Moving on and deeper into the research process, students read Chapter 2 ("Kwe as Resurgent Method") of Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's (2017) *As We Have Always Done*, Max Liboiron's (2021) "A Wee Primer on Colonialism" and watched a YouTube video by MEOPAR titled "Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done" (2021). These were paired with Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's (2015) "R-Words: Refusing Research," Ahmed's "Making Feminist Points," and Carrie Mott and Daniel Cockayne's (2017) "Citation Matters" which were selected to provide more critical perspectives for approaching their research by telling stories about the mental, emotional, and physical harm that has often been caused by research, particularly in the social sciences, as well as how that harm is perpetuated by only validating knowledge production if it aligns with Western ways of knowing and doing. In the reading rationale for Max Liboiron's "A Wee Primer on Colonialism", I suggest to students that "You should consider the ethics of your own research [and] whose interest you want to represent and remain faithful to." These texts don't represent the researcher as "all knowing" and encourage students to think about research as a conversation, as a way of building relationships with others. Mott and Cockayne and Ahmed's texts similarly aim to encourage students to think about who is included and excluded within the academy and who is seen as capable of producing knowledge. Because I wanted to be attentive to students' majors, we closed the course readings with Jared S. Colton and Steven Holmes' (2016) "A Social Justice Theory of Active Equality for Technical Communication" and Janice C. Redish's "What is Information Design?" Largely, these texts helped students make decisions about how to design their

website (i.e., research project, described below) and present information accessibly, the latter of which resonated with the earlier readings on disability.

For each course reading, students were provided weekly discussion questions with the reading rationales and author biographies to guide their reading of each text. The assigned texts were paired with reading rationales and author biographies so that students understood (1) how the reading aligned with the course outcomes, (2) what parts of the text to grant the most attention, (3) what initial connections were possible across texts, and (4) the many voices and faces that contribute to altering relationships to mental disability. The reading rationales were used as a method of facilitating the transfer of both skills and subject matter, giving students different opportunities to interact with the texts and to make the texts interact with one another. At times, for example as we read Price's fourth chapter in *Mad at School*, I would preface for students the useful writing techniques (e.g., rhetorical analysis) they could extract for use in immediate assignments or elsewhere. For Price's chapter, I wrote, "Price's analysis offers a structure which you can follow to conduct your own analysis and targets the underlying assumptions and beliefs attached to discourse about mental disability and violence." Another prominent example of skills-framing, I directed students' attention toward Yergeau's unique writing style: "What I want you paying attention to is Yergeau's style and their explanation of that style. Does this writing (content and style) challenge ideas you have about professional and academic writing?" Subject matter was often framed by presenting initial connections between texts, for example, when I present Dolmage's first chapter from *Disability Rhetoric,* writing that "Within this examination Dolmage poses questions, similar to Yergeau and Price, about the relationship between the body and rhetoricity which leads us to question our own assumptions about disability and capacities to reason." This statement connects three of the course readings, preparing students for the way the texts intersect, serving as an example of synthesis and suggesting how the subject matter might be applied elsewhere. A similar cue was used to prepare students for Bailey and Mobley's "Work in the Intersections." I direct students to think about the content beyond the initial class discussion and into their particular field: "As you read, pay attention to what the goals of disability scholars are, what issues we tend to address, how they are addressed, and what the justification for the presented framework is. Think about what it might look like to use this understanding of disability to 'look at' the university or your field of study." Identifying potential occasions for transfer

through directing them toward disciplinary connections might lead to a shifting of boundaries regarding where disability studies and mental disability discourse belong as well as their boundaries regarding the relevancy of disability frameworks in their own lives. When redesigning my course from English 110 to English 281, I lightly revised the rationales with a deeper focus on sharing details that would support transfer. Similar to what I describe below in relation to the assignment rationales, I was also more intentional about reading the reading rationales in class with students to ensure their engagement with them.

The discussion questions were then used for the in-class free writing exercises that allowed us to begin our class discussions. This form of responding to discussion questions was a change I made reflecting on English 110 where students were asked to respond to readings using the Canvas discussion board which resulted in a lot of repetition in student responses, making me wonder how much students were being influenced by the responses of others rather than interacting with mental disability discourse on their own terms especially considering students who are unfamiliar with these discussions might not know where to begin. Though transfer is a social process, I wanted to learn more about how students think through mental disability content individually, prior to sharing their thoughts in class. Therefore, the discussion post responses were translated into in-class free writing activities which prepared students for our daily discussions. Though there are still limitations that come with the free writing method, this revealed a wider variety of responses compared to the discussion board posts that centered mostly on reframing overarching ideas from each text. Following the free writing exercises, each reading was discussed in class and students were encouraged to share likes, dislikes, agreements, and disagreements all of which tended to present themselves in each class session. As such, class sessions were typically structured in the same way: the first half was dedicated to discussing the readings and the second half was reserved for skills lessons and practice. Reading discussions in English 281 were conducted similar to those in English 110: students were paired to share in small groups, invited to share with the large group, and then built on each other's thoughts throughout the first half of the class session. Discussing the readings at length in class offered more opportunities not only for students to interact with the texts but for them to interact with other's interpretations of and relationships to the texts which I discuss as central to theories of micro-transfer in Chapter 4. The skills practice was meant to guide

students toward completion of their course assignments which I review in detail in the following section before reflecting on other course design limitations.

Course Assignments

English 110: Critical Composition

Informed by Perkins and Salomon's belief that we can create conditions in which transfer is more likely to occur, Yancey et al. argue that "if transfer of knowledge and practice is to be successful, students need to have future occasions to which they can bring their knowledge of composing and composing practices" (p. 16) meaning we need to *help* "our students make connections across writing tasks" — this, they claim, "is a key to transfer" (p. 31). As will be reviewed below, I assigned a number of public genres for students to compose in to, ideally, prime them for future occasions in which they might discuss mental disability and in the hope that they would recognize a greater number of possible activity systems in which mental disability could be discussed.

In English 110, the final project was the culmination of the course's work on a topic of each student's choosing. Each assignment was meant to serve as scaffolding leading to the final project. Students were asked to complete an initial Burrowing Exercise (Appendix XX) which stated that "you will explore possible topics for your research project by burrowing into your interests and deciding which topics interest you most, what you'd like to learn more about, what change you would like to push for, etc." They were encouraged to think about which communities they are a part of or participate in and discover a topic by thinking about their role within their communities, what issues their community members face, or what interests the community members share. Students were not required to write about topics related to our course theme, but asking students to embed themselves in the research process and select a topic close to them ensures that the information is meaningful and, for knowledge to transfer, it must be considered meaningful. From the Burrowing Exercise (Appendix XX), students engaged with issues of genre, completing a Genre Translation (Appendix XXI) assignment which asked them to translate our course text, "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibility of Pain," into a genre for an audience which they believed needed to know more about Price's argument. As with the Burrowing Exercise, the Genre Translation was accompanied by a rationale which began by stating "To become literate or fluent in any topic or field of study, you must learn to communicate information using a variety

of means and for a variety of audiences. This allows you to exercise that knowledge and recognize its possibilities for public engagement. In other words, seeing the ways in which information *moves* from place to place enables us to better implement that into our daily lives." So, students were urged to consider a more public audience with whom to share Price's knowledge. Some students chose PowerPoints, others chose blogs, and some composed Instagram posts—public genres that communicate where information about mental disability is "allowed."

Following the Genre Translation, students wrote an Audience and Genre Reflection (Appendix XXII) which asked them to "turn back to the same steps you used to identify a need for sharing information and selecting a genre and audience for your Genre Translation assignment to identify a need, select an audience, examine context, and propose a genre for your research project." This assignment was, therefore, a proposal of the students' topics, a statement of their intended audience, an analysis of the context in which this topic was being discussed, and a proposal of the genre which students wanted to produce. Students were encouraged to write in the genre that complimented both their topic and their intended audience's needs and interests. Most students chose to write traditional research papers or blog posts with some creating websites and multi-genre papers. As discussed below, this range of options was not ideal for tracing transfer of mental disability knowledge and, therefore, I designed it so that students in English 281 composed a single genre for their research project. After proposing their topic, audience, and genre, students began the research process, leading to the production of an assignment called the Proposal of Conversation (Appendix XXIII). This assignment was adapted from previous assignments that fell under the umbrella of annotated bibliographies. However, I wanted this assignment to be more of a synthesis of the sources students found rather than individual paragraphs stating the use of a particular source in itself. Thus, this assignment was meant to be the start of the conversation students would build between their sources as they entered the rough draft of their project. From the Proposal of Conversation, students began drafting their research projects which were later submitted for peer review therefore the rationales were much less specific and more open to accommodate the array of student topics. The Research Project prompt was sparse (Appendix XXIV), including a rationale that stated

> This research paper allows you to demonstrate your literacy of a topic by offering you the opportunity to use all of your available linguistic resources, to employ all of our course's key concepts, to make thoughtful and ethical rhetorical choices, to have a conversation with your

> peers and other researchers, to participate in a space that views failure as necessary and generative, to articulate your research methods and methodology, to demonstrate your conscious citational choices, and more.

The scarcity of information on the prompt was meant to demonstrate that each student's project would be different from others and that they had a significant amount of freedom in terms of content and structure. Further, multimodality provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning and transfer of knowledge by offering a wider range of tools for responding to disability discourse because students may know more than they are able to show in traditional alphabetic writing, giving them a wider repertoire for engaging content. In this way, multimodal assignments may provide the researcher more sites for observing the reappearance of knowledge about mental disability. At the time, I did not anticipate that such multimodal assignments would necessarily result in a reappearance of mental disability knowledge if students chose to write about topics unrelated to mental disability.

Along with their final projects, and as part of the PWR collaboration with the EOP, students completed posters which were presented later at the English 110 Poster Symposium (Appendix XXV). Students from all sections of English 110 were invited to present and complete brief poster talks similar to what would be conducted at any academic conference. At the end of the term, students wrote a Final Critical Class Reflection (Appendix XXVI) which broadly asked students to reflect on their experience in the course with a specific focus on how they engaged the research process, their writing progress, and the stakes of their work. Students were asked to mention specifically how their work was informed by course readings. Having space and requirements to reflect on one's learning—or engage in meta-awareness—is also proven to boost the likelihood of transfer. Broadly, scholars conducting writing transfer studies argue that metacognition contributes to the likelihood of transferring information and skills across contexts (Nowacek, 2011; Driscoll, 2011; Perkins and Salomon, 1992; Reiff and Bawarshi, 2011). Nowacek argues that successful integration from one activity system to another requires "some degree of metacognitive awareness and a positive outcome for the student" because metacognitive awareness "enables successful recontextualization of elements that seem to be in conflict" (p. 34). In other words, metacognition allows students to resolve conflicts in their thinking (e.g., double binds) and enables recontextualization of knowledge (i.e., transfer) through reflection that fosters connection-making. However, it's worth noting that transfer can occur without explicit reflection or "mindful abstraction."

The Final Critical Class Reflection was a metacognitive opportunity that provided space for students to make meaning out of what we had learned and reflect on ways in which it might come to matter in the future. This sort of cueing and priming through directed questions about the course readings is one way to support transfer. Metacognition was also practiced by students in each of their reflective Writer's Memos which they completed for their Weekly Assignments. Other smaller assignments included informal free writing assignments and discussion posts as mentioned earlier. Students also participated in four peer review sessions. All Weekly Assignments were accompanied by a rationale (rationales are included at the end of each assignment prompt in their respective Appendices); the rationales included details on what skills the assignment was meant to help them practice, how it related to or supported the other assignments in the sequence, and how the skills could be applied in future contexts.

English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing

In English 281, the final research project was a website presenting the topic of each student's choosing (Appendix XXXVII). The content of each research project was inspired by topics discussed during our class sessions or in relation to our course readings. Making this shift—setting guidelines as to what students could write about—gave me a stronger sense of what students do with mental disability knowledge and provided students a future occasion for seeing the subject matter as meaningful. Students synthesized their research into a website which they created on their own—with instructor guidance, instructional videos, workshopping, and review—using web programs, such as Weebly and Wix. The other Weekly Assignments were broken down into two sequences: (1) Rhetorical Awareness and (2) Research and were meant to serve as scaffolding leading up to the final project. Additionally, most Weekly Assignments were written as genres traditionally thought of as business genres, including the Definitions of Rhetoric Email, Rhetorical Awareness Letter, Rhetorical Analysis Memo, and Research Proposal. Varying the genres in which students compose can give the illusion of writing within an authentic writing context which can help students transfer knowledge from one domain to another (Yancey et al., p. 7). McManigell Grijalva (2016) reminds us that students need to feel like they are writing to real-life audiences, for real-life purposes, and for real-life change to learn what it means to transfer knowledge across activity systems (p. 153). This means we need to frame tasks in a way that makes them clearly applicable in other contexts and directs the students' attention outward toward real-life

audiences, increasing the likelihood of knowledge transfer by allowing them to think about the transmission and relevance of the information beyond the classroom.

Because the course began with developing an understanding of rhetoric through Herrick's, Price's Dolmage's, Yergeau's, and Cloud's readings, students' first weekly assignment was a Definitions of Rhetoric Email (Appendix XXXI). This assignment asked students to research and synthesize at least two definitions of rhetoric alongside those we were discussing in class. The Definitions of Rhetoric Email was meant to engage students' critical awareness of rhetoric's complexity. This assignment aimed to lead them toward their own understanding and definition of rhetoric by exercising their research skills and supporting claims with reason. It also marked the beginning of their journey discussing complex topics and questioning what may be presented as objective fact. By looking at various definitions of rhetoric, students ideally came to see that the way we shape information has consequences for constructing our reality. Students, in short, examined and reported on the rhetoric of definitions of rhetoric. Formal emails are genres in which students have been and will all be required to write and this offered them a low stakes space to practice this professional task.

After examining multiple definitions of rhetoric, students were asked to complete a Rhetorical Awareness Letter (Appendix XXXII) which required students to take on a more material view of rhetoric which includes recognizing "something's ability to induce change in thought, feeling, and action" (Gries, 2015 qtd. in Herrick, 2020, p. 3). This assignment gave students the opportunity to demonstrate their attention to the definitions of rhetoric we engaged in the course. It allowed them to practice observing rhetoric in a way that develops the critical lens through which they examine the rhetoric of other individuals' work. This assignment asked them to be aware of the minuscule things and moments in which they are moved to thought, feeling, or action. By doing so, I intended for them to recognize the power not only of the words and other symbol systems they interact with, but those that they use. In other words, this assignment was written with the goal of enhancing their rhetorical awareness by asking them to acknowledge the rhetoric of the things around them as well as their own rhetoric as they move through space and time and interact with other rhetorical agents and beings. Like the engagement with Herrick's text and other definitions of rhetoric, directing students' attention to rhetoric in their lives and themselves as rhetorical beings contributed to my goal of informing students that rhetoric is embedded in all

communicative practice. This assignment went a step further, hoping students would consider themselves meaning-making beings whose communicative choices have consequences and, ideally, see themselves as agents of change in conversations regarding mental disability. In terms of the study goals, this assignment also responds to question 2.d. that wonders how this course design might contribute to students' perception of their relationship to mental disability because it places them in a position of rhetorical influence. Thus, I aspired to spark connections between the definitions of rhetoric from our course readings and students' first assignment, their and other's rhetorical agency in everyday life, and the way that they later chose to communicate about mental disability if they wrote about it and/or if they communicated about their own relationship to mental disability. These hoped-for interactions (micro-transfers) were not always fulfilled and those implications for transfer research will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

Following their Rhetorical Awareness Letter, students wrote a Rhetorical Analysis Memo which asked them to "identify and evaluate the key components of a text of your choosing as long as the text relates in some way to the discussions we have been having about mental disability, health, and illness" (Appendix XXXIII). Asking students to compose a business genre in which mental disability may not commonly be discussed challenges uptake "residues" and "captures" that limit possibilities students see for engaging certain content. In other words, these assignments are meant to open space for discussing mental disability in institutionalized genres. I saw this assignment as having the potential to make some less habituated uptakes more visible for students which would then result in a greater likelihood that knowledge will transfer in other uptake enactments and artifacts by presenting new genre options for mental disability knowledge. Though this was what I hypothesized, in my data analysis, there is not yet enough evidence to make definitive claims about the effectiveness of this design which I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 6. In addition, the Rhetorical Analysis Memo allowed students to demonstrate and deepen their understanding of rhetoric as well as demonstrate their ability to think critically about representations of mental illness and other socially constructed identity categories. Through their analysis, they more deeply engaged conversations of mental disability to further develop a literacy in the topic. Finally, students were asked to write a memo since this is a genre they might be asked to write in the future. Hayes et al. (2016) cite Engle et al. (2012) noting that "transfer is fostered when new

knowledge and skills are presented as ‘resources for productive action in potential future transfer contexts’" (p. 185). This assignment required students to draw on the definitions they examined earlier to evaluate the key components of a text and articulate their rhetorical force. Conducting the rhetorical analysis required students to practice the rhetorical, audience, and genre awareness skills necessary to be an effective communicator in a variety of contexts. It also enabled them to think and look more critically and closely at the work of others to identify the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and motivations that inform their rhetorical choices.

The Rhetorical Analysis Memo was the final assignment in the first sequence of the course. The second sequence began immediately after with the assignment of a Project Proposal formatted as a formal business proposal (Appendix XXXIV). Proposals are common genres in business and marketing; thus, this gave them one more opportunity to practice writing business genres in a low-stakes environment and, as stated, composing in genres that may not traditionally be used to discuss mental disability could disrupt what we see as possible for responding to information about disability discourse. The Project Proposal asked students to propose a research project topic that was “loosely or explicitly connected to our readings and discussions” as long as they were “able to identify and argue for that connection.” Because they were choosing their own topic, it was with this assignment that the prompts no longer referred to the explicit use of course reading content, leaving students to make connections of their own between the subject matter and their chosen topic. As the foundational scaffolding for their final projects, their Proposal included an executive summary, problem statement, objectives, solution, methods, and costs sections. This assignment gave them the opportunity to “sell” their research project idea to me. It also allowed me to determine whether they were on track to develop a successful research project at the end of the course. Writing a proposal allowed students to hone their rhetorical, genre, and audience awareness skills by asking them to write to a particular audience in a professional tone and style while conforming to genre conventions. Despite my hope that the encouragement in the prompt for students to use their creative agency would inspire them to challenge genre conventions, the standard proposal format was followed apart from additions of topic-specific images, title page art, and other aesthetic touches (e.g., in headers). Further, this assignment asked them to do some preliminary research by looking back at the content we had covered over the term to determine which topic they

wanted to explore; in other words, it asked students to partake in the process of invention that is necessary for any writing task. In addition, the “Costs” section of the Project Proposal prompt asked students to “share what other possibilities you considered for your research topic.” This was a question asked to deliberately trace uptakes (i.e., the pathways available to students for responding to the uptake enactment and affordance of the prompt). Despite this, few students even took up the opportunity to respond to that small statement on the prompt which left little to be said about their uptake selection within the classroom context and in connection to the course prompt and subject matter. One error in their request was also that I did not ask students to express why they did not select those other topics.

Because students were translating their ideas into a full website, they were required to develop a Website Sketch (Appendix XXXV) following instruction on how to use the web platform Weebly though some chose to use platforms that were more familiar to them such as Wix or Figma. This sketch could be digital or handwritten and more or less developed depending on the student’s preference. The purpose of the sketch was to provide a visual outline that clarified for me what the structure of the website would be. This assignment was adapted from outlining assignments in previous courses. Similar to the English 110 Proposal of Conversation, students were asked to write a Source Synthesis (Appendix XXXVI) which was so named as a result of some confusion amongst English 110 students. As with the Proposal of Conversation, this assignment was adapted from previous assignments of an annotated bibliography. Therefore, this assignment was a synthesis of sources students planned to engage in their final project and demonstrated for me that students had begun the process of conversing with other scholars.

Following the Source Synthesis, students constructed their Final Websites (Appendix XXXVII). This assignment asked students to employ their rhetorical awareness skills to construct a website that both conforms to genre conventions and appeals to a particular audience. They were given the opportunity to practice their research skills which included but was not limited to presenting a topic, finding and analyzing sources, synthesizing ideas, and joining in a scholarly conversation to come to educated conclusions. As stated, writing in public, real-world genres has also proven to be an effective way to inspire the transfer of writing and other content knowledge. Thus, constructing a research project in a public genre increases the number of possibilities they can imagine for presenting information that may initially feel contained within the classroom.

In both English 110 and English 281, students received various forms and quantities of written feedback on all of their Weekly Assignments and some smaller day-to-day assignments. Most assignment comments were marginal though I adopted a paragraph-style toward the end of the term as students submitted assignments in varied formats that did not have commenting features. Other feedback came in the form of one-on-one conversations, particularly during class conferences and occasionally after class or during office hours. In my courses, I aim to provide suggestive rather than corrective feedback. Most of my feedback tends to take the form of questions with the goal of encouraging students to expand their thinking about the ideas they are presenting. Because the assignments were scaffolded, feedback was important for students making revisions to current and future assignments. In addition to my feedback, students completed two peer review sessions which were semi-structured as students were given a set of questions inspired by the prompt to respond to as they read their peers' work. After making written comments on their peers' writing, they would converse openly during our class session to ask questions and workshop the arguments within their projects. My own comments mostly focused on higher-order concerns unless a student specifically requested a focus on sentence-level concerns and/or if the lower-order concerns interfered with my comprehension of their ideas. In short, I like to provide feedback that enables thoughtful engagement, reflection, expansion, and negotiation. For the study courses, I would occasionally leave comments that hinted at or suggested including some ideas from our course readings and class discussions but only as it was relevant and as a true connection could be drawn that would be appropriate and beneficial for their research project. Peer-to-peer interaction and instructor feedback and support are considered effective tools for facilitating the transfer of writing knowledge and, so, felt essential not only because they are common components of FYW courses, but they provided more opportunities for moment-to-moment interactions between students, texts, and repeated and new ideas. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, peer interaction proved to be influential in contributing to English 281 students' relationships to mental disability.

Following the submission of the final website, students in English 281 were also asked to write a Final Critical Class Reflection (XXXVIII). The instructions stated, "Following your final presentations and peer review, you will make necessary revisions to your website and develop a critical reflection in which you reflect on your experiences in the course including but not limited to the course readings, your writing

experience and process, the production of your website, the class environment, and your future writing goals." This assignment is an opportunity for students to make claims about what they learned that was most beneficial to them throughout the term which could include details from course readings, assignments, in-class discussions, free writing exercises[19], one-on-one conferences, and so forth. It was yet one more opportunity for students to engage in the metacognition that is believed to support transfer. From the researcher perspective, this assignment proved beneficial in observing students' perceived learning from the assignments and course readings.

Other forms of cueing and priming occurred in students' free writing prompts and in my feedback on their assignments; for example, in one free writing exercise in English 281, students were asked "What arguments is Yergeau making about reason and rhetoricity? How do these arguments echo Price's?" which prompted students to think back to previous readings and make connections between them. Further, upon reading Dolmage's chapter, students were asked "How can you challenge or reify norms in your own writing and research?" which required a forward projection of their learning into hypothetical writing and research situations. This was a way of cuing and priming students for using the information in future contexts, building occasions in their mind and helping them anticipate connections that could be made between their new knowledge and future interaction with disability.

Limitations and Alternatives

In addition to the aforementioned limitations of English 110 (e.g., not reviewing all of the assignment rationales together), it's worth noting other limitations to my course design in both English 110 and 281, particularly those that do not align with my claims to accessible pedagogy. I will discuss these limitations as well as affordances in the final chapter in light of the study findings, but here I will touch on a few issues related to course design. Above, I argued that one of the central tenets of my teaching is building rhetorical awareness. In addition to rhetorical awareness, creating an accessible pedagogy is also central. Accessible pedagogy acknowledges that accessibility is not an achievable end. It is never complete. Thus, I approach accessible teaching as an ongoing process requiring continual listening, collaboration, and accommodation. To do so, in the two courses outlined above, I developed flexible assignment designs that were welcoming of various meaning-making practices, believing in the great

[19] For a full list of free writing exercise questions, see Appendix XXXIX.

possibilities offered by disability and other abilities in formal and informal argumentation. For example, in English 110, students were offered the option of creating a website, standard research paper, podcast, or other genre that was consistent with their goals and the interests of their intended audience. Additionally, I used rolling deadlines and accepted make-up work from students any time before the end of the second-to-last week of the term. My assignments were posted on Canvas in advance of when we talked about them in class, so students were welcome to work at whatever pace made sense for them. I also made all of my lesson plans available for students before and after class so that they could prepare for what we would be doing, physically, mentally, and emotionally and could turn back to the documents as needed as they prepared for their final projects.

However, despite my attention to UDL generally, I did not specifically apply UDL principles in terms of offering multiple means of delivering content and multiple means of expressing themselves. In other words, students were not given the option to participate in class discussions beyond verbal communication, including the share outs of discussion posts and free write responses. This also caused me to develop a rather strict participation policy as, if students weren't coming to class, they had no way to contribute to the class discussions. Were I to go back, I would have offered students the option of sharing thoughts in one of two written modes in addition to sharing verbally which is something I do in the courses I teach now. Students would then be able to choose which mode works best for them on any given day rather than committing to one or the other mode throughout the entire term. This would also offer more possibilities for participation for those who miss class due to disability-related absences or other outside obligations.

Moreover, my method of assessment was not the most accessible or effective in terms of comprehension. For each class, I used a lengthy "Assessment Agreement" (i.e., grading contract; Appendices XVIII & XXIX) which students were required to review and sign within the first week of class. This agreement outlined what students needed to do for their grade to fall within a particular range (e.g., A vs. B vs. C) though it was uncommon for students to receive less than a GPA in the A-range due to the nature of the course and my goal of ensuring student success. It was brought to my attention by the end of English 281 that the Agreement was difficult to understand due to its length (four pages and then some). I have since adopted an assessment method that is still imperfect but, in my opinion, more

inclusive in that it is entirely completion based according to assessment criteria on the prompt and is coupled with revisions to participation methods. My current assessment policy states

> Each writing assignment will be assessed on completion of the assignment and should include all elements listed on the assignment prompt. Completing an assignment means being attentive to the assessment criteria for each assignment. If you receive an *incomplete* mark on Canvas, you are encouraged to revise and resubmit your assignment for full marks. Final grades are calculated based on completion of assignments in each assignment group. The groups are then weighted as shown above.

I believe no assessment method is perfect, but this has proven to be more digestible for students even though they often express how unusual or new it is to them.

During revisions of this chapter, my dissertation chair, Anis Bawarshi, pointed out the possibility of asking students to compose their own rationales for the course assignments. Having students compose their own rationales would be impactful for transfer research or simply courses that aim to promote transfer because it would require students make sense and make meaning out of the prompts in a way that is useful for them rather than having the meaning projected onto them by the instructor. As stated above, for knowledge to transfer, it must be meaningful to the student. Having students develop their own rationales could make the process of completing that assignment more meaningful and therefore help them see its use in their future. As an instructor, this could also offer feedback about how your assignment is perceived and how it might need to be revised to achieve the course outcomes. The implications of this practice for transfer research will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

One other limitation that was brought to my attention upon analyzing my data was the timed free writing exercise. Though I used free writing exercises to remedy the repetitive responses on the discussion board, many students ran out of time during the allotted five minutes which was sometimes extended to seven or ten minutes. However, sometimes even seven minutes was not enough time for students to respond as they revealed spending more time than they'd have liked thinking about how to respond or just generally had more to say than they were able to write out in five minutes. In particular, Mason, a student who revealed his ADHD diagnosis early in the term, repeatedly wrote "RAN OUT OF TIME" at the end of his responses. To respond to this issue, I would likely offer more time to write in response to the questions in class, removing time from the verbal discussion. Though this might seem to remove possibilities for participation, it might mean that students feel more confident in their written

responses to share them aloud. One could also require students maintain a class journal in which they write their reading responses prior to attending class. This allows them to take as much time as they'd like responding to as many questions as they'd like while still coming prepared to have a discussion with their classmates. Though this would take more time to transcribe for a research study, it would be a good option for allowing students to fully engage their thoughts on the readings and possibly add more later.

Beyond issues of accessibility, some elements of the course could have been adapted to better support transfer. For example, not requiring students to write about something inspired by our class discussions also proved to be limiting as there was little to no evidence of mental disability knowledge transferring into students' research projects for English 110. In other words, students were not given that occasion to engage in the act of transfer. Thankfully, I was able to revise this portion of the class for English 281 as noted. Though some students wrote about topics related to mental disability in English 281, others, for example, wrote about technological advancements' impact on marginalized communities, the impacts of systemic racism on healthcare, and the lack of educational resources provided to marginalized communities. In short, students were given freedom to make whatever connections were meaningful to them across our class discussions and so drew on both our collective learning and their experiences. Demonstrations of the effect of this shift and others will appear in my findings from the thematic and discourse analysis of students' writing which I present in Chapters 4 and 5 through case studies that are representative of the identified themes.

Chapter 4. Missing the Trees for the Forest: Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Work in Students' Relationships to and Adaptations of Mental Disability Knowledge

In their 2024 reference guide, *Writing Knowledge Transfer: Theory, Research, and Pedagogy*, Nowacek, Lorimer Leonard, and Rounsaville close their discussion by pinpointing three future frames that should be considered by writing studies scholars interested in studying and supporting students' transfer of writing knowledge. One of those future frames is *ephemerality* or the fact that "the transfer phenomenon can be fleeting, hard to grasp, and sometimes occurring without the conscious awareness of a researcher or writer" (p. 347–8) and, therefore, "can be hard to capture and explain in full" (p. 348). Because of this, they propose that researchers "may need to present analysis and findings with less certainty, being honest about what parts of the transfer of writing were not fully grasped" (p. 348). In the following pages—those of Chapters 4 and 5—I approach my analysis of students' stories with informed uncertainty to honor the parts of their thoughts and lives to which I am not privy, be transparent about my own biases, and reinforce the nuance of any transfer act.

The "What" and "Why" of Boundaries as Units of Analysis

As discussed in Chapter 1, Medina's work with micro-transfer takes a leading role in my approach to analyzing and sharing these findings. To Medina, "micro-transfer…[is] part of boundary-work, and specifically the interactions that occur across iterations of boundary-markings that influence the way each new boundary is redrawn" (p. 203). Moreover, he argues that micro-transfer prevents us from "tak[ing] boundaries for granted" and encourages us to look more closely at boundary-work which he sees as "perhaps [transfer's] core work" (p. 209). Boundary-work involves the conscious and subconscious work we do to define people, places, and things within the discursive and material fields of a given environment which involves a complex series of interactions where former/current boundaries around who and what things are intersecting with new knowledge and reshape boundaries. In the larger process of transfer, these interactions continually occur as students learn and "try out" new knowledge.

Because the boundaries we construct around ourselves and other people, places, and things inform our dispositions and how they continue to develop, micro-transfer is part of the defining work we do to position ourselves and others within the world and alongside one another. In other words, micro-transfers result in shifts that determine how we define ourselves, other people, and things as well as places, spaces, and what can be spoken in those spaces and by whom. In this process, as we continually

change, we create possibilities for varied interactions with knowledge, people, and places. For example, Cara who I introduce below, brings her experiential mental disability knowledge to bear on our collective learning of mental disability through a disability studies lens; this interaction alters how she defines herself and therefore inspires new ways of coming into contact with other elements of a given environment, leading to her and other's continual processes of being in the world differently, of giving one's dispositions various forms over time. So, boundary-work and micro-transfer dynamically interact as they produce an endless cycle of shifts from the acquisition and application of new, material and abstract, knowledge. To study micro-transfer is to identify the marking of a boundary and trace the interactions that influenced the redrawing of said boundary. This would not mean that any *single* micro-transfer in the series produced the boundary, but that it acted as part of the inspiration for the articulation of a boundary although the new knowledge has, in some cases, either reinforced boundaries that already existed for students or (re)defined boundaries that were permeable or flexible for them entering the class.

Approaching my data from the perspective of micro-transfer and boundary-work felt necessary, considering my interest in contributing to individual and collective disability literacy that requires the interaction of prior experience with the topic of mental disability and new knowledge to reposition both disabled and able-bodyminded students. In other words, micro-transfer was appealing (and exciting) for its potential to unveil the complexity of transfer processes that I have been curious about—the complexity that results from variations in our movement over time, our individual histories and identities, specifically those related to neurodivergence, as well as the interaction of places and knowledge or experiences that are often viewed as immiscible. Micro-transfer allows me to respond to questions regarding definitions of mental disability and the resulting or prior relationships, immediate knowledge application, the essential structure of the writing classroom, and perception that may otherwise be overlooked for the sake of making definitive claims about whether knowledge has been used or transformed appropriately (by an arbitrary metric). Rather, it can help researchers embrace the value of variations in human experience that can be ignored to achieve the goal of generalizability which, in my studies, felt like an injustice. I also admire micro-transfer for its concern for the everyday, the very minute energetic shifts that can influence our empathy, compassion, and understanding of others which are essential for building (and assessing the impact of) the sort of critical disability literacy on which I have constructed my curriculum.

To discuss the students' movement of boundaries below, I use Medina's vocabulary of variations of *in/flexible* and *im/permeable* boundaries, pairing it throughout the chapter with Dryer's vocabulary for uptake(s) presented in Chapter 1 since the observable boundary-work is what Dryer calls an uptake enactment, a demonstration of one's response to an utterance, and all responses to the engagement with our texts and each other involve selecting from the series of uptakes resulting from the interactions within our environment. In other words, uptake is what occurs between and connects a micro-transfer to the resulting boundary-work—it is the movement of knowledge across the redrawn boundaries. These boundaries categories can be summarized as follows:

1) *Inflexible and impermeable boundaries (II)* are "boundaries that remain in the same place over time and effectively prevent movement" (p. 147). These boundaries are "very difficult to observe"—seeing as we can identify boundary-work easiest when *some* movement is occurring and therefore some level of flexibility or permeability exists—and deeply connected to uptake in that uptake captures and uptake residues both have lingering effects based on our collective and individual memories of interacting with particular people, places, and subject matter that can restrict what engagement we see as possible.

2) *Flexible-Impermeable (FI)* boundaries involve the process of "the boundaries chang[ing] position over time but still prevent[ing] movement between the regions that they define" (p. 158). Medina claims that, for example, "in the field of identity, a flexible, impermeable boundary would look like a student whose identity changes over time, but in any given moment they resist outside influence" (p. 159). In terms of uptake, the affordances may allow a redrawing of a boundary, but the uptake captures and residues prevent certain skills, for example, from being used within that boundary due to the memories attached to those skills about where they can be appropriately used. In other words, one might change how they define the classroom but continue to reject the uptake of personal narrative as appropriate within that spatio-temporal boundary.

3) *Inflexible-Permeable (IP)* boundaries are boundaries that "remain relatively fixed, but…don't constrain action and they allow flow of ideas, knowledge, skills, and other resources to travel between discrete spaces" (p. 182). This might appear, for instance, when one defines themselves as mentally disabled when entering the course but leaves feeling as if they are more skilled at speaking about said disability or, in the case of Ethan below, feeling as if they have a broader perspective for understanding mental disability. Alternatively, the fixed boundary around one's identity informed by uptake residues and captures does not limit the number of possible uptakes of information and therefore increases the number of potential uptake artifacts and enactments.

4) *Flexible-Permeable (FP)* boundaries are "boundaries that change over time and that allow for ideas, knowledge, skills, and rhetorical force to move across them" (p. 183). Such boundaries appear, for example, in Cara's case when she defines herself concretely as mentally disabled by the end of the course while also redefining mental disability as an identity marker (that is not negative) and therefore blends the knowledge of her queer experience with that of her disability identity. In other words, she takes up the new knowledge to redraw boundaries while also using it to better understand her queer identity and vice versa. In this way, the uptake affordances create

> possibilities for uptake enactments and artifacts that are not limited by the residues or captures that are attached to one's boundaries.

In addition to Medina's vocabulary for speaking about boundaries, I have directed my attention to student acts of boundary-work through his identification of three boundary fields: the discursive, identity, and spatio-temporal. These fields are pertinent for responding to my research questions because the work we did in class involved (re)defining mental disability, possibilities for reflecting on one's relationship to mental disability, and bringing mental disability explicitly into a space where it is often euphemized or ignored. In this chapter, Medina's vocabulary and definitions help me respond to the following research questions taken from my full list of research questions from Chapter 1:

1) What changes occur when students are reading and writing about mental disability?
2) In what ways do thoughts, ideas, or concepts related to mental disability translate or reappear in student writing and dialogue?
3) What anticipated and perceptible knowledge application and micro-transfer occurs within the course?
4) What new words, perceptions, relations to knowledge, and concepts do students demonstrate knowledge of?
5) In what ways does confidence with course content contribute to student self-advocacy and agency?
6) What changes can we trace to the boundaries that students construct about mental disability discourse?
7) What changes can be observed in students' perception of their relationship to disability?

The defined fields make it more possible to observe where students' boundaries are being marked by directing attention to students' claims about things, people, and places. Although they relate to the defining of various elements, these three fields can never be fully distinct from one another and are, instead, co-constitutive. As Medina notes, "these boundaries interact with one another and are in a constant state of flux as the world iteratively comes into being. So, while these categories don't do justice to the complexity of boundary-work…they do help us understand the nature of boundaries and build the foundation for future studies that can generate a more nuanced understanding of boundary-work" (p. 81). As will be demonstrated below, it is difficult to separate the movement of a boundary in one field from that in another, and one of the many hopes for my research is that transfer acts become treasured for their nuance and complexity. Although I agree with Medina in that three categories don't do justice to this

nuance and complexity, they do offer us a vocabulary for working together toward more fluid definitions or labels. So, in the next subsection, I define these fields in the hope that their co-constitutive nature becomes increasingly apparent.

The Co-Constitutive Boundary Fields

Discursive boundaries determine what counts and what does not count as a particular thing (p. 194). Medina claims that this includes "those [boundaries] that differentiate one discourse from another and those that define ideas, concepts, and other cognitive objects" (p. 79); this is observed, for example, in Mason's case as he begins to redefine mental disability as something that can have positive impacts (e.g., increased creativity) while not rejecting the very real pain it can cause an individual and their family. Cara, too, experiences a positive shift in connotation and begins to see mental disability as fit for discussion in the classroom which involves a redefinition of mental disability *and* the classroom. Ethan also does this sort of discursive work when he makes claims about mental disability being something that lends us special abilities rather than something that is deterring. *Identity boundaries* "are those that individuate people in a spatio-temporal and discursive context. [Such as] I am defined by the boundary that separates me from the rest of the world" (p. 195). Below, you will see Peter defines himself as distinct from his English 281 peers in that he has not had "exposure" to mental disability in the past. Cara also grapples with her identity, no longer seeing herself as someone who has had mental health issues but as someone who *is* disabled by her depressive disorder. The identity field spans the spatio-temporal and discursive fields but differs from others in that it's uniquely interested in human individuals (p. 3). For example, how the writer is constituted and what boundaries define the individual. In short, the *spatio-temporal field* contains the literal physical features that distinguish one from another such as material objects, discursive objects, and individual people and is related to elements of environment and movement through time. Medina claims it is "the field of space and time and includes the material environment and their existence in a particular point in time. Spatio-temporal boundaries are lines in space and time that define objects of an environment...these boundaries define concretely the where and when of an environment and the elements therein" (p. 79). Boundaries are useful points of analysis not only because they turn us toward the micro-transfers that occur or lead to boundary-work but also to argue why micro-transfers matter. Transfer researchers have explained that dispositions matter, as do

incomes, attitudes, and self-efficacy. To be concerned with boundaries is to be concerned with such elements of the student experience and to, therefore, care about micro-transfers. In aiming to study micro-transfer, Medina claims that "What appeared…was that the boundaries, or how things were defined in space, time, and discourse, seemed to have a tremendous effect on [and I argue *reveal* or *make real*] the interactions." However, because the "series of micro-transfers" that leads to defining, redefining, or reinforcing a boundary has no beginning and because I do not have information on all the students' daily happenings, thoughts, and feelings or the memories attached to each articulated boundary, it will be impossible to account for all micro-transfers. So, I'll be restricted to those within the confines of the classroom and the students' writing and dialogue.

The remainder of this chapter is organized by themes which are organized by students' stories within my English 281 course as they engaged with the subject of mental disability. I have chosen here to present two themes: (1) Relationship to Disability and (2) Adapt and Transform both of which are defined in their respective sections. I have paired these themes together before presenting my final three (Class Environment, Rhetorical Awareness, and Agents of Change) due to their focus more on the individual rather than the context or interactions between individuals. Despite it being difficult to present any of the findings in a vacuum or any transfer act as separate from the context in which it is being shaped, I reserve Chapter 5 for those patterns that could be defined as more inherently "social" though the individual histories and experiences of the students are still interacting within those social spaces and situations with the reverse being true for those themes, here, defined as more "individual." Following the presentation and analysis of each theme, I briefly offer some initial implications which arose from it which will be reviewed further in Chapter 6.

Relationship to Disability: Micro-Transfers and the Boundaries We Draw Between Ourselves and Mental Disability

One of the most striking and consistent patterns across students' experiences was how the boundaries around their relationship to disability shifted. Most students came to view themselves or others differently or saw disability as something more dynamic than they had before even if that meant challenging their firsthand experience with disability as with Mason's story below. These boundaries are both discursive (i.e., concerned with what something is or is not) and identity-related (or part of the act of individuating oneself, asking "who am I and who am I not?") which is consistent with Medina's claim that

"The identity boundary is both physical insofar as it is inscribed on the human body, and discursive insofar as that individual has meaning and agency in discourse" (p. 80–1). In my work specifically, part of changing our relationship with disability involves expanding our definition of the term and of our or other's mental disability experiences. In addition, upon this redefinition, an association to one's own experience can—and in this data set does—occur, changing how one thinks about their and/or other's mental disability experiences. In some cases, this engagement can lead to an awareness of one's lack of relationship with mental disability which, as you will see in Peter's case, can cause a sense of alienation. For others, the responses were largely positive seeing as most of the participants disclosed some degree of prior experience with mental disability symptoms (e.g., anxiety, depression, self-harm, bipolar disorder, ADHD) and claimed that the readings and experience of discussing this knowledge in an academic setting was impactful for their relationship with their past and current mental health and disability experiences; as will be demonstrated below, the intersections that we see here—of this knowledge, their experiences, and the classroom itself—contribute to students' redrawing of boundaries around who they are.

The theme of Relationships to Disability pertains to any past, present, or future indication of one's positioning toward disability. One's relationship to disability is deeply tied to their identity which is intertwined with their prior and personal experiences with disability, contributing to one's level of confidence with the course content and whether they see themselves or others as having specialized knowledge that assists in or interferes with their learning about or connecting with disability. A *relationship* can be defined as "the way in which two things are connected", "an association", or "connection" (*OED*). Therefore, this theme involves one's understanding of their own connection to disability, their connection to others with disabilities, and their connection to other's learning about disabilities. As you will read below, relationships to disability impact topic choices and how students adapt information. The degree of specialized knowledge they or others with mental disability possess can impact their uptake of and engagement with mental disability subject matter. Typically, this specialized knowledge is seen by students as an asset that makes understanding the subject matter easier—as in the cases of Peter, Ethan, and Foster. Understanding students' relationships with disability involves also having some degree of awareness about their personal or prior experience with disability, be that in their own life, the lives of

their friends, texts they have read, or movies they have watched. This theme speaks largely to identity and discursive boundaries in that shifting definitions or perceptions of *disability* contribute to shifts in one's perception of who they are in relation to disability. In this process, spatio-temporal boundaries are also worked on as students' bodies carry discursive and identity knowledges across material planes. The working on identity and discursive boundaries could take the form of surprise (e.g., Ethan's surprise at the degree of scholarship on disability), statements on having not considered a particular perspective (e.g., Foster's recognition and acceptance of disability as an identity marker), or plans for how they would be thinking about mental disability in the future (e.g., Peter's statements on how he can continue to learn about mental disability from others). In the case of Ethan Heiss[20], this took the form of a "breakthrough" in how he thought about mental disability beyond his own experience. Though there were many demonstrations of these positive, more flexible identity and discursive boundaries, I will begin with Ethan's story.

Ethan Heiss: The Boundaries of One's Own Disability Experience

Ethan was a transfer student from a Washington state community college who was a junior at the time of his enrollment in my course. Upon completing his first class assignment, the Course Introductory Email, he claimed that he was a business administration major with a focus in finance and accounting and a minor in mathematics. Early on, it was clear that he is a lover of learning. Ethan also shared that his family immigrated to the U.S. from Poland in the 1940s and was "lucky enough" to have access to higher education at that time. Despite how all of these facets of Ethan's identity and experience inform his engagement with the course content and learning generally, for the purposes of this study, it's essential to know that he, at the time of the study, had active accommodations through DRS (Disability Resources for Students) at UW for his diagnosed mental disabilities which he stated, in an email, are "countless" and later disclosed include bipolar II disorder, ADHD, and OCD. However, he noted that, eventually, "you can't even keep track of the individual [diagnoses], and you stop caring about what the diagnosis label is and you start to focus more on the symptoms or things that you experience." I speak about this comment in relation to his discursive and identity boundaries below. Ethan's mental disability history informed his

[20] Ethan Heiss was the only pseudonym chosen with a surname.

engagement with the course subject matter and decisions he made throughout his writing journey as will be discussed further.

I was honored to have Ethan participate in my study since he demonstrated an interest in and dedication to furthering research not only for me but for others. In his interview, he shared that he sought out opportunities to participate in many studies at least through the completion of surveys. Additionally, his family history and diagnosis journey are similar to my own, so it felt like a privilege to be trusted with his story and to see how this course impacted students who share similar experiences to those I had as an undergraduate. Because of his journey thus far, he entered the course with a lot of confidence with the subject of mental disability and inserted himself and his knowledge into the discussions but was also intentional about learning more about the topics and from his classmates. He also already had a strong ability to advocate for himself, sharing within the first week what his specific accommodations were and how they needed to be addressed in the class. He also demonstrated general agency over his education in his early questions about what the course structure was and what we would be learning or doing during our class sessions. There was always a desire to know. In short, he possessed a great deal of disability literacy and a strong stance and understanding of disability as something that is not inherently wrong, but that makes one extra intelligent. Ethan's base subject matter confidence will be discussed further in the section in Chapter 5 titled "Agents of Change: How Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Work Influence Advocacy Efforts."

From week one of the quarter, Ethan stood out. Transfer principles appeared in his discussion of what type of learning environments were most beneficial for him, writing in his Course Introductory Email, which was completed during week one of the term, that "My most powerful learning experience(s) are those that extend the course content beyond the boundaries of the class." He addressed that he wants the concepts to be clearly applicable "in real-world contexts." In other words, Ethan cared about transferring knowledge, and we know from transfer scholarship that motivation is an important factor in determining whether and how students will transfer knowledge. It is possible that this is what led Ethan to demonstrate a greater degree of intertextuality (and appreciation for that intertextuality) through the term and across the course readings. The motivation to learn and to make knowledge meaningful was what made me view Ethan as an avid and lifelong learner. As stated, Ethan was transparent and shameless in

sharing about his disability status at the beginning of the term. He quickly took up the ideas presented in Dolmage's *Disability Rhetoric* during week two, finding meaning and frustration with the history of disability being associated with a deviation from the norm. From this and other statements in the free writing assignments, Ethan clarified his perspective on disability, for example during our week four free writing exercise where he supported Price's main idea in "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" that "disability is not a problem that needs to be fixed or cured, but rather, is a part of human diversity that should be accommodated and celebrated." Ethan mentioned finding disability differences valuable based on his own experience with it as such.

I had the privilege of interviewing Ethan during week seven of the term which brought to light how this was not a new perspective for him. He reflected—reluctant and uncomfortable with the positive statement about himself—that "I'm probably smarter often because of these challenges" and indicated that *mental disability* is not his preferred term because he sees *disability* as indicating something inherently negative or detracting—the inflexible discursive boundary around the latter half of this term is deeply tied to his flexible identity boundary resulting from his positive reflections on his experience as mentally disabled. The uptake residues (Dryer) stuck to the term *disability* prevented Ethan from seizing an opportunity to ameliorate and/or reclaim the word altogether. Rather, Ethan claimed that mental disability is an "extra ability" and previously explained in his week six submission of his Project Proposal that disability is a "powerful tool" that enabled him to "develop…arguments by pulling on my own experiences" from the "perspective of *understanding* rather than just observing" (emphasis his). Ethan's use of his own experiences to make arguments was also a way of showing the permeability of the spatio-temporal boundaries of the classroom as his physical movement through time and space brings with it the tools acquired through his struggles. His existence at that point in time only took its current form through the work he did to bring that knowledge into new physical and intellectual contexts. To him, mental disability "is actually a strength and leads to more intelligence than the norm" as he stated in our interview.

Although Ethan presented an inflexible boundary around *disability* in this conversation, his earlier statements about how "you stop caring about what the diagnosis label is and you start to focus more on the symptoms or things that you experience" showcase the permeability of the boundaries of diagnosis

labels in Ethan's life as the symptoms are defined not by the label that holds them but by the way they are experienced, of how they allow him to *be* in the world. I think Ethan is a good example of his personal truth regarding the strengths that develop out of disability experiences. He has an emotional and academic intelligence that is represented mostly in his excitement and desire to learn and to make his learning experiences meaningful for himself and for others. In short, his personal experience and what he saw as positive outcomes of his own disability experience greatly informed his early feelings toward our mental disability subject matter. Thus, he mentioned a couple of times how the course didn't necessarily change any of his perspectives but there was notable change in his relationship to disability in other ways.

During our interview which, as stated, took place just after the middle of the term during week seven, I asked Ethan, "Which pieces of knowledge from our course and course readings do you think you're most likely to carry forward?" I prefaced this question with a statement on how we had already briefly touched on these ideas when he shared how much he sees this content appears in the media and its impact on his analytical approaches. In response, Ethan said

> I can probably try to expand in a different direction here. So, I already touched on, I guess, my new perspective on the media, and just like understanding people in general. But I guess…you've highlighted a lot of things and these authors have highlighted a lot of things that I agree with and passionately disagree with but, I guess, I'm definitely gonna approach, not just like future writing about [mental disability] or future discussions about [mental disability], but just in general it's like the understanding is no longer limited to my personal experience, and I think that was kind of a breakthrough.

His initial passion for the topic, therefore, did not mean that he developed a new perception such as when students enter with a solely medical mindset and learn to adopt a more social perspective, but this learning reinforced what he already felt about mental disability—keeping the discursive boundary around *mental disability* inflexible. However, the discursive boundary around *mental disability* was permeable as was his identity boundary in that he saw himself now as possessing an even more specialized knowledge than prior to the course although he was not different as a result. This is evident in the above statements and in his Final Critical Class Reflection, the course final, when he stated that this course "expanded my understanding [of mental disability] beyond what I ever imagined." In addition, *mental disability* came to encompass more than one's individual experience and, rather, the experiences of many and how sharing and knowing those experiences can expand our knowledge base. Ethan's perspective no longer being

limited to his personal experience signifies a permeability of both the discursive and spatio-temporal boundaries around mental disability. Mental disability was no longer solely personal, existing as a thing confined to the private times and spaces of Ethan's life and was instead something that could be discussed to expand and create positive perspectives for others. In anticipating future writing and conversations about mental disability, Ethan pushed the spatio-temporal boundary, adopting mental disability knowledge as knowledge that has influence and can be useful across material planes.

Thankfully, Ethan was transparent about what he valued most in the course, enabling an identification of the interactions that were most influential in his learning process. First, the course readings were a space where micro-transfer occurred for Ethan. In our interview, he mentioned that "I do a lot of research. I read a lot to try to figure out why I think and act the way I do [but] I haven't been exposed to like any of these authors…and it helped me to like, I guess, look at things from a new angle." Ethan's mention of his exposure to the authors' ideas may indicate an interaction of his expertise with the uptake residues of the field of disability studies (e.g., the repeated handling of disability experience and critiques of deficit lenses). The conditioned ways of responding to disability, ableism, or disablism in DS, and the repeated uptake enactments by these scholars serve as examples of how one can respond to such topics whether it's experienced individually or from an outside perspective. Ethan's reflection on his prior knowledge about and experience with mental disability interacted with the new disability studies knowledge bringing to light, in his final reflection, the way in which his "Prior…understanding of mental health challenges was purely informed by my personal experiences" and how "my initial understanding was not wrong, this class caused me to realize my narrow perspective." This also provides a good example of the way uptake theory can be useful in analyzing transfer processes. Because Ethan has significant and meaningful histories with the subject of mental disability, his uptake captures (what students see as possible for responding in a situation given their repeated engagement with a genre or other knowledge) were informed by the prevalence of it in his life and his repeated interactions with that subject, allowing him to productively respond to the uptake affordances (those characteristics of a situation that make an uptake encounter possible) or conditions of the course since he has adopted well-worn paths for responding to mental disability knowledge. For transfer, this helps us look even more closely at the ways certain conditions can be taken up differently depending on their interaction with

varied captures and residues that enable different pathways for selection to be drawn between the receipt of information and the resulting uptake enactment. All of this ties into his claims as to how mental disability is a "very personal topic which I am very passionate about" and nods toward what he knew prior to entering the course, indicating both a change in how he views mental disability and a change in his perspective of himself in conversations of and learning about mental disability. In other words, this "new angle" and "[realization of] my narrow perspective" do not alter the discursive boundary around *mental disability* entirely but alter it in a way that gives it more definition and blurs the lines between the personal and social aspects of disability. More than anything, it seems that the shift from personal to social perspectives of mental disability indicates a flexible and permeable spatio-temporal boundary because discussions, research, and writing on mental disability became no longer limited to the confines of Ethan's private life where he reads "a lot to try to figure out why I act and think the way I do."

Seeing things from a new angle also indicates that Ethan saw himself as possessing a skill he did not formerly—the permeability of his identity boundary allowed new knowledge to seep in and spread throughout to change what he is capable of. What stands out as representative of this change in what Ethan is capable of is his comment during our interview that "I'm never going to look at like my own role in the academic setting the same" and this will be a "core part of my career" as "I intend to go into education in the future" because it has "put me in a very valuable position where I can like challenge a lot of the issues that have been going on" since he gained knowledge about the amount of academic discourse surrounding issues of disability justice, which played on the permeability of the spatio-temporal boundary around educational and career settings where these conversations might not have initially felt possible. Further, Ethan claimed that before this class *mental disability*

> was just another word. I mean, obviously it's more important to me. But it's like, after this class, it's like every time I'm reading a news article about anything, and they even hint at a little bit of mental disability or mental health topics, it's like that just pops out to me and it's like I've started like, I guess, analyzing like trying to compare it to the authors that we've talked about in class and trying to analyze, like what are they trying to say, or what are they claiming?

These comments also reveal where micro-transfers happen because "it involves the effects of past experience on present and future contexts" "but on a moment-to-moment scale" (Medina, p. 198–9); here, Ethan disclosed interactions between his past, course readings, and leisurely reading that led to his reflection of his initial perspective as "narrow."

Ethan also reflected in the course final that, because he “connected with the course content on a very personal level” he was more inspired to participate in class discussions, reflecting that “It’s not often that I’m fully engaged or interested in the classes I take (in most classes, I don’t participate in class discussions at all).” In his work, this is attributed to both the content and the atmosphere of the course. As a DRS student, Ethan recognizes that attendance requirements are often not beneficial for him and can interfere with his ability to maintain grades despite being a strong self-directed learner. He explained in our interview that he believes “environment can be everything for your success” when you are a student with disabilities. His prior learning environments conflicted with the “very casual, relaxed atmosphere [of our course] from the start” which encouraged him to use and adapt his prior knowledge about mental disability. I would attribute much of this possibility largely to the students within the class as Ethan was not the only student who was “excited to be…in an environment where people are comfortable discussing these stigmatized topics.” The willingness of other students to engage in conversations about stigmatized topics created a class climate that allowed for more interactions to occur through students’ increased comfort with sharing their own thoughts and experiences, bringing more perspectives and knowledge into conversation with one another. Moreover, his surprise and excitement toward this topic being discussed in an academic setting emphasizes the initial existence of a spatio-temporal boundary surrounding what “belongs” in the classroom which, through our discussions and his comfort discussing these topics with his classmates, became more flexible and permeable. The very social nature of transfer is also underscored here since the redrawing of this spatio-temporal boundary would not have been possible without the continual willingness of each participating student to speak openly about their opinions and experiences with mental disability. This social aspect of transfer processes is something I expand on more in Chapter 5 in the section titled “Class Environment and Peer Interaction Support for Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Marking.”

Beyond his engagement with other students, Ethan noted in the course final how my own “openness in discussing [my] challenges” as the instructor was valuable which may have also been a contributor to the redrawing of the discursive and spatio-temporal boundaries surrounding the classroom and academy. In addition, these statements about my openness could be connected to his shift in understanding mental disability as something beyond his personal experience. After Ethan shared about

his diagnosis and treatment journey during our interview, I briefly mentioned a few of the similarities between our stories, telling Ethan that his story "resonated so much, and I appreciate you sharing [it]." Immediately following my claims about this parallel, Ethan said

> I think that's interesting because I would have never guessed, and I think that's one of the big problems right now is that you can't just like look at someone and know what they're like demons are because everyone's…I mean everyone looks at me and they're like 'Oh, my god, you're so happy and upbeat! You're so smart like you get all these classes done' and they don't realize all the behind-the-scenes brutality. It's like, I would have never guessed that there was any overlap between us as far as those struggles.

The similarities between our experiences, surprising us both, might have been one of many contributing factors to Ethan's new angle for understanding mental disability outside of his own experience especially considering such similar diagnoses, symptoms, and histories can manifest or hide differently depending on the person. In this way, my sharing might have acted as an uptake affordance—as it contributed to the shaping of the uptake encounter—that allowed Ethan to take up the information and produce an enactment that reinforced a former belief in the invisibility of mental health challenges, a belief that could have been an important aspect of his more privatized view of mental disability upon entering the course.

In addition to specific indications of how the past relates to the present and how the present alters the boundaries of the prior understanding as well as his claims about the workings of the course and course environment, Ethan's engagement with the course readings is another demonstration of the micro-transfers that occur though I do believe Ethan is a special case in his attention to and intentionality toward intertextuality. Because Ethan expressed a great deal of surprise at the amount of scholarship written on these topics despite his prior research, we see how the course texts mattered in shaping his new perspective by providing alternative spatio-temporal lenses through which to *know* mental disability. Beyond the interaction of his own experience with the content, Ethan was also intentional about the way the texts interacted with each other, further complicating these layers of knowledge and probing the boundaries around disability experience. In his Final Reflection, he notes that those texts that stood out most to him were Cloud's, Yergeau's, Dolmage's, and Price's and he valued how the "constant intertextuality and connection between ideas were especially engaging." His practice of intertextuality appeared in his free writing assignments when sharing his thoughts on the assigned readings, but it extends beyond syllabus requirements and into his week five Rhetorical Analysis Memo assignment in

which he chose to analyze the article titled “Ableism in Academia: Where are the disabled and ill academics?” a focus inspired out of our discussion on Price’s first chapter of *Mad at School* during week two and, then, his final research project which analyzed media discourse surrounding Kanye West’s antisemitic comments and other erratic, insulting behaviors that are often blamed solely on his bipolar disorder. This attention resulted from the interaction of Ethan’s own experience with bipolar disorder, past attention to these conversations, and week three reading of Price’s fourth chapter on the Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University mass shooting perpetrators and how they have been portrayed in the media as a case study into how the media constructs mental disability. His summary, analysis, and intertextuality skills are a demonstration of micro-transfer in that making those meaningful connections are inherently acts of making meaning of the information and, as we know, the more meaningful the information, the more likely we are to transfer it. These interactions prod the boundaries around what mental disability is or is not and *how* mental disability is, as well as Ethan’s identity as someone with mental disabilities, by offering examples of disability experiences other than his own despite sharing diagnoses with one. In the act of accepting those examples and the knowledge gained from our class readings and discussions, Ethan allowed these boundaries to become vulnerable and although the basic definitions of mental disability and who Ethan is remained relatively unchanged—inflexible—they were permeable in that these new perspectives were spreading throughout the boundary lines and illustrating the possibility of mental disability to be, in some ways, socially constructed through media representations rather than it coming to be solely from one’s personal, biological make up. In conjunction with the identity and discursive boundary transformations Ethan performed, there was also a shifting in his spatio-temporal boundary-work through his awareness of the existence of mental disability knowledge, experiences, and various perspectives outside of his personal and private spatio-temporal realms. These knowledges, experiences, and perspectives circulated across space and time in textual ways as well as through the bodies and histories of others moving throughout and influencing the structure of various material planes. Mental disability also seemed to move more abstractly across the spatio-temporal field through the expansion of theoretical knowledge. His attention to intertextuality particularly illustrates how he worked on spatio-temporal boundaries—which are flexible and permeable—as knowledges of various scholars, peers, and other individuals overlapped and intersected. This immediately influenced, he

disclosed, his engagement with his co-workers. Within our interview conversation, and upon answering my question regarding what information has been useful for him from the course subject matter thus far, he said

> I think the biggest impact it's had so far is just like interpersonal relationships; not like my friends or people I date, but more so like co-workers. It's given me an alternate lens to observe and, I guess, analyze their actions. Try to figure out like why they act, or think, or feel the way they do. And then that's a very powerful angle or lens to look at things through, because I mean the nature of my job, I have to inspire student employees to do physical labor, which is a hard thing to do but it just helps me, I guess, to like, I don't know…maybe it's partially my own experience, and maybe it's partially the course content, but it's like very easy for me to just like observe, like I guess, like I have a very good intuition for just like knowing someone's psyche, I guess.

Ethan's personal knowledge in tandem with the analytical frameworks for thinking through mental disability impacted where and when he saw this knowledge as useful, a working of flexible-permeable spatio-temporal boundaries that changed his view of and interactions with others.

These are just a few examples of where micro-transfers occurred for Ethan as there are many I cannot speak to. However, from these few influential moments revealed we come to see what Medina argues, that "in any moment, students interact with the material, discursive, and identity fields and the various boundaries that give those fields definition. Each interaction is afforded and constrained by the past configurations of those fields, which in turn reconfigure those configurations" (p. 197) all of which led him to "feel more confident and motivated to…[express] my ideas on the matter [of disability]"—a redrawing of permeable spatio-temporal boundaries that he came to see as locations in which these ideas can be expressed. We must not also forget the importance of disposition and how Ethan entered the course *looking for* opportunities to transfer knowledge beyond the classroom which may have contributed, more significantly than I am able to provide evidence for, to his statements in the course final that "I'm never going to look at my own role in the academic setting the same" and that this will be a "core part of my career" as a future educator.

In the remainder of this section, I share the boundary-working stories of three other students who, together with Ethan, highlight the nuance and intricacies of transfer processes and the ability of boundary-work identification and micro-transfers to respect such nuance as well as the way that uptake residues, captures, and affordances impact and are impacted by the boundary-work that takes place. What we don't see in Ethan's story is the experience of students who are not or do not define themselves as

mentally disabled. Peter provides some insights to this, while Foster opens up about their mental disability experience with parents who support their autonomy and speak openly about mental disability. Finally, Cara showcases the potential of mental disability literacy to deepen one's understanding of their multiple marginalized subject positions. Together, and as I will discuss in more detail in the subsection "Implications of Students' Relationships to Disability," these students' stories present interesting points about the impact of dispositions, confidence, incomes, and social interaction on transfer processes.

Peter: A Non-Disabled Student Welcomes Disability Knowledge

I now turn to Peter who coincidentally sat next to Ethan all term, becoming friends as the quarter progressed. Peter was an Information Systems (IS) major and a senior at the time of his enrollment. With it being his final term at UW, he disclosed that he may be experiencing a bit of "senioritis" when we sat down for our conference during week eight and which will become more relevant later. His interest in IS resulted from his passion for tech and desire to optimize that interest in the business industry. Peter's father is a UW alumnus and he has other paternal family members who have attended UW. Despite it being Peter's senior year, he told me during his Introductory Email assignment that he did not have prior experience with the UW libraries resources except for using ProQuest and EBSCO databases at his former college. His prior research experience involved, most influentially, an analysis of Tim O'Brien's "The Things They Carried" with attention to the war veterans' coping mechanisms. So, despite Peter's acknowledgment of his lack of relationship to mental disability, to some degree, he did have experience addressing related topics. I've chosen to share Peter's story because of his self-proclaimed lack of experience with mental disability and inability to relate to it. However, Peter presented me with more complicated data because he did not complete three Weekly Assignments (Definitions of Rhetoric Email, Rhetorical Analysis Memo, and Source Synthesis) until *after* the final date on which I usually accept students' late work (i.e., the Friday of week 9). He attributed this to his senioritis, and I accepted the assignments via email despite the submission portals being closed. This is to say that the final products of those three assignments are influenced not only by the first two, five, and eight weeks of the course, respectively, but nine weeks.

My interest in Peter's story wasn't sparked until the end of the quarter upon reading his Final Critical Class Reflection. Throughout the term, he committed to transparency, disclosing his attention

struggles rooted in his eagerness to complete his degree. I also anticipated Peter wouldn't provide me much of a story at all (this assumption is unfair to make about any student but felt particularly so in this case) because his assignment submission process was complicated and, despite his active participation in class discussions, he showed little interest in the mental disability subject matter, making few connections across readings or sharing his own opinions in relation to the texts. So, much to my surprise, Peter has become one of the most exciting and important characters in the narrative of this course.

This importance stems from a series of small yet connected statements he made in his Final Critical Class Reflection where he wrote

> We spent a lot of time focusing on mental disabilities and the different topics revolving around that subject, along with the different voices who are present in current conversations. For me, I found it a bit difficult to relate and really get into the topic, as I personally have not experienced things or been exposed to topics that others in class have [so] I find it difficult to relate [and] I find it harder to really understand and get into the topic at times.

First, I want to note the care with which Peter made these statements. His use of "For me" and "I personally" show his consideration of others' experiences and his recognition of the way the work did resonate with many of his classmates. He was careful not to speak for everyone, but his personal experience is just as important as those who did relate to the content in more personal ways and it might be perceived as something that prevents him, in some way, from accessing the full benefits of the knowledge he is being "exposed" to in class. Peter seemed to think that having firsthand experience with mental disability meant having a sort of specialized knowledge that allows you to engage with the topic more meaningfully or that you don't have to work as hard to understand. Within this passage, he drew a distinct identity boundary indicating that, in my words, "I am someone who does not relate to mental disability" and "My peers are people who do relate to mental disability." He was not only assigning a particular identity to himself but constructing the identities of his peers through these markers of difference.

Despite his awareness of his own disconnect from the content and his apparent doubt in his ability to understand, he did not shy away from engaging with the course readings in free writing assignments or trying to gain new skills. In other words, he was not confident in, nor did he seem to care, about being *right*, but he was confident in his ability to *try* to understand what we were discussing even if he tended to favor bringing attention to the rhetorical nature of the texts. This confidence might be even

more important than the confidence with the subject matter because his initial learning was being engaged intentionally as he grappled with potential meanings and made connections, frequently providing his own unique examples to demonstrate how he understands a topic.

His lack of confidence presented itself throughout the term in his free writing responses as he wrote variations of “hopefully that makes sense” eight times, such as “Hopefully I understood those concepts right” and “Hopefully I got the gist of it.” Despite these statements illustrating his uncertainty, he did not give up or disengage from the discussions of the course readings. For example, he wrote in one response that “I am not fully sure if I understand this, but I want to give it a go.” His use of the term *want* here speaks volumes to who Peter is as a learner and the development of his relationship to mental disability. Immediately following the above statements in his Final Reflection about his inability to relate, he wrote “I have much room to grow and bolster my understanding of the conversation within the realm of mental disability, and listening to voices such as Margaret Price and fellow students within our class did help me improve my understanding of the conversation.” In addition, he saw this experience as more widely applicable in terms of the skills he acquired, writing that he “did [his] best to listen and understand” what we were talking about and others’ experiences and this made him want to improve in “expand[ing] [his] horizons into topics that [he is] not sure how to approach.” Peter’s boundary for engaging with the topic of mental disability was restricted to his belief that personal exposure defines one’s ability to engage in conversations about a particular topic. To redraw the boundary around engagement, Peter took up other’s exposure and stories through listening to redefine his relationship to disability which allowed him to find new, meaningful, and productive ways to engage with the course; through this engagement, Peter shifted the uptake affordances of the classroom.

The observable boundary-work being done in these instances relates specifically to Peter’s identity but also to the spatio-temporal boundary around engagement which is an essential element of physically being in a classroom and which must be permeable for him to find new ways to engage with the unrelatable stories and information. Moreover, Peter’s recognition of his disconnect from and his peers’ connection to the topic and experiences of mental disability was an act of defining who he is and what he is capable of in contrast to how he defined his peers, whom he saw as being more capable of connecting to the topic despite not knowing more than a few classmates’ histories with mental disability

which were gathered from class discussions. In these defining practices, Peter's identity boundary is presented as inflexible yet permeable and he saw his peers' identities as less flexible as well in that he saw himself as fully unable to access their experiential knowledge and them as unable to revert to their prior experience without mental disability knowledge. However, his identity boundary was permeable: new knowledge and skills were integrated into his identity as he made claims about the topics he engaged and the learning he still needed to do as well as how he would adapt those skills in other cases. Peter's desire to learn and grow a greater understanding of mental disability conversations left him open to attaining new knowledge and was a tool for fulfilling the requirement of engagement but he did not see himself as being inherently changed by the acquisition of this knowledge. He, in other words, remained distinct from his peers. His belief in the importance of gaining such knowledge indicates that something he didn't have any experience with prior to the course now *meant* something to him, particularly because he saw it as a way to connect with, listen to, and learn from his peers. Although he was unable to *fully* access his peers' knowledge and experiences, he did find ways to learn from them and hoped to continue to learn from them in the future. Because he was shifting a boundary around engagement with mental disability that he initially believed requires firsthand "access" to mental disability knowledge, his relationship with mental disability is one that could be described as new but also open—it is a topic he can now welcome into his life even without it directly affecting who he is, a necessary step in larger transfer processes and acts of far- or high-road transfer.

In addition to the identity boundary-work Peter was performing, he also worked on the discursive boundary around the term *mental disability*. This discursive boundary was moderately flexible in that he associated disability more with socially and physically constructed barriers throughout the term. This began in his week two free writing response to Dolmage's first chapter of *Disability Rhetoric* where Peter defined, in his own words, issues of ableism and disablism, the latter of which he said "creates a negative view of those with disabilities" and that "we as a society have given these individuals the status as disabled." In response to Yergeau's text during week two, he also wrote that "my interpretation of this is that society has deemed certain individuals as disabled based on a deviation from the biological norm." Further, his discussion of the social and medical models of disability in his free write on Bailey and Mobley's text during week five reinforced his newfound grasp on disability as, in part, something we

create. This repetition could be deeply connected to the value he placed on his learning about rhetoric which I will discuss further in Chapter 5. Despite this expansion of his definition and despite, prior to the course, having conducted a research paper related to veterans' coping mechanisms in "The Things They Carried", he did not, at the beginning of the term, classify coping or war-induced PTSD as connected to mental disability which means there was some fixity throughout the term regarding what "counts" as mental disability. This discursive boundary therefore affected the flexibility and permeability of his identity boundary because, without an established connection between coping with trauma—diagnosed or not—and mental disability, or at least symptoms of mental disability, Peter could not see himself as having ever been in conversation with the topic. However, when Peter did submit his Rhetorical Analysis Memo, after the end-of-week nine deadline, he chose to analyze a video titled "A Veteran Victory: The Battle at Home | Addition, PTSD, and Depression." I discuss this choice further in the section "Peter: Uptake Captures and Residues Impact on Adaptation and Transformation." Though this decision demonstrates a shift in the discursive boundary of *mental disability*, his identity boundary remained inflexible, permeable as he still, at the end of the term, did not believe he had exposure to the topic. Thankfully, Peter's learning disposition—his self-efficacy and motivation—was an inflexible element of his identity and one that he planned to leverage in future circumstances for example, in his claims that his engagement with these topics encourages him to study more topics he is "not sure how to approach" which leaves possibilities for both the discursive and identities boundaries worked on in our course to remain flexible and permeable.

Like Ethan, Peter experienced several interactions that could be classified as micro-transfers in that they contributed to the boundary-work illustrated above. His interactions with his peers are the most apparent contributors to his boundary-work. As above, Peter defined himself as distinct from his peers because of what our class discussions and research presentations revealed to him about his peers' exposure to topics of and experiences with mental disability. Because many of his peers tended to be transparent about and comfortable with speaking on their personal connections to the subject matter without being required, Peter's interactions with his classmates reinforced how he defined himself as lacking mental disability knowledge and experience. Such interactions between his seeming lack of access to this knowledge and his peers' perceived expertise, though potentially limiting, made Peter curious and motivated him to be a more active listener on such topics. Within the spatio-temporal field,

Peter's peers existed as part of his definition of the material space of the classroom and become actors that informed his ability and need for engagement. It's worth noting how Peter's interactions with and observations of his peers and their discussion contributions and/or research topics influenced the fixity of his boundaries, making such interactions important points of consideration for long-term, high-road forms of knowledge transformation, but this will be talked about in more depth in the section titled "Class Environment and Peer Interaction Support for Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Marking."

Moreover, the interactions between the course texts impacted Peter's mental disability discursive boundary, and the interaction of one of the podcast episodes—Alice Wong's discussion with Imade Nibokun on "Black Mental Health" which we listened to during week three—and his personal experience influenced not only his project topic (educational resource disparities and the impact on marginalized communities) but what he saw as possible for him in the future therefore contributing to the complexity of his identity boundary. As stated, Peter made clear connections between Dolmage's focus on norms, Yergeau's critique of Theory of Mind scholars removing agency from autists by labeling them as disabled, and Bailey and Mobley's definitions of the social model because he repeated the concept of norms and the idea that "society has deemed certain individuals as disabled based on a deviation from the biological norm" in various forms. Beyond this, Peter repeated how inspired he was by Wong and Nibokun's podcast episode which he said in his Project Proposal "really stood out to me, as it focused on an area that I never really thought of being unavailable to certain communities, therapy, and opened my eyes to the major aspects that are simply missing from some areas." He expanded on this later in his Final Reflection, where he claimed

> it introduced me to something I did not know, and…inspired the topic for my research project. I had no idea how detrimental this disparity in healthcare was for Black Americans, and when [Nibokun] stated that 'Some of us are going to our doctors, and we're having all these problems. And we're not being heard. Or it swings the other way: we're being criminalized and we're thrown into psychiatric hospitals against our will and we're not being part of the treatment process' I knew that there was some structural discrimination happening, but to this extent of not even being listened to and criminalized due to racial/ethnic factors was eye opening. This then leads to how this inspired my own final research project…I wanted to combine this newfound, eye-opening knowledge with something I am passionate about, education, and through this I was able to explore something new, and really develop an understanding of the societal imbalances of not only education, but other areas as well.

Here, Peter's identity boundary is once again demonstrated as permeable. Instead of shutting down at his disclosed lack of connection to the topic of mental disability, he integrated the "newfound, eye-opening knowledge" into his repertoire, making it useful for approaching a topic he already considered to be a part of his story. This knowledge allowed him to productively complicate a part of his history and identity and gave him tools for further exploration, engagement, and connection in the future. Peter's ability to complicate and multiply new knowledge to increase what he was capable of as a student, researcher, and community member was complemented by the series of micro-transfers—between him, his classmates, and the class texts—that gave the boundaries their diverse contours.

The phrase "I am not fully sure if I understand this, but I want to give it a go" seems to represent Peter's learning overall. He never felt 100% positive about anything but always gave it a shot. Despite his lack of certainty about the content, he did take agency over his learning and education, taking time to learn what he could and to admit where he was lacking in his learning and engagement with the course. So, what Peter really reinforces for me is the importance of dispositions in our transfer processes and the idea that "everyone is both conditioned by past experiences…but not limited by them" (Nowacek et al. 2024, p. 349). In other words, what Peter made clear in this work is that our prior knowledge and experiences have a huge impact on what knowledge we take up, how we use it, and whether we view it as useful or meaningful as well as how micro-transfers enable students to re-orient their prior experiences and knowledge to redraw boundaries and develop new relationships to knowledge and people with which they saw no previous connection. Concerning ourselves with micro-transfers highlights the ways in which transfer does not necessarily only exist as clear and direct translations of knowledge since each micro-transfer (the intersecting of people, places, things, and ideas) complicates the uptake affordances of any one situation and consequently complicates decisions students make regarding the appropriate use of information based on their perception of the affordances. In the cases within my classroom, these uptakes result from affordances directly related to students' interaction with the subject matter but also those indirectly related such as social and individual memory, family histories, and identities. In short, transfer does not result from a singular, clear and direct path but from a student's unique selection from paths that came to be through various and multiple iterations of uptake affordances and the enactments they condition.

Cara: Embracing Identity Through DS

At the time of her enrollment, Cara was a first-year sociology major and UW women's club volleyball teammate. As a student from rural Illinois, moving to Washington and away from her family was a "big jump" because both of her parents attended universities in Chicago. Besides her major in sociology, she was also interested in pursuing a double minor in human rights and English writing or a double degree in business marketing. In her Course Introductory Email, she claimed that her passion for sociology was inspired by her concern with how the social world impacts "human rights, equality, and mental health perceptions." Although she had never conducted research or written research papers prior to the class, she had conducted an analysis on gothic elements in the television series *Game of Thrones* for another English course at UW. In the Course Introductory Email, she expressed that she saw our class as a "very exciting" "opportunity" to research and write about the social issues that interest her. In addition, she reflected on her desire to start writing a blog about her mental health journey but explained that "I have never felt comfortable in my knowledge to publicly express my thoughts," but she hoped this course would help her feel more confident and lead her to creating such a platform "to express my thoughts and help others."

From this first assignment, her goals for the course were clear and closely tied to the course subject matter which led her to connect with the readings on mental disability during our second week, commenting passionately on Price's critique in Chapter 1 on the DSM being produced largely from a white, heteromasculine lens and the capital gain and monetary incentives associated with diagnosis. She wrote "I was once told, by a doctor, that my diagnosis from my psychiatrist, therapist, and dietician was a result of their need to put something on a billing statement. I felt unseen and unheard. I felt that this man was belittling the years I struggled; thinking I was crazy because no one would believe me about my symptoms." Cara revealed the drawing of her identity boundary as she defined herself as someone who experiences mental disability symptoms. Two days after reading Price's text, she read "Clinically Significant Disturbance" by Yergeau and responded to the same free writing prompt question Peter responded to above which asked "What does it mean when Susan Wendell says, 'Disability is not a biological given; like gender, it is socially constructed from a biological reality?'" I quote Cara's response at length for three reasons: first, Cara was grappling at that point with the social model of disability and

using her knowledge of first-hand queer experience to make connections that crystalized the concept. Second, this was the beginning of Cara's development of her more positive perception of herself as disabled; she began taking ownership over this part of her identity—her act of ownership also highlights how uptake residues (the sedimentations of memory attached to knowledge that condition uptakes) and captures (what students see as possible in response to an enactment based on their repeated interactions with such knowledge, genres, etc.) can be destabilized given the diverse uptake affordances. Finally, we can see, as I will discuss in the section titled "Adapting and Transforming Mental Disability Knowledge to Meet One Where They Are", the sort of boundary-work Cara performed to develop her research topic for her final website. She wrote

> I know people can be born with predispositions for certain disabilities but that does not mean it is necessarily a biological trait. Like gender, I feel like it is a label. Like I am a girl and I am clinically depressed. I have XX chromosomes but that doesn't make me a girl, my feelings and expressions make me a girl. I have a predisposition for depression, but my thoughts and feelings lead me to be diagnosed. In the same way, I am labeled as a girl…I am labeled as clinically depressed. Maybe this is just the label the doctors decided to put on me like they would label someone with a physical disability. It is their perception of the person, not necessarily what their biology says. I don't outwardly go around showing my depression so I am not labeled as disabled as the way someone in a wheelchair might be, but it is still a label society puts on me.

In this free writing space, she took initiative to think critically and to begin working through how to talk about the nuances of disability and diagnosis; the free writing exercise was an uptake affordance that allowed Cara to question and counter the uptake residues that shaped her initial boundary around *mental disability*. Although Cara might not have been getting close enough to say disability itself is (in some ways) constructed, the label does assist in her better understanding that constructed otherness. She was learning actively and applying that learning uniquely to her situation and experience. The interaction between the new knowledge and past experience caused her past experience to take on new meaning and the current knowledge to mean something personal due to her acquisition of it. Her statements remind me of Goodley's note that "For many of us engaged with the politics of disablement, the social model gave us our 'aha moment' [and] a new disability lexicon" (p. 7) because Cara entered the course with concerns about mental disability, equity, and human rights but this social model knowledge changed how she thinks about her own positionality and the positionality of others as both biologically different (in

this case, in brain chemistry) but only “depressed” inasmuch as they are constructed as such by other actors in society.

A discursive boundary is most clearly being worked on in a way that altered how she defines disabilities broadly because being disabled is now more than just a thing that we are but a thing we are told we are. Her grappling with the nuances of disability experience and knowledge reveals that the discursive boundary around *mental disability* was inflexible—it is not that disability necessarily became different than it was in her mind—yet permeable in that other ideas were allowed to enter and transform “what counts” without changing the meaning of the phrase entirely. As the discursive boundary of *disability* was being molded, she was also making statements about who she is. Initially, Cara had a “mental health journey” and “symptoms” that she experienced and struggled with. Now, she is a “clinically depressed” girl as defined by herself and by obtaining an awareness of the constructedness of our identities through comparative means. Though her identity might not be changed, she found the language and ideas needed to give the identity boundary more definition.

This extended excerpt is also the beginning of her shift from a more reserved stance and uncertainty about disclosing disability to her argument about the positive effects of calling it what it is rather than, as she noted she used to, saying “mental health or stuff like that.” When discussing this change of perspective in our interview during week seven, she said

> I feel like disability always had a negative connotation for me, but like now doing all these readings and doing the discussions and just educating myself more like I don’t feel that connotation anymore. So, I feel more comfortable and honestly, like it feels more…powerful almost to say mental disability.

As with Peter and Ethan, it’s difficult to separate the discursive and identity work Cara is doing. First, the discursive boundary of what *mental disability* is is permeable because a positive framing shaped how she might present and engage with that information later. In addition, this statement showcases the permeability of her identity boundary. She did not necessarily see herself as different than she was but did see herself as more capable of saying “mental disability” and granted herself more power through that act as well. In other words, her identity became more defined through her acceptance and pride in her new skills and perceived abilities. In the interview, she continued that she appreciated

> knowing that [mental disability is] not a negative thing like it’s part of me and…I’m still like a good person and it’s not like it takes away anything from me or like who I am, like it’s just, it is who I am

> and I can't change it. So, it…feels powerful to keep it…as a positive, and not let it like drag me down or feel like I'm like a castaway in society just because I say I have a disability instead of like a health issue.

Cara's shift in positivity and reflection on who she is in relation to her disability is inspiring and something I hope for anyone who begins learning DS theories, discourses, and values as that was a part of my journey as well. Similar to her changing "negative connotation" about mental disability broadly, when she reflected on herself and her own experience her identity boundary was not evidently flexible—she disclosed she both entered and left the course clinically depressed and her disability and previously stated "mental health issues" are the same thing. Her identity boundary was permeable but she didn't necessarily see herself as different apart from the knowledge she has gained and the outlook she had toward herself and disability generally. Rather than seeing herself as now different in terms of ability, she saw her disability status as more concrete and less threatening therefore ossifying her identity boundary. There is identity boundary-work happening but it's a bit more complex—she identified herself as disabled but she already knew she had clinical depression; the identity boundary was permeable because it was the attitude that is seeping through. Another form of discursive boundary-work occurring is in her statement to "not let it [the label of disability] like drag me down or feel like I'm like a castaway in society." Cara disclosed here her previous belief that being disabled meant being isolated and alienated from others, which shifted more toward empowerment in "owning" that part of her identity. As Cara worked to complicate the boundary of what counts as mental disability and develop what she believes to be an appropriate attitude toward mental disability, she also came to see herself as more capable of even *being* disabled. In other words, the knowledge she acquired was accepted as a part of who she is and therefore how she writes herself into the world around her. Whether this identification and embrace of herself as disabled varies based on her spatio-temporal boundaries is not suggested by the data. However, it does suggest that she experienced changes in what possibilities she saw for engaging this knowledge (a wider array of uptake captures) which, in turn, gives her access to a different variety of uptake enactments and artifacts and, therefore, varied combinations of affordances.

Cara's micro-transfers were similar to those of Ethan and Peter. More explicitly, however, Cara referred to the course readings as impactful—and therefore as informing her boundary-work—where she said, "I feel like disability always had a negative connotation for me, but like now doing all these readings

and doing the discussions and just educating myself more like I don't feel that connotation anymore." Not only did she reveal that the readings' interaction with her prior knowledge was influential, but she also revealed the sort of micro-transfers occurring between different classroom elements—I speak more on the class environment in Chapter 5. We can see early in the term where the micro-transfers, or interactions with the texts she mentioned, contributed to her shift in connotation. First, when she read Dolmage's first chapter of *Disability Rhetoric* during week two, she wrote that

> I resonated with the discussion of 'normal' in school. My experience throughout school was that if you had any learning disability you were automatically put in a special learning environment. When talking to counselors recently, I was given the option of having extended time on tests, and internally I freaked out because it made me feel like I was back in elementary school when I would see kids leave the room for the test, and other students would laugh or bombard them with questions about their need to leave. Overall, I think the school system has really created a meaning of normal that many find hard to shake.

She expanded on the impact of her week two readings in an informal Letter Writing Practice assignment, stating that "I would like to discuss the first chapter of Margaret Price's *Mad at School*. Through this text, I was able to challenge my experience with 'norms,' and how it has been reiterated in my academic and personal life." Although Cara took time above to reflect on one experience that contributed to her negative perception of mental disability, her final sentence indicates a critical thought about the construction of normality and those negative perceptions of disability that she has internalized over time. She redrew the boundary around *normal* and, potentially, accommodation and access. As she moved through the class, she began to see normality as not only a construct that impacts disability perceptions but also perceptions of queerness once she began seeing disability as an identity marker. Earlier, I quoted Cara's response to Yergeau's reading at length, and I repeat part of that response here to illustrate her developing this perception of disability as part of one's identity: "Like I am a girl, and I am clinically depressed. I have XX chromosomes but that doesn't make me a girl, my feelings and expressions make me a girl. I have a predisposition for depression, but my thoughts and feelings lead me to be diagnosed." This connection was advanced when we read Price's article two weeks later and our discussion focused on queerness and disability and she went on to claim "In the same way, I am labeled as a girl, and I am labeled as clinically depressed. Maybe this is just the label the doctors decided to put on me like they would label someone with a physical disability" where she ameliorated her depression diagnosis through parallelling it with the way we label gender. The micro-transfers occurring are multi-faceted as Cara brought knowledge

from her high school experience to bear on the new knowledge and uses the new knowledge to redraw boundaries around her identity and what is “normal” which created greater possibilities for taking up the information in the course readings and discussions and adapting it within her Final Website. In these acts of personal transformation and the adaptation of learning from the readings and discussions for her project, Cara also proved the spatio-temporal boundary of the classroom to be permeable as she situated her personal and private knowledge about mental disability within the academic space and along her educational timeline.

To expand on this point, toward the end of the term, Cara stated that the class discussions and hearing others talk more openly about mental disability influenced her newly developed positive view of mental disability. She noted in her interview that “honestly, just like hearing everyone in class like talk about it more openly and not like trying to work around like saying ‘mental disability’ or like finding like a way to say it like nicely just kind of like opened my eyes to like this isn’t a bad thing that you have to hide like you can talk about it openly, especially in like an academic or social setting.” The when, where, and what of this situation also stands out as an indication of spatio-temporal boundary-work. Cara’s classroom boundary, her attention to academic and social settings, was flexible and permeable as she saw the different material elements—her peers’ physical presence and therefore the knowledge and skills they bring with them—as influential in the redrawing of her discursive and identity boundaries around mental disability.

What’s intriguing here is that Cara hinted at the construction of all three of Medina’s boundary categories: (1) in the discursive, she separated “mental disability” from “a bad thing” making the definitional bounds of the term tighter. (2) In her admission to “open[ing] her eyes,” she was making claims to herself being changed by the information, and (3) she proved flexible the spatio-temporal boundaries of home, friends, and school in her claims that this knowledge and these conversations do not have to be limited to private spaces or between a closed set of actors. These boundaries are all played with, as she stated, in response to her engagement with her classmates—a micro-transfer that I argue later is essential for the meaning-making required for successful transfer. This micro-transfer was paired with the interactions with the texts in the interview when she specifically stated that

> I also feel like, in the beginning of the term, like my understanding of mental disabilities, was very like boxed into what I personally understood or like what I’ve heard from my friends. So, like being

> exposed to different kinds of mental disabilities or like even people who have similar mental disabilities to me, but they experience it in a different way, has given me a lot more perspective.

This is similar to Ethan's claim about how his fairly educated understanding of mental disability was enhanced by his reading of the texts and engagement with his classmates who had a lot to teach him from their experiential knowledge, making the counterstories presented in the texts and the counterstories presented by students and their simplest disclosures of *existing* as disabled in the academy significant supporters of micro-transfers. What's important to remember as well is that Ethan and Cara both entered the course with clear goals and desires. Ethan wanted knowledge to be applicable to real-world contexts and Cara wanted to act as an advocate for herself and others with mental disabilities. This could mean they spent a large part of the class seeking out opportunities to reach these goals or employ the knowledge they acquired whereas those with less concrete goals, such as Peter desiring to finish his degree, might be inclined to make fewer connections with the subject matter regardless of their level of exposure.

Although I will speak on this more in Chapter 6, as I close Cara's story, I want to point to the evidence herein that demonstrates how the writing classroom is uniquely suited for facilitating and supporting knowledge transfer. Ethan, Peter, and Cara all share that their engagement with their classmates influenced their relationship to mental disability whether they did so explicitly or not. Writing classrooms commonly require a great deal of peer-to-peer interaction for students to be successful; that is, to grow as writers. This interaction creates multiple avenues for micro-transfer to occur. In addition, the data suggests that the typical writing course structure naturally guides students toward micro-transfers, for example, in the requirement to write in different genres, with different levels of formality or stakes, and for different audiences. Students' interaction with new and challenging texts also acts as an opportunity for micro-transfers. Although each of these elements seems discrete, the students bring with them those unique aspects of their identity that make micro-transfer more possible. This is to say, we, as writing instructors, already have the tools and basic classroom structure that nearly force micro-transfers if interactions are facilitated and performed meaningfully.

Foster: Disability Literacy Incomes and Identity Construction Through DS

Like Cara, Foster was a first-year student when they enrolled in my course and, like Peter and Ethan, Cara and Foster considered themselves friends and often positioned themselves next to each

other during our class sessions, a spatio-temporal move that might have influenced both Cara and Foster's willingness to discuss mental disability more openly and the movement of their discursive and identity boundaries due to the immediate, physical influence and closeness of other's experiences. Foster, a queer-identifying, "female college student," stated they were majoring in archeological science with a minor in informatics because they love learning about other cultures from a critical perspective. Although Foster is not a first-generation student, they did often feel "ill prepared" since their father went to college but not university. Despite their feeling of ill preparedness, they claimed in their introductory email that they "never truly struggle with composing assignments or expressing myself in class" but do experience "immense test anxiety" that could require accommodations depending on the course. From the start of the class, they included their disability as part of their narrative, stating that they "do not perform well on tests due to my disability." Then, their identity boundary was rather inflexible seeing as their testing ability is immovable and they take ownership of their disability in the use of the possessive adjective "my." So, Foster entered the course in a similar position to Ethan—that is, in terms of their level of disability literacy and experiential knowledge. They disclosed in their interview during week seven that their mother "works with like a nonprofit in California that helps people with disabilities," so they have always been treated with respect regarding their mental health and anxiety diagnoses. Moreover, Foster demonstrated a clear understanding of disability bias and prejudice in reflecting on and connecting personal experiences to the words of those in our readings. For example, in their free writing exercise responding to Yergeau's "Clinically Significant Disturbance", they stated that

> When Wendell said that disability wasn't a biological given, I think she meant that it isn't a natural hindrance to one's ability. It has just been viewed as such through social conditioning. I agree with Wendell in this statement as I feel like my learning disability wouldn't have been so hard to manage if academic institutions weren't so anti-disability in their earlier stages of creation. Due to the preconceived notion that disabilities were correlated to incompetence I feel like students with disabilities were never really meant to get a seat at the table.

In addition, during our interview, they disclosed multiple disability experiences including panic attacks and an almost-hospitalization. These experiences are discussed in relation to how they apply their learning while viewing media representations and reading Yergeau's text which "made me really frustrated and I talked to my mom about that just because I was like…I just was very emotionally charged by that and just as someone who was about to be hospitalized and I was just very thankful that my parents let me make

the choice to not hospitalize myself" which they saw as distinct from Yergeau's experience of forced hospitalization. These experiences (or uptake residues) helped Foster connect to the readings and, as they noted, *see* themselves in the readings when they said, "As someone with a learning disability, I see myself in a lot of our class discussion and readings. A lot of what is said in the readings have become rather healing for me." The observable boundary-work being performed is related to Foster's identity. Over the years, they mentioned, they have been able to recognize that their brain simply developed differently and that there is no possibility of a cure, but that they get better at handling their symptoms. As such, they entered the course with an already-established dislike for the "cure" mentality, claiming that the urge to "cure" ultimately disadvantages the healing of mentally disabled patients in their statement that "people…especially in the medical profession, it's like 'here's a cure and you'll be better and it'll be over' but the thing is that that doesn't really apply to someone with a disabled brain like mine where it's just like…in a constant state of, I wouldn't say broken, but just different." In addition, they claimed that "my disability isn't a bad thing." In the former, Foster avoided using the term with a more negative connotation (i.e., broken) to demonstrate their positive outlook on disability and practices speaking of mental disability in a way that is consistent with their general view of mental disability perceptions as socially constructed.

This dialogue within their interview is significant because, in response to their second free writing exercise during week two—that which responded to Dolmage's *Disability Rhetoric* and Price's first chapter of *Mad at School*—they stated that "I've always wanted to be perceived as normal throughout all aspects of my physicality, personality, and emotions." As the quarter progressed and Foster joined me in the interview space, they reflected differently on this aspect of their identity, seeing disability, in some ways, as a strength. To them, disability contributes to their creativity, as they noted that "being disabled, it makes me more creative because I feel like if I'm already perceived to be outside of the norm, I might as well continue." In other words, their disability identity has allowed them to feel more comfortable taking risks in their learning and everyday life since they already experience the physical and emotional impact of this marker of difference. I really admired their repetition of how their disability makes them different but doesn't make them incompetent or less-than. Due to their initial level of disability literacy, they claimed that their perception hadn't really changed but their attention to issues related to mental disability issues has heightened and they valued being able to see representations of "the multidimensionality of disabled

people." However, their statement about creativity being connected to disability difference could be a progression resulting from the micro-transfers of the course readings, discussions, attention to identity, and Foster's prior experiences and values. Overall, their reading and learning in this class has inspired a lot of self-reflection and mostly personal use of the knowledge. They mentioned, for example, that it helped them look at social media and television and film differently. Though their perception of themselves as disabled does not change—making it inflexible—their identity boundary is permeable since the new knowledge and stories of disabled people inform their relationship to their own disability and healing process. In other words, the findings suggest they have adopted new skills to think about their disability, making their healing abilities a new facet of their identity despite their identity as disabled remaining the same.

Other notable identity boundary-work appeared for Foster as they reflected on their engagement with Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" during our class discussion. The class discussion they refer to is one I have stated was the most impactful for me as a teacher that term. During this session, Cara and Foster—as well as one non-participant student—came out as queer to the class and guided a powerful discussion on how disability is an identity marker in ways similar to queerness which responded to some of Price's claims about and problematization of "disability desirability." In their interview, Foster reflected on their surprise with their actions and the safety of the classroom (to be discussed further in Chapter 5), stating that their thought process involved saying to themselves "Okay, I'm going to come out to my entire English class that's known me for like five weeks." Despite their statement that this felt unrelated to the course content, it was connected to Price's reading and was their way of making meaning out of the disability discussions we were having, making connections between queer experiences and disabled experiences in ways that benefited everyone in the classroom. In other words, it seemed to inspire a new way of thinking about disability for them as they paralleled disability identity with queer identity. They discussed in the interview that "being disabled is also like a form of identity and that…felt really nice to have other queer students kind of talk about like these things that happen in queer communities…I don't know if I have any of those conversations with my queer friends, so I felt like that was like a really nice space to kind of openly talk about it…from a theoretical perspective." Foster seemed to no longer see their disability as something they *have*; rather they were

understanding it as part of one's identity. Additionally, their queer identity was applied as a tool to better understand their disability identity, making the two intricately intertwined. Class environment and interactions with peers were two important factors in helping Foster make these connections. In Chapter 5, I discuss further the micro-transfers occurring in those interactions and how they might have impacted Foster's boundary-work around disability as an identity.

The micro-transfers occurring in relation to this boundary-work are like those discussed above which could speak to the limits of the classroom and the interactions we are able to facilitate through our usual teaching methods. Some moment-to-moment interactions occurring in Foster's narrative are in their engagement with the course texts, notably Price's and Yergeau's—the former of which provided them a new outlook on how the bodymind is implicated in sexual trauma and the latter of which contributed to how they reflected on their own near hospitalization. In speaking about Price's text, Foster said "I think that's really important to see that there's not only physical, but also like mental or developmental or emotional attachments…and how our brain and body are just such an interconnected entity. It's kind of absurd to like view them as two very separate things." To them, this felt like common sense as they stated, "If your brain is distressed your body is going to experience feeling some distress" and "It's just so stupid that people think otherwise." In addition, Foster expressed gratitude for the article, claiming that as they read "I just thought…like, 'thank you.'" Foster's interaction with classmates, as we can see in their statements about the speaking to the other queer students in the class, also impacted the construction of their identity boundary and the discursive boundary of *disability*. What's really striking about Foster is the way that they used the new knowledge to reshape the old and to see their sexual assault and hospitalization memories differently through the act of learning a new term and hearing others' stories, respectively.

Implications of Students' Relationships to Disability

For the theme Relationship to Disability, these five students demonstrate a range of incoming relationships with mental disability, varied levels of confidence and investment, and various responses to and shifts in boundaries related to mental disability. Together, they show us that beliefs about one's closeness to particular subject matter can have an impact on their investment in learning more about that subject. In Peter's case, his distance was inspiring for him to pursue gaining more knowledge about

mental disability but, among other elements of his experience, also seemed to hinder his investment in completing assignments. This might indicate a need for more intentional guidance and framing on the instructor's part about how this content *does* relate to all students and how they *might* be connected to it in their everyday lives. Together they also showcase the necessity of continuing to grant attention to dispositions in transfer research and to turn toward micro-transfers to examine how they lead to shifts in dispositions that inhibit or support the transfer of knowledge later on. For example, Peter's disposition and continual engagement (his micro-transfers) with the content and his classmates resulted in identity boundary shifts that would make him more likely to welcome mental disability knowledge in the future. However, had his disposition been more defensive or protective of his position "outside" of mental disability experiences, he may have resisted influence from the subject matter altogether and inhibited possibilities for high-road transfer in other contexts. Similarly, Foster is a great example of how dispositions matter and how they shift in the collisions of experience, subject matter, physical bodies and spaces, etc. Foster very well could have been a student whose expert-level disability literacy prevented them from seeing possibilities for varied engagement (and shifting boundaries) with mental disability knowledge. Transfer research shows us that those who consider themselves to be more "expert" upon entering a course can be less likely to perform high-road or far transfer acts whereas those who accept themselves as novices find unique ways to adapt rather than committing and holding onto their worn ways of completing writing tasks. In Foster's case, their "seeing" themselves in a lot of the readings did not lead them to position themselves as more expert than the authors but to recognize an array of disability experiences and to express appreciation for not only their relationship to mental disability but also their parents which resulted in a deep level of respect for Foster's medical autonomy.

Although these findings show us that these case study students, no matter their incomes or initial positions toward the subject matter, did manage to productively engage with micro-transfers that allowed them to use what they were learning in the course immediately and possibly beyond, it might do us well to ask students more explicitly about how they would label themselves as learners, their learning processes, and ask earlier—when we are teaching for subject matter transfer—what they see as their relationship to the topic as well as continually guide students toward responding to points of connection or contention rather than a longer list of free writing questions. These stories also support the idea that transfer is

social—all of the students indicated that their interaction with either their classmates, family members, friends, or all of the above had an influence on their learning about, relationship to, and value of mental disability knowledge. Transfer research has historically "consolidated around individuals" (Nowacek et al. 2024, p. 316) but in their synthesis of transfer research from various fields of thought, Nowacek et al. remind us that we should consider more how "individual characteristics exist in dynamic relationship with social contexts for learning" (p. 59), a goal which is linked to boundaries drawn across all three fields, but particularly the spatio-temporal as our movement through time and space and therefore interaction with various physical elements influences changes in our self-perception and individual characteristics. Uptake theory can also provide a language for looking at such dynamic relationships in that these stories, especially Cara's, show us that uptake captures and residues can be challenged when presented with affordances inconsistent with our histories and memories, particularly those attached to specific spatio-temporal boundaries. In the future of transfer research, being more considerate of the individual within social contexts might mean assigning more collaborative work, recording and analyzing students' group conversations, having students reflect on each group activity after their task is complete, and even framing for how students' interactions with their classmates are significantly impactful for their learning. In other words, it would have been worth establishing, beyond the community guidelines, the interconnectedness of the individuals within the classroom space more explicitly. Similarly, because it is evident that micro-transfers do impact the boundary-work that occurs and thus the dispositions that form, we need to be intentional about creating opportunities for transfer-motivated moment-to-moment interactions beyond what we might regularly create.

In addition to foregrounding the need to inspire more collaboration and also be clear about the utility of said collaboration in student learning, these students' boundary-work shows us that transfer acts are not always intentional, deliberate, or conscious—micro-transfers themselves often go unnoticed despite students' consistent references to their past experiences. In these moments of referring to the past, we witness past knowledge quietly informing engagement with present learning through their interactions—which, enacted more explicitly, would be labeled as transfer. Because of this, inspiring micro-transfers through setting up intentional interactions that solidify and make new knowledge meaningful, students are likely to quietly use this new knowledge in future contexts as well, whether they

are able to articulate that those influences are working on each other or not. These micro-transfers matter and layer on top of one another in ways that can complicate prior knowledge productively since “every writer is pre-oriented by past experiences” (Donahue, 2016, p. 118).

Finally, Nowacek et al. (2024) remind us that transfer is a “realm of possibilities” (p. 349–50); so, micro-transfer matters because the smaller, frequent interactions that occur as students move through the world and condition uptakes contribute to the multidimensionality of that realm. In short, these stories further contribute to the scholarship on the complexity of the transfer phenomenon and confirm the nuance that can interfere with our ability to “pin down” a definition and method of studying transfer and a transfer act itself. Additionally, despite these varied student experiences and shifts in their boundaries, the shifts were inspired out of similar micro-transfers meaning that the sort of interactions fostered in the writing classroom can and do contribute to students ever-shifting boundaries that inform how and where they see their new or built upon knowledge as useful. The following section defines my second theme—Adapt and Transform—before further analyzing the boundary-work and micro-transfers of Foster, Cara, and Peter and introducing Mason, who I briefly mentioned above. Adapting and transforming is largely concerned with how present knowledge cannot go without being touched by our pasts and thus results in varied transfer acts—a turn toward micro-transfer can enhance our understanding of such phenomena.

Adapting and Transforming Mental Disability Knowledge to Meet One Where They Are

In Chapter 1, I discussed the “terminological baggage” that the term *transfer* carries (Becker, 2023, n.p.) in that it holds a “resonance of discrete, portable packages of knowledge simply carried over and applied to new contexts” (Nowacek et al. 2024, p. 7), leading many to attempt to abandon the term altogether. Becker proposed that *transformation* was better suited than *transfer* but Nowacek et al. (2024) make a strong case for retaining the term, referring to Perkins and Salomon’s (2012) argument that it is hard to distinguish learning from transfer of learning since all learning involves some degree of transfer to be recognized as such (p. 8). *Transfer*, they state, has been universally used across seemingly disparate disciplines and is consequently a term that enables us to turn to said disciplines to grow and embrace the untidiness of transfer processes (p. 8). Although I tend to hold to the term *transfer* throughout this work in my claims about micro-*transfer*, for example, transfer has always been about adapting information for use and in such adaptation, transforming it in some way. This section and those subsections within are

focused on the theme Adapt and Transform. This theme arose out of my consistent observations of how students were taking up the mental disability knowledge they were interacting with in our course readings and discussions, the resulting uptake enactments, and the application of that knowledge in their final research projects. This theme helps me respond to the first six of the seven research questions presented in the above section "The 'What' and 'Why' of Boundaries as Units of Analysis" which relate to general changes in student writing but more specifically to observable micro-transfers and the use of knowledge learned in our course.

Foster confirmed my belief that Adapt and Transform was a theme despite my not being able to put it into words prior to reviewing their data a second time. They said, "I am taking that certain topic [bodymind connection] and then kind of adding on like a topic that I'm interested in." This theme is defined by the work students are doing to (1) take up mental disability knowledge, (2) reflect on their prior knowledge in relation to that mental disability knowledge, (3) adapt and transform either or both of their knowledges (current and previous), and (4) develop something new or present one or each knowledge as changed within their research. Every student did this in some way, but it was more apparent and meaningful to the student when it related to their personal experiences which is why I present it in this chapter alongside Relationship to Disability. Adapt and Transform also grants space to examine how variations of uptake affordances, captures, and residues work together to inform those resulting enactments and artifacts (here, the Final Website) and how the process of selecting an uptake is complex and individualized even if attached to collective memories and shared moments of learning. Adapting and transforming therefore involves making new knowledge meaningful by adapting it to work with what they already know or what they want to know/do. To adapt and transform is to mold the boundaries around a thing or idea to fit it within a particular context or position it alongside other things in that context. In this section, I turn back to three of the students introduced above—Foster, Cara, and Peter—but also introduce Mason, who illustrates how some students experienced tension between their disability experience and the disability experiences discussed in class. I begin with Foster because of their insight and language they offered me in the process of analyzing data within this theme.

Foster: Making Connections to the Bodymind

Foster's "taking" of a certain topic and "adding on" a topic of prior interest is clear in their Final Website as they wove together genres (e.g., sharing links to YouTube videos of the People v. Turner case with more standard academic argumentation), and their own claim to this learning and these connections demonstrate that micro-transfer can be effectively facilitated in the writing classroom to shift boundaries that inform future engagement with similar concepts or promote connections between current and future knowledge. Foster, as mentioned above, identifies as a queer, female college student and, from their interview, I learned that they also have a learning disability and anxiety disorder; in their Final Website titled "The Bodymind Connection of Sexual Assault in Collegiate Settings", they also disclosed that they are a survivor of sexual assault. They wrote that "My own experiences as a female, college student, and survivor have all shaped how I approach topics such as this." It is because of this that they were able to confidently make the claim that "there is a deep undermining of the bodymind connection of sexual assault survivors in collegiate settings." Prior to the production of their Final Website, students were asked to complete a Project Proposal which followed the structure of a business proposal. Within their proposal, Foster wrote that "the bodymind connection is a true testament to the aftermath of sexual assault, as it demonstrates the physical, mental, and developmental hinderance on a person's well-being", and they claim that the topic is relevant to "myself and my peers." Later, in their discussion of what inspired their exploration of this topic, they said

> When reading 'The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain' by Margaret Price, I saw the importance of restructuring our language and understanding around the body and mind as well as their abilities and functions. Price furthers this idea through noting how disability, queerness, and other forms of identity don't neatly compile into a box where stereotypes of physical appearances or behaviors/mannerisms are the epitome of the identity group.

The visible boundaries being worked on in this instance were largely discursive—the boundaries around the term and experience of sexual assault were fixed; their definition of sexual assault was not changing entirely, but the boundary was permeable in that Foster allowed the concept of *bodymind* to inform how they think about the experience of sexual assault. Their claims about the "restructuring [of] our language" demonstrates the flexibility of the boundaries of *body* and *mind* as separate entities. The data suggests they became inseparable for Foster, making them conceptually different in their world. Although Foster may have had an understanding of this through their own experience and prior knowledge/research, the

bodymind concept as presented by Price provided them a new lens for discussing this issue. In fact, in their interview, they mentioned that this is the main concept they will carry with them. Foster is explicit about the interactions that inspired their work, claiming that

> The discussions in class in regards to the text led me to think about more pressing issues in my day-to-day life that connect back to the notions raised in the original text. As a student at a widely known university with numerous sexual assault cases (especially within the university's Panhellenic system), I felt that speaking on how sexual assault impacts the bodymind connection on survivors as well as their identity as a survivor would bring light on an issue that is continually tried to be swept under the rug.

Later, in the same assignment, they wrote that their work was "inspired by the literary works that are *Know My Name* by Chanel Miller (the Emily Doe of The People v. Turner) and Margaret Price's 'The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain', as well as my experience as a female-identifying college student with a prominent Panhellenic organization." Foster's research project is a prime example of how students can absorb and adapt information from our class readings and discussions to make meaningful connections to their personal experiences and existing interests. They clearly have an initial interest in sexual assault consequences and "aftermath" (as they repeat) but expand their understanding of those experiences and responses through an incorporation of the *bodymind* which emphasized that the effects of assault are not only physical but mental and emotional. This is further demonstrated in Foster's claims as they reflected on their methodology in their Final Website. They stated that Miller's "conversations surrounding the aftermath and the continuing present of the assault" inspired their interest in the topic which was "expanded to that of the bodymind connection explored" in Price's text and "With[in] the frame of English 281." They also noted, in their project introduction, that "This concept led me to iterate on the bodymind connection that prevailed as highly relevant to myself and my peers." Their use of *iterate* might show that Foster did have an understanding of the mental consequences of sexual assault but didn't quite have a term they deemed appropriate for discussing those consequences, making this concept useful for their "prevailing" arguments about the aftermath of sexual assault. This combination of uptake affordances allowed for Foster's unique enactment and artifact associated with the surfacing of their sedimented memories (uptake residues) of sexual assault's impact on physical and mental well-being which conditioned how *bodymind* was taken up.

The dynamic nature of micro-transfers reveals itself in these excerpts as Foster shows us the interweaving of, at least, (1) their personal identity and affiliations, (2) a book we did not read for class that resulted from a highly-publicized assault case and therefore, (3) the actions of the rapist as well as (4) the response from and trauma inflicted on the victim, (5) media coverage of the case, (6) an article read for class, and (7) additional articles read and synthesized in their final project. These elements interacting were also not separate from Foster's engagement with classmates as they discussed the article and it became more meaningful in its connection to their queer identity. In addition to defining themselves as a queer female and survivor of assault, they also defined themselves as someone who has authority to speak on this topic—possessing the skills necessary to complete this task. Their perception of themselves as such led to the uptake and thus adaptation and transformation of in-class knowledge for the purposes of completing the assignment and meeting their own goals. Additionally, the unique and complex adaptation of information as it is molded by many factors (i.e., uptake affordances) presents us with issues of space and time and how our and others' material being and movement blurs the lines of spatio-temporal boundaries.

If, as Medina claims, spatio-temporal boundaries are boundaries that "define concretely the where and when of an environment and the elements therein" as well as account for the "material environment and their existence in a particular point in time" (p. 79), Foster worked on, and blurred, such boundaries, particularly as they lived their own trauma into our classroom space. Often, trauma can force survivors out of the present moment, causing bodily and mental distress; so, memories physically *become* a part of "the elements therein" as they change the individual's being within their material environment. There is also, regarding Foster's project, a sort of seeping or warping of time and space that occurs in engaging with the history of sexual assault cases and how their legacy weaves through space and time as it is transported within the individual. Such seeping between material planes seems necessary for the production of effectively adapted and transformed knowledge in the "here and now" which only exists as a series of iterations of other heres and nows. Foster is a strong representative of this sort of seeping between material planes which we also observe as they took their reading and our discussion of Yergeau's forced hospitalization into a time and space where their mother was present. Additionally, Foster's majoring in archaeological science due to their interest in critical examinations of other cultures is

something that seeped into their work as they engaged with the disability stories of others as well as shifted perspectives of their queer and disability identity in their critical reflections. These perspectives and parallels they found between their disability and queer identity and their act of coming out to our entire class pushed the boundaries of the spatio-temporal field where the classroom became a location for discussions of disability and gender and sexuality with their ability to discuss disability acting as an opening for other cultural and political conversations. Moreover, this suggests that they were better able to be themselves within the context of the classroom since they shared this piece of information, potentially impacting their affect and the other material elements of the classroom. What this tells us, broadly, is that it is difficult to prevent the acquisition of new knowledge from altering our spatio-temporal boundaries whether it involves changes in where information is seen as appropriate for discussion, who is welcomed into conversations, how our affect changes upon receiving new information, or how our past experiences and iterations of ourselves contribute to the energies we bring into each given context. The networked nature of these interactions begs the question of how we can further complicate transfer research to account for how histories, affects, relationships, and other aspects of our lives come together to produce a seemingly cohesive whole presented in a written or multimodal uptake artifact. Micro-transfers and boundary-work help us pause and look at the fractions of transfer acts and how they are bumping or melding into each other while uptake theory helps us articulate how and why knowledge moves across those boundaries in various ways, attuning us to the movements of knowledge that are more elusive when we hold too tightly onto traditional definitions of transfer; in metaphorical terms, micro-transfer and uptake teach us that we will continue to miss the forest if we do not give credit to the trees.

Mason: Adapting and Transforming as an Exploration of Double-Binds

Mason, a first-year student at the time of the study, was pursuing a double major in entrepreneurship and marketing with a minor in political science. He disclosed in his Introductory Email that he was directly admitted into the business school at UW and had a strong desire to “become a founder.” Overall, he views himself as “resourceful, curious, and creative” as well as “ambitious” while acknowledging his privilege in that both of his parents are college graduates and education is highly valued in his family. This creative, curious, and ambitious nature was apparent throughout our time together as Mason consistently wrote beyond what was required to produce unique and insightful

reflections on rhetoric, adverse childhood experiences, and issues with diagnosis in the field of psychiatry. Within the same assignment, he disclosed his initial relationship to mental disability, stating that “I am a DRS student, but I do not have any accessibility concerns or access needs for [English 281]” and his diagnosis of “dyslexia and ADHD [doesn’t] debilitate my academics,” indicating that he might think teachers perceive him as less academically capable due to his diagnoses, which could stem from internalized stigma; so, his relationship with disability presented itself as tense from the start.

Despite one limitation of my study being that student names were not collected for the initial survey, Mason’s responses were easily identifiable due to the repeated statements in the email assignment referenced above, later assignments, and the survey where he spoke again about his dyslexia and ADHD but added details about his mother’s and brother’s mental disability experiences; this experience “growing up in an environment tainted with mental illness” helped his understanding of mental illness “[mature] a lot over time.” Although he reproduced some negative connotations attached to mental illness by saying the environment was “tainted” he did remedy this in part through his statement in the Initial Survey that “certain mental illnesses and disability can provide an advantage in the writing process” and reflected on how he sees his ADHD as being an asset in the process of invention. Although he built an identity as someone who has been negatively impacted by mental disability, he added depth to this, defining himself also as a stronger writer as a result, a perspective of himself he developed prior to entering the course. Mason’s close family ties to the topic of mental disability led him to see “the issue as personal, private, and inherently medical” and one that should first be presented and addressed by the parents of a suffering child—a spatio-temporal boundary that defines the when and where of mental disability as the home. As such, in his writing, Mason tended to avoid the personal apart from those few instances where he mentioned his brother’s physical and developmental disabilities and how that has impacted his family as well as his own diagnoses.

I introduce Mason in this section because he transformed and adapted his home and personal mental disability knowledge as he engaged in current learning and vice versa—his home knowledge allowed him to adapt and transform the current learning in ways that helped him sift through some of the double binds he experienced when reading the disability studies scholarship. He also confirms the existence of what King Beach (2003) and Wardle and Clement (2016) call double binds in student

learning which complicate transfer processes. For example, in Clement's own experience with a double bind, transfer was complicated in her honors seminar course where the instructor asked students to "consider matters of race, class, gender, and sexuality" which was "in direct conflict with her home values and experiences" (p. 168) and required her to find unique was to approach the new knowledge that were appropriate within the course context. Mason was similar not because he hadn't had experience with mental disability but because his experiences with it and the way others in his life talked about it were largely negative. Mason's working through this double bind also underscores how double binds can be potentiating in their disruption of uptake captures that might limit possibilities for responding to mental disability knowledge or prevent its uptake altogether.

Throughout Mason's writing and class contributions, the micro-transfers feeding his discursive and identity boundary shifts were often apparent as he vaguely referred to his home life, own diagnoses, the course texts, and his attitudes toward diagnosis generally. He demonstrated a great deal of interest in the first half of the course, connecting personally with the readings, stating his opinions, providing examples, and offering agreements and disagreements because he entered with a lot of confidence in the subject matter which appeared in his early definitions of mental health and disability based on his firsthand experience and in his engagement with these topics from the perspective of the authors. Although he did have confidence in the subject matter and firsthand experience, he did not take an expert stance and remained open to what the authors said by never immediately shutting down a viewpoint that contradicted what he was formerly and strictly committed to. A strong example of this appears in his response to Price's first chapter of *Mad at School* where he shared, at length, his prior knowledge about mental disability injustice in the education system, but linked that knowledge with Price's work, for example, in his statement that "Price mentions the need to diagnose, and I think this terminology is especially applicable. School systems label students who fail to meet the standard instead of giving them the attention and individualized structure they need to succeed." In this excerpt, Mason saw an opportunity for engaging with the subject matter (i.e., taking it up) due to its resonance with his prior experience and beliefs about the utility of individualized attention, therefore transforming how he thought about that prior experience and, then, increasing possibilities for responding to disability experiences later as well as making arguments in later assignments about approaches to diagnosis. This form of

engagement (i.e., being open to the ideas of the authors) was consistent throughout the free writing exercises, but another notable example is in his response to Yergeau where he claimed that “Although I had trouble getting acclimated to Yergeau's unconventional usage of syntax and structure, I think that their rhetorical choices of organization and style help echo their passion for the issue at hand and are appropriate for this genre of writing.” Below, I also share a quote from his response to Price’s “The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain” which we read during week four and which caused him to feel confused with the idea of disability desirability due to his contradicting at-home experience of his brother’s disabilities putting a significant amount of strain on not only his brother but the entire family. In his free writing exercise, he wrote “First, I was intrigued by the statement and argument relating to the desirability of disability, and queerness, specifically the passage, ‘There are moments when we are all queer/disabled, and that those disabled/queer moments are desirable.’ Initially, I was very confounded by this statement, especially after growing up in a household riddled with mental illness.” Admittedly, the concept of disability desirability can be confusing even for someone who is more acquainted with disability studies literature, and Price’s presentation of the concept as, at times, necessary and, at others, invalidating could lead to questions about her own stance and whether she fully agrees with one or the other. This level of nuance was something that led to his double bind because what Price was claiming some have advocated for, but what she was also pushing back on, did not resonate with his own or his family’s collective disability experience. Because Mason mentioned being “initially confounded”, the lingering effects of his personal experience (uptake captures) were suggested to be impacting what he seems to believe is an appropriate response to Price’s text. However, the use of “initially” might also suggest his double-bind experience was disrupting those deeply sedimented memories (uptake residues) that have contributed to his strict beliefs about the “personal, private, and…medical” nature of mental disability. This conflict was never explicitly resolved but, as will be discussed below, appears to be central to the claims and arguments he makes in his Project Proposal and Final Website, particularly when he presents his concern about his ADHD symptoms and behaviors being framed negatively rather than framed as characteristics that promote creativity and curiosity.

The micro-transfers that informed the shifting of his identity and discursive boundaries presented themselves explicitly in his Project Proposal titled “Beyond the Diagnostic Criteria: A Critical Analysis of

Overdiagnosis in ADHD and Anxiety Disorders" (his Final Website adopted a nearly identical name with the exception of replacing "and Anxiety Disorders" with "in Adolescents"). Within the Proposal, he mentioned that "my family has a history of disabilities and mental health issues" and "my experiences with mental health and diagnosis have motivated me to pursue this [topic]." Here, he reveals that the personal is interacting with the course subject matter to inspire the proposal of this particular topic—with this topic being just one potential uptake tethering his current learning to the Final Website assignment. He went on to disclose some disdain for his family's approach to his diagnosis and disorders, saying that "my behaviors were often framed through a negative lens of 'illness' rather than as positive attributes such as curiosity and creativity." His above confoundedness and intrigue toward Price's disability desirability claims seems to have been adapted as a way of advocating for himself (and transforming his perception of his past experience) as someone whose disabilities could have been treated as potentiating rather than as faults. In the same assignment, he claimed that diagnosis can, for some, be a "self-fulfilling prophecy" in that the label offered by a diagnosis can lead some to define themselves by that and think their lives can only turn out one way. The identification of Mason's work on his identity boundary suggests an inflexible boundary as he displayed the fixedness of himself as part of a particular family that has a mental disability history and the fixedness of himself as mentally disabled through the act of diagnosis. However, this identity boundary was permeable in that his disdain for his behaviors not being framed positively indicates a shifting in his attitude toward himself as disabled. Mason's prior, now seen as complicated, experience with mental disability allowed Price's text to be taken up and adapted for use to make arguments about appropriate diagnosis procedures. Said differently, he saw possibilities for adaptation and transformation of the current learning through the lens of his past experience but also of his past experience through the lens of disability desirability.

In his statement that "medical professionals may overlook critical contextual factors and non-medical influences contributing to behavioral symptoms" he disclosed a new perspective that revealed a shift in the discursive boundary around mental disability or, at least, ADHD; this not only resonates with the social model of disability, but is clearly connected to and adapted from ideas in Price's "Assaults on the Ivory Tower", our week three reading, where she argues that context was not considered in discussions of the shooters' behavior and choices. This adaptation permeates the entire project as he

continually emphasizes the “nuanced” and “multifaceted” view of diagnosis that is attentive to the holistic needs of an individual, that accounts for environmental, social, financial, and cultural factors. Taking up and adapting conversations in Bailey and Mobley’s text where the social and medical model are discussed as needing to be used in tandem, Mason stated in his Final Website that “By focusing on medical causes, alternative explanations and appropriate support may be missed”—this lends itself to both a medical and social perspective of disability without being explicit about the social construction of such. Further, in the diagnosis pros and cons section of his Final Website, he wrote that “It’s critical to take a step back and evaluate yourself and your needs before allowing someone else to define your experiences” which is suggested to resonate with or be adapted from experiences of his parents making diagnosis and treatment decisions for him. Thus, the disability experience might have become less about him and more about those outside of himself not valuing his reality in a way that could have been more supportive and productive. This all reveals itself in Mason’s approach to adapting information we are learning in class—he made sense of it through reflecting on his personal experience and in the process directly addressed the double bind he faced as he learned more about others' disability experiences.

Other examples of the micro-transfers that contributed to his particular adaptation and transformation of mental disability knowledge involve his proposal in the website of further self-reflection and analysis of one’s own actions and suggestion that those presenting symptoms “seek perspectives of trusted friends, family, and most important, your parents to gain external insights into your behaviors and whether they are problematic.” Though these statements contradict each other—with one suggesting individual perception and the other suggesting the need for outside validation—Mason’s early comments about mental disability being “personal, private, and inherently medical” were transformed in his final project as he focused on the necessity of community in the diagnosis process as well as social factors and other, non-medical, methods of treatment for ADHD. Mason’s use of the word *problematic* in the above passage is also striking. It’s unclear what it would mean or look like for one’s behaviors to be “problematic.” The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *problematic* as “constituting or presenting a problem or difficulty.” In such a case, Mason might see behaviors related to mental distress as having the potential to cause problems or difficulties—an uptake capture habituated by his repeated exposure to mental disability through negative frames—but it is still unclear whether he meant those behaviors are difficult for

the individual experiencing them or those surrounding them. The use of this term might indicate that he still had a somewhat inflexible discursive boundary around mental disability, defining it as something that is tainting or that riddles individuals and their loved ones with suffering. Although mental disability can and often does cause a great deal of suffering, presenting individuals' behaviors as problems can be counterproductive in their healing process. So, it might be the case that Mason's definition of mental disability was still being dominated by his home experience and the perspectives of his own disabilities as troubling which was then adapted for use in his final arguments. In addition to his discursive boundary, this terminology also suggests the tracing of his identity boundary as someone who has been perceived as behaving "problematically" since his family, as stated, framed his disabilities negatively rather than seeing their potential. Because this knowledge and attitude toward mental disability is appearing across contexts—that is, being adapted and transformed in ways that Mason sees as appropriate within the given contexts—it is also a way of allowing the spatio-temporal boundaries of home and school to overlap, making them permeable boundaries that can intercept and implement information from one another.

Another interesting point of boundary-marking that occurred for Mason was in his intersectionality free writing exercise during week five where he noted that he sees cultural norms in research being problematic versus the use of the scientific method, but then he went on to use more cultural norms, personal experience, and circumstantial issues as a valid point for studying and diagnosing mental disability in his Final Website—a seemingly subconscious adaptation of the research skills and values we discussed together. For example, he consistently repeats that social norms and cultural differences might impact disparities in the diagnosis of ADHD, such as in his claim that "With differing cultural norms, social expectations, and personal experiences, inconsistent diagnoses and treatment plans can be carried out despite relying on similar criteria for diagnosis." In addition, he assessed the progression of DSM criteria that have changed in response to shifting social attitudes and perspectives and focused a good deal of attention on the misuse and misinformation spreading in the media and other platforms that impact a person's perception of their likelihood of having ADHD. Here, the discursive boundary around *research* is permeable since the performance of research itself wasn't changing but the tools with which it can be conducted were expanded and viewed as useful—an unconscious adaptation of information learned

across the course texts. Because of this, his identity boundary also appeared to be permeable in that he saw himself as now possessing alternative skills for conducting research. Seeing oneself as equipped with new skills is a way of demonstrating permeability in that Mason's identity boundary is not being redrawn but he is allowing the boundary to be permeated by information that reshapes what he sees himself capable of doing.

Throughout his analysis, the undertones of his personal connection seeped through. The contradictions in his experience and the idea of disability desirability did not force an inflexible, impermeable boundary around his identity which, as with Peter, was a possibility considering Mason's disclosure of his position "outside" of the positive perceptions of mental disability. Rather, his memory of his experience was the same, but the new perspective diversified the texture of his identity boundary as experiencing suffering and shame was true, but the positives of the disability symptoms were also true which allowed him to see possibilities for taking up and adapting Price's and others' work in his final project. In other words, the discursive boundary around *mental disability* was inflexible, yet permeable—mental disability did not in itself change but it became more nuanced and the uptake captures less secure. What is also interesting is that, despite his desire to focus more on individual positionality and the intersections of our identities, he still believed in "the potential for full recovery." Though he seemed to adopt a combination of a medical *and* social perspective—a potential adaptation of Bailey and Mobley's detailed discussion of the two—he remained latched onto the need for cure, further demonstrating the inflexibility of the discursive boundary around *mental disability*. His identity boundary can also be defined as inflexible and permeable since he saw himself as the same (his experience and symptoms did not change) but more complex, accepting the pain and demonstrating ownership of his experience and placing blame of the negative view outside of himself and partly out of his control.

What's especially interesting in Mason's work is how, in his pursuit of addressing an issue that is personal to him, he synthesized (and thus adapts and transforms) the course themes of intersectionality, healthcare injustice and implicit bias, and lack of representation in healthcare. He mentioned that Price's "bodymind" reading contributed to his writing but doesn't necessarily state *how* when he speaks in his Final Critical Class Reflection, but we see where this reading operates as demonstrated in the above examples. In his Final Website, he also wrote that "Our classroom discussions have also highlighted how

power dynamics and systemic barriers can make it difficult for marginalized communities to access healthcare." This is an example of an adaptation and transformation of Bailey and Mobley's and Wong and Nibokun's texts in that he merged their conversations with a conversation about the use of the DSM to, sometimes, inaccurately diagnose certain populations or to be inaccurate in the sense that research on mental disorders has often only included certain populations—a point that is critiqued in Price's first chapter of *Mad at School* which we read during our introduction to rhetoric or week two of the quarter. Further, he went on to say that "These cultural differences and externalities can potentially affect diagnosis and treatment approaches, and our classroom discussions have reminded us that it is necessary to realize this." *Intersectionality* was a concept that clearly stuck with him as he adapted that concept to meet conversations about mental disability, for example, when he mentioned how "age, environment, and individual differences all contribute to symptoms development" and that we need to consider a variety of factors to fully and appropriately treat individuals. Additionally, he stated that "Racial bias in the medical field plays a role in these disparities" which, again, resonates with Bailey and Mobley's and Wong and Nibokun's conversations. His attachment to the concept of intersectionality, particularly as it was used here to explain differences of symptom development and presentation and how it was used above in his arguments regarding which approach to take to address symptoms (individual or collective), could have been a way for him to reconcile the difficulties he faced with the double bind in his story and those we read as a class.

The claims to attention to the environment might also indicate an adaptation of Price's "Assaults on the Ivory Tower" since Price argues that Cho and Kazmierczak should not have had their violence only attributed to their mental health struggles which were framed as inherently nefarious. His attention to the subjectivity of the DSM also resonates with our conversations on citational politics and how knowledge is informed from few perspectives rather than all. I also mentioned above his ability to synthesize the information in his website that he found, but also to synthesize class concepts to accent and complement his unique topic; rather than adapting and transforming pieces of information from singular texts, Mason used his awareness of their intertextuality to adapt and transform it for use uniquely to complement his research topic. Not only did Mason demonstrate pulling on Wong and Nibokun, Price, and Bailey and Mobley, but also combined these discussions with our conversations on rhetoric and subjectivity in Dana

Cloud's work. Though not explicit, he claimed that "The process of diagnosing mental disorders is subjective" and the "criteria carry with them external influences" which follows our conversations about reality and bias. These moments of knowledge from one reading or one experience "crossing over" into Mason's understanding of other readings and his final research topic are acts of transfer that were made possible in the micro-transfers facilitated within the classroom between his prior experience, the readings, class discussions, and observations of the use of ADHD symptoms in popular discourse. For this sort of transfer to occur, the micro-transfers leading to it were necessary in that they allowed Mason to do the boundary-work that made it possible for him to move knowledge from one realm of thought into another. Further, his overarching interest in subjectivity that resulted from a range of our readings could have, like intersectionality, been a concept that worked as a tool for tackling the double bind in his experience and others'. Mason's engagement in the course and his approach to seemingly come to some peace about the double bind are also representative of the sort of work that can be complemented by uptake theory. For Mason, the uptake residues attached to the topic of mental disability initially restricted his uptake captures and therefore the resulting enactment, or the options he thought he had for adapting and transforming the course subject matter. However, as the uptake affordances contradicted what he is accustomed to in conversations about mental disability he saw various possibilities for responding, allowing those sedimentations of memory to exist to some degree while also selecting alternative uptake pathways for responding with our conceptual tools. He, in other words, found ways to adapt and transform what we read and discussed by aligning it with his own interests and experiences while performing new uptake enactments through his discussions of subjectivity and individualized approaches to mental healthcare.

As I'll discuss further below, Mason's work shows us the importance of intertextuality and the role of the instructor to make connections between the texts, themes, and concepts explicit in ways that could allow for such adaptation and synthesis. Moreover, Mason is one of four of the students to value Price's discussion on the bodymind connection. Each of those four students, however, took up and adapted that information differently, presenting implications for transfer researchers and providing further evidence of the necessity of micro-transfer and its connection to identifying uptakes in our analyses.

Cara: Selling Connections to the Queer Experience

I turn back to Cara in this section because she seemed to have the most metacognitive approach to adapting and transforming knowledge throughout the term. Multiple times she made claims about how she took up the information and how that resulted in the final product she submitted. The first instance of this was in her Rhetorical Analysis Memo when she realized she did not analyze a text that *explicitly* referenced mental disability; therefore, she didn't classify the article she analyzed as a mental disability artifact. In her Writer's Memo, she acknowledged this and argued about the mental moves (uptakes) she used to get to that point and how she saw them as connected. She wrote

> I realized after writing that I did not use an article centered on mental disability, health, or illness. However, after thinking, I believe I did despite the study's face-value purpose. In many places, specifically the Texas town in the case, homosexuality and 'gayness' are treated as mental disabilities, and I think this case study does a good job of representing this. The case study also works to show the effects of these beliefs. I realize that it is not stated outright in the article, but after rereading, writing this memo, and rethinking, I do believe this case study is representative of 'gayness' being represented as a mental disability or sickness.

Here, Cara was doing the sort of "selling" that Nowacek (2011) sees as part of the process of "integration" or transfer acts that require "some degree of metacognitive awareness" (p. 34). When students "sell" their transfer act, they are successfully conveying a connection to an appropriate audience (p. 40), in this instance, me as the instructor asking them to analyze a mental disability artifact. In doing this selling, Cara shifted discursive and identity boundaries by redefining traditional perceptions of the teacher as the sole authority and positioning herself to make decisions about her own work. In other words, she produced an identity of herself as the one who decides whether the submitted work meets the requirements and me, the teacher, as someone willing to listen and value the unique connections she is making across texts and contexts. In using the Writer's Memo space to redefine the traditional teacher-student dynamic, she also increased the permeability of both her and my identity boundary. Beyond this, such selling might act as a precursor to the adaptation and transformation she did later in her Final Website by acting as an affordance of the situation and, as such, increasing the number of uptakes she saw as appropriate for responding to the Final Website prompt.

From the Rhetorical Analysis Memo, students produced a Project Proposal for their Final Website. Cara's Project Proposal and Final Website took the title "The Expectations of Heteronormativity" which she claimed "outlines the issues of heteronormativity and its effect on the LGBTQIA+ community,

identifies the goals for bringing awareness to these issues, and leave readers with an understanding of the steps needed to divulge the systems in place." She added,

> This proposed project will explore the deep roots of heteronormativity and its effect on the queer community's 'bodymind.' It also will work to discover the steps that can be taken to bring awareness to these issues and lead to a more suitable and functional path to equity

as well as "start a conversation on the damage caused by heteronormativity." Her project was

> based on internal thinking, conversations with friends, and experiences like the one [with my family] described previously…I have discovered the norms of heteronormativity and the rules it places in the world. These thoughts also came after reading Margaret Price's 'The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain.'

She was explicit about Price's influence and the connection to bodymind but a couple of sentences later she added

> Despite the world appearing to shift towards equity of identity, the 'norm' still controls the rules and regulations of the world. Heteronormative ideals create the concepts of 'coming out,' how to 'be gay', and the role the queer community serves. They don't let us exist outside of their realm. If we don't conform, if we become fluid instead of stable, they shame us.

More subtly, and in her emphasis on the existence of and conforming to norms, we can hear echoes of Dolmage's arguments in the *Disability Rhetoric* introduction which is consistent with her week two free writing assignment responding to the same text where she connected most to the "discussion of 'normal'" and explained how it resonated with her own experiences with a learning disability and stated that "I think the school system has really created a meaning of normal that many find hard to shake." In her interview during week seven, Cara continued to synthesize the course readings and make them interact. She took the idea of the feminist killjoy to make claims about what it means for her to spread awareness about mental disability as she has wanted to do in the past and how she wants to in the future. She said a goal of hers is to spread awareness and I was curious about what that would look like for her or in her life. She said,

> when we were talking about like feminist killjoy in class today like bringing it up in situations that may be uncomfortable, and like talking at people who like have the like set image of like what it means to be like mentally disabled or have a mental disability and like kind of try to educate them and what it really might be compared to their understanding. So, I think [my role] it's like challenging the perspectives.

Although Sara Ahmed does not speak about mental disability and although we did explicitly connect Ahmed's claims to our mental disability discussion in class, Cara connected Ahmed's argument (read

during week six) about disrupting the comfort of those who are complacent in systems of power to our need to destigmatize mental disability and bring it into her everyday conversations. Through this adaptation and synthesis, Cara's identity boundary might have shifted as she saw herself more as an agent of change in conversations about mental disability which I will discuss further in the section "Cara: Listening, Learning, and Challenging Perspectives" in Chapter 5. In other words, this adaptation beyond the course readings and into her everyday life has implications for moves she will make later.

Moreover, in her critiques of the norm, she revealed the working on an identity boundary as well as the discursive boundary around the term *norm*. Within the few lines of her proposal where she used the first-person plural "us" and the "experience…described previously"—which involved her reflection on playing a card game with family members who did not know what *heteronormativity* meant despite their "significant role in the heteronormative world"—she identified herself as part of the queer community and, therefore, as someone existing outside of the norm as well as distinct from her family in rural Illinois who do not have to be concerned with the consequences of the world being largely heteronormative. When she works on this boundary, which appears to be permeable, she also reveals the micro-transfers that enable this sort of boundary-work to be done. Overall, she connected immediately with the readings on mental disability—with Price's and Dolmage's being the first two, read during week two. As above, she used this space to think critically about the nuances of disability and diagnosis. Her disclosure of depression and then emphasis on an emotional connection to the issues could signal an interaction or micro-transfer for this information in that our dispositions are connected to our emotions and values. She also alluded to the inclusion of ideas from our intersectionality portion of the course by addressing how she approached or will approach bias and the inclusion of various perspectives. Similar to Mason, Cara consistently made unique connections across texts, combining a variety of our class discussions by acknowledging citational politics, discussing the intersections of identity, and sharing on mental health. That means, she at least combined our discussions of Price, Dolmage, Ahmed, and potentially even Bailey and Mobley. But, the micro-transfer occurring here is not only her immediate interaction with the text but also her ability to adapt it meaningfully so as to interact in potentiating ways with the other aspects of her experience and identity such as being part of the queer community, her group of friends, and her family life as well as the vision of her future, but what occurs between the micro-transfer and

uptake enactment is still uncertain without a study more tailored toward those processes in-between receipt of and response to information.

Cara's acts of shaping information to fit her story and the story she told about heteronormativity's impact on the queer community in her research project resonates a lot with those of her peers. For example, like Mason, Cara recognized the intertextuality of the readings without direct instruction to make particular connections. In addition, however, Cara's use of the writer's memo space to justify her use of what she considered to not be a mental disability related artifact shows that, as many have, we need to use writer's memos and offer other reflective activities that might reveal micro-transfer and student uptakes. More intentionally framing writer's memos or providing prompts that ask students to make claims about how their assignment meets the prompt could serve as important data points for those studying transfer, particularly those interested in seeing how students "sell" connections they have uniquely made. It might also, for the sake of studying uptake, to ask more "why" questions to better understand the choices students are making and which uptake captures and residues they are attached to.

Peter: Uptake Captures and Residues' Impact on Adaptation and Transformation

Earlier, I articulated my interest in the complexity and nuance of transfer processes and the innumerable variables that contribute to each student's transfer acts that may not lead them to present "successful" transfer in traditional ways. Looking at Peter's work and contributions with a micro-transfer framework reinforces this interest—at a micro-level, Peter's boundaries were meaningfully redrawn as he discussed mental disability knowledge, but the absence of mental disability knowledge from his final project, "An Educational Deficit: The Impact on Marginalized Communities," could, according to traditional definitions of transfer, be deemed negative, zero, or unsuccessful transfer. And, in my earlier discussion of Peter's relationship to mental disability, I explained my surprise, excitement, and curiosity about Peter's statement in his Final Critical Class Reflection that

> We spent a lot of time focusing on mental disabilities and the different topics revolving around that subject, along with the different voices who are present in current conversations. For me, I found it a bit difficult to relate and really get into the topic, as I personally have not experienced things or been exposed to topics that others in class have [so] I find it difficult to relate [and] I find it harder to really understand and get into the topic at times.

This came as a surprise because, as I explained earlier, Peter discovered productive ways to engage with the subject matter during free writing exercises and in-class discussions by building a relationship to

mental disability through the boundaries he marked around his identity and that of his peers. What resulted at the end of the term, however, was a research project disconnected from any mention of mental disability. Although this may, traditionally, be perceived as negative or zero transfer given we take Peter's incomes (lack of exposure to mental disability) and compare them to his final artifact, looking toward the micro-transfers that led to this artifact allows us to see that transfer *is* happening since we can observe the way knowledge uniquely moves across the boundaries Peter marks. Micro-transfer and rich descriptions of the moment-to-moment workings of student writing and engagement bring us closer to understanding the uptake captures Peter saw as appropriate based on the uptake affordances given his own, the discursive, and the spatio-temporal uptake residues. In other words, what's interesting, more so than whether Peter carried specific knowledge into the new artifact, is the series of decisions and selections he made to adapt and transform his learning in a final project that he saw as belonging within the course (English 281) focused on mental disability discourse.

Upon entering the course, Peter's first encounter with the subject of mental disability led to his decision against having a connection to the topic which made it "hard to relate and really get into [it]." From the possible uptakes resulting from the blending of his prior experience with this "new" subject, he chose one that inherently limited possibilities for adapting that information. However, his repeated interactions with the topic did result in some engagement, as stated above, as he developed a relationship to mental disability through the act of listening to his peers and the scholars we read in class. Said differently, he gained and accepted exposure as he repeatedly chose to listen as a reader and contributor to class discussions which helped him redraw the boundary around engagement within the course. As this occurred, Peter found ways to discuss the topic despite his belief that he could not relate to it. In his free writing exercise responding to our reading of Price's first chapter of *Mad at School* and Dolmage's introduction to *Disability Rhetoric* during week two, he took the time to define *ableism* and *disablism*, an attempt to relate the topic to observations in his everyday life. Beyond this, a lot of his engagement with the readings on mental disability in the free writing exercises involved examining the text from a rhetorical analysis standpoint. In this way, our approach to discussing mental disability discourse through a rhetorical lens granted him an additional pathway for responding to content that was

unrelatable which I speak about in more detail in Chapter 5 in the section titled “Peter: Expanding Uptake Possibilities by Teaching Disability from a Rhetorical Perspective.”

Peter’s first opportunity to entertain conversations about mental disability outside of the classroom and away from the free writing assignments was offered through the Rhetorical Analysis Memo assignment which asked students to rhetorically analyze a mental disability-related artifact in the format of a business memo. However, Peter made the decision to not complete the assignment during week five as others did (he later submitted it at the end of the term, just before week 10, which I discuss further below). Much of these decisions to *not* engage were attributed by him to his senioritis, but his revelation at the end of the term makes me curious about how much of this was really a result of certain uptakes not yet being visualized. Although Peter did not write about Wong and Nibokun’s podcast discussion in his free writing exercise during that week, his reflections on the course as he needed to select a topic for his research project made their comments more meaningful.

Encountering the final research prompt as an uptake affordance alongside the other affordances of the classroom, Peter had the option to resist finding a connection at all, limiting the boundary of the prompt which asked students to “write about a topic inspired from *any* of our course readings and discussions” and indicated that “Your topic can be loosely or explicitly connected to our readings and discussions, but you must be able to identify and argue for that connection.” Instead, the micro-transfers that occurred between his own interests, the unrelatable course subject matter, the prompt, and his reading/listening of Wong and Nibokun’s discussion in the *Disability Visibility* podcast enabled him to find a connection that he hadn’t been able to see for the first half of the term. In his Project Proposal, as quoted in the previous section, he claimed that the podcast episode on “Black Mental Health” in which Wong and Nibokun talked about therapy resources not being available to marginalized communities “opened [his] eyes” to other resources that are unavailable to certain populations. Peter decided that this conversation was the bridge between the course topic and his Final Website. The uptake he selected (i.e., the theme of social justice and lack of resources for marginalized communities) was afforded by the podcast existing within the course and alongside his interest and curiosity about quality educational resources not being available to everyone. Peter did, however, see other topics as options (i.e., other uptakes as possible enactments resulting from the micro-transfers), stating that he considered “the

prevalence of drug use among those in marginalized communities, or something along the lines of looking into how often and how many young people join gangs within these communities and why." Because Peter had other options for Final Website topics, his decision to focus on a topic related to social justice demonstrates that the micro-transfers that occurred between the course readings, discussions, and the personal statement and recognition of his more privileged subject position contributed to the redrawing of his identity boundary as someone who can be and is invested in social justice issues and who, as someone in a non-marginalized position, can leverage his privilege to support others.

Another example of Peter's adaptation and transformation that resulted from the uptake affordances of the class readings and discussions and therefore his increased uptake captures is his response in his Writer's Memo for the Rhetorical Analysis Memo which, as stated in the section "Peter: A Non-Disabled Student Welcomes Disability Knowledge", was submitted, not during the original week five, but between weeks nine and 10. For this assignment that asked students to rhetorically analyze a mental disability-related artifact, he chose to analyze a video titled "A Veteran Victory: The Battle at Home | Addition, PTSD, and Depression." In his Writer's Memo for this assignment, he wrote:

> One piece of knowledge on mental disability that I will hold on to going forward would be that many veterans do not know how to deal with the ailments they have developed. Sometimes when I see a drug addict on the streets, they have signs or state that they are veterans. At first I was really focused on the drug aspect, and why they turn to drugs of all things, but this video helped me identify the reasons that many do, and has opened my eyes going forward.

His redrawing of the boundary around *mental disability* as including PTSD and drug use as a coping mechanism enabled him to see something that he *did* have prior experience with (writing about PTSD in Tim O'Brien's "The Things They Carried" from a previous course) as a potential uptake for the mental disability knowledge that was both meaningful for him and appropriate within the course. It's possible, too, that Peter's recognition of PTSD as associated with social justice solidified social justice as an appropriate uptake for the final project. However, with his Rhetorical Analysis Memo being submitted *after* his Final Website, it's difficult to determine if this is the case. Most important is that, determining that Peter did not transfer or unsuccessfully transferred mental disability knowledge is unfair given the exceptional work he did to build a connection with the course content and the affordance of a loose connection to anything discussed in our class. The seeming lack of adaptation and transformation of mental disability knowledge in his final project is not so much a *lack* but a difference that can be better revealed through

an examination of boundary-work and micro-transfers to help us better value students' diverse incomes and their interactions with elements of the current context.

Implications of Students' Adaptation and Transformation of Mental Disability Knowledge

As with the first theme, the four students whose stories I shared in this section all brought to light implications for transfer studies and teaching for transfer approaches. For example, Mason's story revealed the potential of double binds to inspire curiosity or resistance which signals writing instructors to be transparent about the existence of double binds and to encourage students to write about them as they face them. Supporting engagement with such conflicts could help students resolve negative feelings toward experiences, such as those Mason had with mental disability, and the boundary-work we observed occurring in Mason's journey helped identify which micro-transfers could have influenced those positive shifts, offering insight into which sort of interactions we might want to support in the classroom. Mason's story also indicated that more attention to uptakes could be beneficial in disrupting uptake residues and captures that limit possibilities students see for engagement. In addition, looking at boundaries, uptakes, and micro-transfers helps us recognize what and why students may adapt and transform knowledge in vastly different ways. For example, four out of five of the students introduced in this chapter—Foster, Mason, Ethan, and Cara—all indicated some degree of influence from Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" but all adapted the information differently according to their values, interests, goals, and degrees of prior knowledge. Some students combined a wide range of course texts, ideas, and concepts, identifying their intertextual nature without explicit instruction. However, it might have served students well to have that intertextuality made explicit to increase micro-transfers and guide students toward more boundary-work that increased possible uptake enactments in response to information and situations later. In other words, although each student made a multitude of connections (e.g., Foster), the texts made varied appearances in the students' work and those appearances did not always indicate a redrawing of boundaries that increased the uptakes students saw as possible and, consequently, their likelihood of adapting that knowledge for use in diverse contexts. As such, turning toward micro-transfers is beneficial for more deeply understanding the intricacies of our students' transfer processes rather than maintaining expectations about how information from each text *should* be transferred. This benefit is only deepened given we also recognize the influence of uptake

captures and residues on students' responses to micro-transfers and, thus, their ability to (re)draw boundaries that commit them to transfer later. As above, Cara's personal metacognitive approach to adaptation and transformation showcases the need to maintain consistent metacognitive tasks in our classrooms to encourage students to see and sell their own connections to the course subject matter.

Overall, these students represent how one's individual adaptation and transformation of knowledge is deeply impacted by their personal experiences, dispositions, interests, goals, and motivations and their unique micro-transfers as they come into contact with information, people, and spaces differently. The first three students discussed in the Adapt and Transform theme all had some degree of personal connection to mental disability meaning the knowledge we dissected together in class could only be adapted first through these initial lenses since we are all pre-oriented by past experiences as Nowacek et al. (2024) remind us above. However, Peter who, despite the shifting of his discursive and identity boundaries, did not explicitly adapt the reading or discussion topics in his final project other than the overarching topic of concept of social justice. He did not have past knowledge or confidence in the subject matter to apply to his current learning in a way that made it meaningful and, therefore, worthy of adaptation into his final project. In traditional transfer studies, an analysis of Peter's final product could have resulted in claims about zero or negative transfer, but boundary-work identification allowed us to see what connections Peter *was* making, why, and how he saw that as appropriate within the course which is evidence of micro-transfer and uptake theory creating possibilities for transfer researchers to examine the product on a more microscopic level to provide even more of an explanation as to why students' responses to the same learning conditions result in different acts of transfer. As in the case of Foster, the students in this section show us that we have been missing the trees for the forest, making judgments based on final products or full transitions into alternative contexts instead of remembering that the pieces (micro-transfers and uptakes) make the (still incomplete) whole because these are "complex interactions that occur *continually* as people navigate the boundary-work that iteratively brings the world into being" and are a "shifting of boundaries that allows people to apply past knowledge and skills to the present context" (Medina, p. 197). Although they occur on the moment-to-moment scale, the basic experience of transfer is still enacted in the projection of past knowledge onto the new and vice versa.

To begin this chapter, I reviewed seven of my research questions which were addressed by the students' stories I shared. The changes that occur when students are reading and writing about mental disability, and the boundaries they mark along the way, are vast and varied as some changes relate to students' perceptions of themselves and relationships to others or the subject of mental disability—such as in Ethan's story where he interacted differently with his co-workers and Cara who adopted the identification marker of "disabled"—while some relate to where students see it acceptable to speak about mental disability (e.g., in the case of Mason who began with a view of mental disability as personal and private but argued, by the end of the course, that we should also bring our concerns about it to others) which is revealed in the translation and reappearance of thoughts, ideas, and concepts related to mental disability in student writing and dialogue (like in the various translations of Price's *bodymind* across six of the student profiles). As such, I have shown above what anticipated and perceptible knowledge application and micro-transfer occurred in my course as well as explained how different levels of confidence or familiarity with the subject matter can influence students' uptake and boundary-marking activity. Of the questions presented, only one has not been fully addressed: In what ways does confidence with course content contribute to student self-advocacy and agency? Although we did see students move through the course with a range of exposures to and experiences with mental disability knowledge, little discussion was had about how this contributed to students' self-advocacy and agency. In the following chapter, I turn back to this question while introducing my final three themes: Class Environment, Rhetorical Awareness, and Agents of Change which help reinforce the social nature of transfer hinted at in this chapter. Chapter 6, then, will review the implications within this and the following chapter, expand on the answers to my research questions, and offer broader implications for writing studies, transfer research, and disability studies.

Chapter 5. Supporting Micro-Transfer and Expanding Uptake Possibilities Through Class Environments, Rhetorical Awareness, and Opportunities for Advocacy

In the previous chapter, I began by returning to the issue of transfer's ephemerality and the nuances in students' transfer acts that cannot be accounted for no matter the definitions or methods of transfer research. Following that brief discussion, I defined boundaries, why they are a necessary unit of analysis, and outlined the types of boundaries I would identify within three co-constitutive fields, as defined by Dylan Medina (2017), and all of which are only a starting point for this research. I then presented the stories of five students and analyzed those stories within the themes (1) Relationships to Disability and (2) Adapt and Transform. In other words, I analyzed how the interaction of students' personal experience with mental disability and our course readings, discussions, and each other inspired the performance of boundary-work that shaped their varied engagement within the course as well as how the interactions between mental disability knowledge and prior knowledge resulted in differing adaptations and transformations of our learning. Throughout those discussions, I hinted at the influence of our class environment and discussions on students' shift in relationship to mental disability. This was particularly apparent in Ethan's and Foster's cases due to their explicit statements about in-class influence. But it was also true for Peter in his analysis of his own and other's positions as well as Cara who was struck by her in-class conversations on disability desirability and expectations society places on queer people. I bring some of those students back to the conversation in this chapter, explaining how their references to our classroom and others within it matter for boundary-marking and remarking and, therefore, how the interactions of students with each other, the instructor, and other elements of the material environment contribute to micro-transfers in our classrooms. Following my analysis of students' stories within this first theme—Class Environment—I present two final themes: (1) Rhetorical Awareness and (2) Agents of Change. Although these three themes help me respond to some of the same questions those in Chapter 4 did, together they respond to a different combination of overlapping research questions, including those left unanswered thus far related to how changes in students' understanding of rhetoric and tools for rhetorical analysis helped them draw different kinds of boundaries around mental disability that then led to different micro-transfers and uptakes, as well as how by redrawing advocacy boundaries, including via genre, around mental disability students were then able to create uptake pathways for transfer to the final project and beyond. That combination of questions is as follows:

1) What changes occur when students are reading and writing about mental disability?

2) In what ways do thoughts, ideas, or concepts related to mental disability translate and reappear in student writing and dialogue?

3) What anticipated and perceptible knowledge application and micro-transfer occurs within the course?

4) In what other ways might we find indications that the writing classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate the transfer of mental disability knowledge?

5) To what extent can these changes prepare students for future engagement with mental disability?

6) What genre possibilities do students see for engaging the content we have covered in the course?

7) What changes can we trace to the boundaries that students construct about mental disability discourse?

All three themes speak to these seven questions, but Rhetorical Awareness and Agents of Change address a few others on their own. Rhetorical Awareness additionally responds to

1) What happens to student writing as a result of this engagement?

2) What new words, perceptions, relations to knowledge, and concepts do students demonstrate knowledge of?

3) Where do students see this information being useful for them beyond the course?

Agents of Change overlaps further with Rhetorical Awareness in answering that third question, but also responds to

1) In what ways does confidence with course content contribute to student self-advocacy and agency?

Like Chapter 4, these themes are presented and discussed within their own respective sections despite their obvious overlap and interconnectedness. Similarly, each themed section concludes with a brief statement on the implications of the analysis, to which I return in Chapter 6.

Class Environment and Peer Interaction Support for Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Marking

The theme of Class Environment speaks directly to the social nature of transfer and the need to focus on both individual and social/interactive elements of transfer that might influence a single transfer act. This theme arose out of quite a few students commenting on how positive and productive the class discussions were for them and what they learned from engaging in the class discussions or interacting with peers. This theme is drawn directly from an *in vivo* code where both “class environment” and “class

discussions" were used to speak positively about the students' learning. For example, Yeni claimed that he valued the free writing exercises and "vibrant learning environment." This theme, then, centers around any mention of the effects of class discussion, climate, interaction, or activities on students' learning about mental disability as well as any indication that class or peers' discussions influenced their uptake of assignment prompts. The class environment deserves focus not only because of students' explicit notes about its benefits but also because a classroom is such a dynamic space in which the "environment" is established through the work of the instructor, students, and their collective and individual memories as well as the institutional memories that support the boundary around *classroom*. Initially, the classroom, as a thing, interacts with the students and instructor in a way that inherently limits uptake captures, or what people see as possible within that space whether that's in writing, dialogue, or movement. In other words, the uptake residues stuck to the institutionalized *classroom* typically limit students' uptake captures and therefore limit the number of possible micro-transfers that can occur to reveal boundary-markings. For example, if students see the classroom as a space in which the instructor is the sole authority, they may not find it possible to redirect a conversation in the way Cara and Foster did during our discussion of "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain." Rather, they'd likely engage in more habituated and "low risk" ways, possibly, for example, responding only to the direct questions posed by the instructor. A micro-transfer analysis focuses on the moment-to-moment interactions between students and other students as well as students and instructor and how those repeated interactions result in micro-transfers that allow students to see different uptakes through their redefinition of boundaries around appropriate content, genre performances, and behavior. The stories in this section illuminate how course content, prompts, and instructor actions can affect boundary-markings and disrupt habituated uptakes to grant students more agency over their writing and creates more opportunities for their unique connections to mental disability knowledge to further support its transfer.

Hearts: Supporting Micro-Transfers through Class Discussions and Climate

Hearts was a sophomore whose major was undecided at the time of her enrollment in English 281, but she was interested in studying business administration because of the job opportunities it offered and the various paths she could take, such as marketing, finance, accounting, or economics. As a first-generation college student, Hearts was proud of her position at UW, seeing as her parents are the ones

who encouraged her to pursue a post-secondary degree. Upon entering our course, Hearts was optimistic about the opportunities she would have to learn and saw it as a place to “make friends and communicate better with people”—goals she shared with me in her Introductory Email assignment during week one. In the same email, she claimed that her most helpful learning experiences have been informed by the phrase “Do not be shy.” Throughout the term, Hearts held herself to that affirmation, speaking often in class, taking every opportunity to write with full force, and committing herself to vulnerability in the hopes of helping others. I include Hearts’ story in this section because her hesitations around pursuing her Final Website topic provide valuable insights into the power of social engagement for supporting varied uptake pathways and transfer.

Like some of the stories told in Chapter 4, Hearts’ English 281 story ended with a Final Website project, in her case titled “Exploring Self-Injury and Mental Illness”, a topic which was inspired by Price’s “The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain.” Prior to submitting the Final Website, Hearts completed the Project Proposal which she titled “Relationships Between Self-Harm and Mental Pain.” She claimed that both of these assignments were concerned with promoting empathy, understanding, and care for those who self-harm. She was explicit about Price’s influence, beginning the “Problem” portion of the Proposal by summarizing Price’s main points, introducing *bodymind*, and revealing that she was “interested in how Price [used] her self-injury experience to discuss the body-mind concept.” Within Price’s text, Price discloses her own diagnoses and positionality as someone who is “diagnosed with a range of DSM labels ranging from the mundane (major depression) to the sensational (borderline personality disorder, or BPD)” (p. 277) to demonstrate the power relations and issue of fitting for a scenario in which one person—who she calls Person A and, then, describes as herself—is “mentally ill” and experiencing “transient psychosis”, causing them to wish to “strike [themself] on the head with [a lamp]” (p. 272). In other words, she says that Person A is “experiencing mental pain of a kind that must be *alleviated* through striking his own head” (p. 272), where Person B tries to prevent such an act, believing that they will be preventing harm. She complicates the situation by describing Person A as herself and Person B as her partner, who has “deep experience with people who self-injure” (p. 277), to demonstrate that issues of “fitting” within these situations are dependent on relationships and positionalities. She claims that making the scenario of Person A and Person B specific in this way “opens

the possibility of talking about compulsory able-mindedness, pain, and desire in more productive ways" (p. 278). To close, she further discloses her personal experience with self-harm, claiming that "My partner has seen me injure myself on multiple occasions, and has a fairly good idea of how much danger (of long-term harm) I am in at any given moment" (p. 278) which is followed by claims about her partner's knowledge on how to speak to and care for her when she might injure herself and, then, a section on "Caring for Bodyminds" which covers how we should approach situations in which someone is experiencing extreme, unbearable, mental pain. This is the personal experience that stood out to Hearts in her reading and this initial interest in Price's approach to discussing the *bodymind* was part of a much more complex series of micro-transfers that helped Hearts uniquely take up the prompt in a way that was meaningful to her.

After one of our class sessions prior to the production of the Proposal, Hearts and I had a conversation about her topic. I remember her standing to the left of the desk where I kept my materials; she waited for the last of her classmates to file out the door and she looked worried. She had every right to be worried since she was preparing to be vulnerable with someone in a position of authority—without saying it, she seemed to understand the risks of the interaction she was creating. Nevertheless, Hearts asked me if she could write about self-injury and mental pain, disclosing in this process her own history of self-injury and concerns about the possibility of her peers learning about that history as she wrote; such concerns might indicate an incoming awareness of the stigma associated with self-injury. After checking in about her safety in the present moment and trusting her claims that these actions were past events, I told her she should write about it if that's what felt right and as long as it did not cause her mental and emotional distress. I explained the options she had for anonymity in peer review sessions and for abridging any of her drafts and/or the final presentation if needed. I tell this portion of Hearts' story to further contextualize her statements in her Final Reflection where she wrote "I decided to launch my website on a self-injury theme. But, I also began to worry because of the sensitivity of this topic, whether it would be scary and inappropriate if I presented the website about self-injury in front of my teachers and classmates." As I show next, this demonstrates that Hearts redrew boundaries within the spatio-temporal, discursive, and identity fields in ways influenced by class environment, such as a redefinition of the

classroom as an appropriate location for the topic of self-injury or as a location in which self-injury discussions are “allowed.”

Hearts’ interaction with Price’s text revealed her drawing of her identity boundary—which is presented as permeable—not only as someone who has self-injured but who has empathy for herself and others in the same situation. At the same time, she redefined her peers and me as people who could “handle” this topic and she hoped that we also have empathy and understanding which began with her engagement with her peers and me and her observations of how we *did* handle difficult conversations in the past. In redefining us, she also worked on the permeability of the spatio-temporal boundary of the classroom, redefining what belongs within and across private and public contexts by redrawing boundaries around *appropriateness* and the subject of self-harm. In short, our class interactions, the environment in which we could talk about difficult topics and where her peers and I modeled productive ways to do this, allowed Hearts to reshape the boundaries around what was possible within the spatio-temporal field—Hearts was able to see this research topic as a possible uptake in part because of the class environment. In her Final Reflection she noted that “almost all of the reading I learned in this course helped shape my website’s idea” —that is, the micro-transfers between the course readings themselves and with her shaped what uptakes she saw as possible for responding to the website prompt. In addition, when she pointed toward her classmates and me as a potentially inappropriate audience for her research topic, she brought into question how interactions between classmates and instructors permit a redrawing of the boundary around what a classroom is, what can be discussed there, and who can determine students’ research trajectories. Such redrawing expanded the number of possible uptakes for responding to the prompt which were informed, in part, by the engagement of her peers with the course texts and each other, or the class environment. Hearts’ experience makes me wonder if uptakes, then, might only be possible when there is little enough risk of negative consequences that would make it seem inappropriate.

In Chapter 2, I discussed my rationale for disclosing my own position as mentally disabled to my students in English 281. This decision was made, mostly, to serve as a counterstory to the often-internalized belief that mentally disabled people cannot be successful, intelligent, or in leadership positions. It also served as a way to humanize myself which I believed could inspire more students to

participate in the study. What was not initially on my mind was the way that this disclosure might have been a part of Hearts' journey into her Final Website, a piece of information, in combination with peer openness and disclosures, that made asking for topic approval more possible, that increased the number of pathways Hearts had to choose from when responding to the assignment prompt. The redrawing of my boundary around the classroom as a space in which one can disclose and discuss mental disability and mental health increased the number of possible micro-transfers and, therefore, supported the redrawing of Hearts' boundaries around the Final Website and increasing her possible uptakes. This is one such example of how our boundary-marking activity is interdependent.

In one of her free writing exercises, Hearts unknowingly left me with a segment of wisdom that holds true to the one of the messages spread throughout this chapter. Although not directly related to our subject of mental disability, her statements in response to Max Liboiron's research frameworks and practices in CLEAR lab were insightful. Extracting a quote from a YouTube video titled "Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done", she said

> 'Everyone knows more than we do' means that there are things that other people know but we don't know yet. And that's an opportunity to learn more from the people around us. There is much to be discovered, meaning individual knowledge is insufficient. Personal knowledge should combine with everyone else's, making the research more comprehensive and diverse.

Not only should personal knowledge combine with everyone else's but it *does* as we facilitate and lead discussions in our classrooms. As demonstrated in the example of my disclosure boundary re-marking allowing micro-transfers that impacted Hearts' boundary-work, her quote aptly illustrates the intricate interdependence of boundary-marking and micro-transfer and their bidirectional influence on one another. By this I mean that each act of boundary-marking can allow for diverse micro-transfer possibilities that may direct others' boundary drawing and redrawing. Further, boundary-marking activity and possibilities can be modeled by, learned from, and learned with those we engage with in our various discourse communities—often, this interdependence and influence is not visible but closer, micro-level examinations of students' classroom interactions can offer more insight into the co-constitutive process of students' becoming who they are to themselves and in relation to other people and things. So, the combining of student knowledge is a necessary part of the transfer act that makes the concept so capacious and the ways that students take up and transfer knowledge so diverse. Focusing our attention

on an individual's knowledge in our learning about and study of transfer is insufficient without a consideration of what they have been discovering through their interactions with others.

Cara: Alternative Uptake Captures from Peer Engagement

Cara was introduced in Chapter 4 with parts of her story being included in both the first and second theme sections. To summarize, Cara was a freshman from rural Illinois who claimed to have entered the course with a negative connotation on mental disability. Her now positive perception and increased confidence demonstrates flexibility and permeability in how she defined mental disability and herself. Cara's final project focused on the negative consequences of heteronormativity on both queer and straight communities. Within this section, I look back at Cara's story with a focus on her comments about our class discussions to further complicate transfer acts as ongoing, dynamic, and multidirectional processes influenced by a variety of unique factors for each student.

Similar to Ethan Heiss's comments in Chapter 4, Cara articulated a change in perspective based on her exposure to others' stories. She stated in our interview during week six that

> I also feel like, in the beginning of the term, like my understanding of mental disabilities, was very…boxed into what I personally understood or like what I've heard from my friends. So, like being exposed to different kinds of mental disabilities or…even people who have similar medical disabilities to me, but they experience it in a different way, has given me a lot more perspective.

Cara's use of the phrase "boxed into" demonstrates the initial inflexibility of the discursive boundary around mental disability and, therefore, her perspective as only informed from one standpoint. However, her interactions with her peers and in class made that boundary flexible and permeable. The shift in spatio-temporal boundary in which mental disability can exist in a conversation within the same time and space as Cara and therefore the material elements (including people) involved in the discursive construction of mental disability allowed that discursive boundary to be reshaped to be more expansive. In other words, Cara's interactions not only with the texts but with peers who shared similar, yet different experiences allowed her to take up her knowledge as a new perspective that expanded her definition of mental disability. In this same excerpt, she worked on her identity boundary as she defined herself as both like and unlike others who have mental disability experiences. The physical presence of others contributed to discursive and identity boundary-marking and, as those and their perspectives changed, so

too did the people within the classroom and the number of possible micro-transfers, creating new pathways for uptakes.

Her more explicit acknowledgement of the impact of class discussions and environments also appeared in her interview where she said

> I definitely have always thought like that [mental disability] shouldn't be something hidden and it should definitely be talked about a lot more so like reading a lot of the readings…the discussions in class like reiterated that point to me and made me feel more strongly about it, like having open discussions and not trying to hide it.

Like above, we get a sense of Cara's income boundary where she claimed to have "always thought" mental disability should be talked about openly. But she revealed the way she was able to redraw or trace this boundary through interactions in class discussions and the openness she perceived throughout our conversations about the topic. This openness was the result of highly collaborative work between the students and me to create a space in which openness was permissible. Although my offering the topic for discussion mattered, arguably most important is what students were able to see as possible uptakes for responding to that topic based on their prior experiences and knowledge. These uptakes became more visible for students through the catalyst of other students' willingness to discuss mental disability.

When I asked about the development of her more positive outlook on mental disability, Cara claimed that "honestly, just…hearing everyone in class like talk about it more openly and not…trying to work around like saying mental disability or…finding like a way to say it…nicely just kind of like opened my eyes to like this isn't a bad thing that you have to hide like you can talk about it openly, especially in like an academic or social setting." What stands out to me first in this quote is "especially in…an academic or social setting" where Cara worked on the spatio-temporal boundary of the classroom which expanded how and what we could talk about in that space. The discursive boundary around the *classroom* was also redrawn as a space in which mental disability could be an appropriate topic of conversation, meaning *mental disability* was also redefined as an appropriate topic more generally. At the same time, in her claims about being able to talk about mental disability more openly, she redrew her identity boundary as she believed herself to be someone who is capable of having these open and explicit conversations. All of this might have been possible due to the interaction of the material elements of that

given time and space as they made repeated decisions to adopt particular terminology and confront a topic that is often far removed from in-class academic conversations.

One final example of the influence of the class environment and discussions on Cara's boundary-marking activity is in her reading and our class discussion about "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" which we read for our class session on April 19 during week four. This was the class session I've mentioned multiple times, the session in which Cara and Foster took the lead on the conversation as they were deeply interested in the connections between disability identity and queer identity which allowed them to redraw the discursive boundary around disability as an identity category. [I reflect on that conversation in more detail here as it is a demonstration of the sort of complex series of interactions and micro-transfers that happen on the moment-to-moment scale. Unfortunately, I did not have an audio recording of the class session but, rather, a detailed post-class reflection and discussion notes. During that class session, I wrote in my notes that "Today felt like a breakthrough day" because students demonstrated a level of trust in their peers and me that they hadn't before. Price's text is, as mentioned, admittedly difficult not only for the beautiful dynamics of her style and synthesis but for the emotional response it can and often does evoke. To frame the in-class discussion I outline below, I first recount some of Price's main arguments which appeared in and sparked our circulating ideas:

Following her definition of her title term, *bodymind*, Price explains what she calls a "crip politics of bodymind." Drawing on scholars such as Robert McRuer (2006), Eli Clare (1999), and Carrie Sandhal (2003), she's careful to say that crip theory is not only the simple melding of queer theory and DS; although it is a strain of DS informed by queer theory, and although *queering* and *cripping* share commonalities, they are distinct and, more so, twisted together. Crip theory is a perspective on disability that recognizes its potential and flexibility; encourages reclamation, celebration, and coalition across the varied disability identity categories; centers activism in DS; and rejects identity categories as stable entities. Such a conversation between queer theory and DS has led to the concept of "desiring disability" or, in other words, valuing difference and rejecting binaries of queer/straight or disabled/able-bodied. Price claims to personally "not reject the turn to desire" (p. 275), as she practices desire in her life and within the disabled and queer communities she is a part. But, she wonders, "To what degree does the turn toward desire in DS move too quickly past the question of undesirability? Of pain? Of, well,

badness?" (p. 275). Following Liz Crow's (1996) words, the quick turn to desire does not account for "peoples' experiences of their bodies" (p. 217) and, to Price, this means we should ask that the experience of pain for disabled or impaired people be treated as real "and in some cases…*really bad*" (p. 276). At the time, feminist DS hadn't yet determined what to do with pain and, in particular, that unbearable type of pain toward which Price directs us, such as pain that inspires self-injury or attempts at suicide. So, Price centers the unfortunate reality that "some aspects of disabled bodymind are distinctly undesirable" referring not to the oppressive structures attuned to in social and crip models but the "bodyminds themselves" (p. 276). This un-desire relates to those experiences Price claims are "painful in and of themselves" (p. 277), and compels her to illustrate a scenario in which one person experiences unbearable mental pain resulting in self-injury and the complexity of care in such situations.

To begin our discussion of these threads, Mason—introduced in Chapter 4—mentioned that he was troubled by the idea of disability being desirable in the way that Price mentioned because he grew up with a brother who was and is significantly disabled and saw the impact of the disability not only on his brother's suffering but on the suffering of him and his family. Consequently, we then discussed Price's own reservations about desire. Lorraine, who I introduce below, said that she felt similarly about the issue with desiring disability and the note that disability is *never* bad because there is very real pain that comes with being disabled and no one would ever want to be more disabled than they already are (a point which Price mentions in reference to Alison Kafer, 2013). This sharing of the personal sparked other connections and disclosures from students. Ethan Heiss shared about his experience with the mental healthcare system and how his doctors never associated chronic pain with mental pain or distress and tended to reinforce the body/mind dualism. Moreover, students in the queer community, Foster, Cara, and Fern[21] mentioned that the same was true for queerness, that they loved being a part of the community but often felt as if the realities of pain they face are overlooked by people feeling a right to access their knowledge as queer individuals (e.g., to knowledge about their gender or sexuality through the pressure to come out and to act as representative for the queer community).

Foster claimed that being a part of the queer community can bring a lot of hardship, confusion, and sometimes a feeling of un-desire, a wish that they were straight and/or cisgender so that they

[21] Fern was removed from the study for lack of assignment submissions and a significant number of absences.

wouldn't feel the pressure to explain themselves. It's tiring, they claimed, to constantly feel like you have to be a representative and to have the responsibility of educating people put entirely on those who are marginalized. Foster and Fern were both bothered by this representative expectation since there is no way for one to be a representative with the community being so diverse. Further, they found it unfair to ask someone to explain themselves when they are actively in the process of exploring who they are. This fluidity, a beautiful aspect of being part of the LGBTQ+ community, means it can be difficult answering to others who feel entitled to knowledge about you. For Cara, this sparked thinking about the expectations of physically presenting as queer or not "looking gay enough" which she personally experienced; therefore, she had become frustrated with certain images being placed on queerness since it isn't necessarily about outward presentation. With appearance also being fluid and subject to change, it doesn't determine who you are on the inside. Cara reminds us that "there's no one way to be queer" just as there's no one way to be disabled.

Ultimately, this conversation inspired Cara's final project on the harms of heteronormativity, a topic "Based on internal thinking, conversations with friends, and experiences" which helped her "[discover] the norms of heteronormativity and the rules it places in the world. These thoughts also came after reading Margaret Price's [article]." Beyond this reading and discussion impacting her choice of research topic, it also had an influence on her ability to "sell" her connections or uptakes in her Rhetorical Analysis Memo which she submitted one week after our class discussion and within which she argued that, although her chosen artifact was not immediately recognizable as one related to mental disability, "this case study is representative of 'gayness' being represented as a mental disability or sickness." I am curious about whether Cara would have felt she had the agency to make this argument had we not made our discussion of queerness a core aspect of our conversation in which she could recognize it as relevant to the overarching topic of mental disability. In other words, it's possible that fruitful class discussions and positive responses to what interested students personally about a text—from instructor and peers—allows them to make more meaningful connections and express more educational agency in that it can reduce fear in responding with the "wrong" ideas.

To conclude my discussion of Cara's story, I revisit her Introductory Email from week one. Within the email, she stated that "My goal for this course is to gain more knowledge through our readings and

discussion to feel comfortable enough in my understanding [of mental health] to create a platform to express my thoughts and help others" which she believed is more likely to be achieved "when these readings are discussed/explained and debated in class" so that she "can understand and learn more from them." I quote Cara's email comments to reinforce our understanding that student incomes (including classroom environment expectations and the person's willingness to let this environment shape them) matter for transfer research whether we are analyzing the transfer of writing knowledge or subject matter knowledge. Being gifted these insights about Cara's best learning experiences and what she hopes to achieve from the class creates more questions about whether her boundary-marking activity was more likely as a result of her initial desire to learn from the course readings as she had in other classes.

Foster: Alternative Uptakes as Perspectival as Shown in Responses to Bodymind

Foster's story, like Cara's, was introduced in the section "Relationship to Disability: Micro-Transfers and the Boundaries We Draw Between Ourselves and Mental Disability" and expanded on in "Adapting and Transforming Mental Disability Knowledge to Meet One Where They Are" in Chapter 4. They were also struck by Price's article on *bodymind* and took up that reading by joining the scholarly conversation on a topic deeply tied to their experience: collegiate sexual assault. They entered the course with a great deal of disability literacy since their mother works at a nonprofit that supports mentally disabled individuals. Their boundary-work offered insights into the complexity of determining shifts in the spatio-temporal field as their trauma—both physical and psychological—was carried within their body to our classroom. This emphasizes that distinctions between one space and time versus others can be incredibly difficult to identify or pin down.

As with Cara, Foster claimed that the most impactful class session for them was the one in which we discussed queer culture, a topic they saw as "not applicable to our course content" which they mentioned in their interview. As demonstrated by Cara and discussed among disability scholars, this is not the case. Foster just visualized different uptakes for responding to the subject matter based on certain discursive (e.g., *bodymind*), spatio-temporal (e.g., boundary of the classroom as appropriate for the topic of sexual assault), and identity (e.g., as a survivor of sexual assault) boundary-markings. When I discussed Foster's process of adapting and transforming mental disability knowledge for their final project in Chapter 4, under the section titled "Foster: Making Connections to the Bodymind", I explained the

dynamic elements at play and interacting that led to Foster's decision to write about the bodymind in relation to sexual assault and the responses by college administration and officials. There were *at least* seven elements interacting and influencing each other to take a new shape as a result and, therefore, making it possible for Foster to take up this topic in response to the assignment prompt. Within the network, Foster's personal identity as a survivor of sexual assault and affiliation with the UW; their reading of Chanel Miller's *Know My Name*—a book which resulted from the highly-publicized Turner v. The People case—and, so the actions of Brock Turner, Miller's rapist; Miller's response and the trauma inflicted on her; the case's media coverage, Price's article and the introduction of *bodymind*; and any additional articles Foster read for their project all impacted one another in shaping Foster's belief that this was an appropriate uptake for the assignment and cannot be separated from their interaction with their classmates, particularly in that most impactful class because they were able to talk about their queer identities. In talking about that session, they said "being disabled is also like a form of identity and that…felt really nice to have other queer students kind of talk about like these things that happen in queer communities." They continued, "I don't know if I have any of those conversations with my queer friends, so I felt like that was like a really nice space to kind of openly talk about it." Openness was repeated by Foster as it was for Cara, allowing Foster to mark spatio-temporal boundaries. First, the classroom became a space in which students could openly talk about their queer identities. In expressing their gratitude for this, they also indicated working on their identity boundary where, as a member of their queer friend group, they didn't yet see themselves as possessing the skills or capacity to have these conversations but in their English 281 community, they could discuss this part of their experience. This could also mean a redrawing of spatio-temporal boundaries that have expanded to include discussions on this experience. For example, their identity shifting as they acquired and practiced new skills could have allowed them to redraw the spatio-temporal boundary in which they engage with their queer friends to now include conversations about the intricacies of coming out. I talk more about the redrawing of their discursive boundary around mental disability as an identity category in Chapter 4.

This is all to say that, although Foster did not see their queer experience as necessarily applicable to the course content, they were able to make connections between their experience as a survivor of sexual assault and the very real mental and physical pain they endured as a result. During the

production of their project, Foster disclosed their own experience as well as the ways in which their topic choice was inspired by their position within the university and their recent reading of Miller's book alongside Price's article. To repeat some of what I shared in Chapter 4, Foster mentioned in their interview how they were immediately impacted by the term *bodymind* since they finally had a word to use to describe something they felt they already knew: "how our brain and body are just such an interconnected entity." They followed that with a claim about how they "just thought…like 'thank you.'" when they were introduced to the concept. The holistic perspective on well-being was meaningful for them as someone who had been experiencing the mental and physical consequences of assault. Price's article provided them a pathway not only for taking up the assignment prompt but for intellectualizing their pain as a way to support others.

We also see, in Foster's claims about how the conversations on queer culture impacted them, their perception on the atmosphere of the course as they stated "It's all very safe…so it was very nice to kind of have that…solidarity amongst the class and just like I was just like 'okay, I'm going to come out to my entire English class that's known me for like five weeks.'"[22] Foster's own surprise at their coming out to their peers and me during our class session which I described above might indicate the redrawing of the discursive boundary around the classroom, defining it as a "safe" place where conversations about gender and sexuality are welcome and accepted. In this redefinition, Foster also worked on the classroom's spatio-temporal boundary. In that moment, the time and space became seen as including the appropriate material elements to make coming out a physically and emotionally low-risk uptake enactment. The perception of these material elements being appropriate for this response stems from the discursive boundary Foster was also shaping around their peers and me as they defined us, based on our previous interactions, as people who would be receptive to and supportive of their disclosure. The class environment may be a contributing factor for Foster to perform the sort of boundary-marking that supports meaningful engagement with and uptakes of the subject matter. Such boundary-marking was made possible through the micro-transfers of Foster's queer identity and experience, other students' openness

[22] Although "safe" was a term used by Foster to describe the class environment, I understand the subjectivity of "safety" in student experience and the inability of any instructor to produce a comprehensively "safe" classroom. In practice, I prefer to describe such environments as "curious" since they allow students to explore and "try out" the sharing of ideas they may not typically. However, for the sake of consistency with student language, I will use "safe" to describe the environment in this chapter.

and vulnerability in class discussion, the course texts, and solidarity among them and other queer students in the class. Allowing the conversation above to unfold naturally, relinquishing the authority of directing the conversation, my behavior/response to their uptake of the article also interacted on a moment-to-moment level to help Foster redefine the classroom, their peers, and me. Looking at transfer more broadly in a study of including mental disability discourse in the classroom (e.g., based on incomes and final product) might result in conclusions about a lack of knowledge transfer (or unsuccessful transfer) in terms of subject matter since Foster, Cara, and Fern did not discuss mental disability in this moment or extensively in their final written products and, in Foster's case, they still did not see the topic as explicitly connected to mental disability when we interviewed despite these uptakes leading to later engagement with DS for Foster and Cara as they continued using *bodymind* and queer theory as part of the frameworks for their project, respectively. However, an analysis of boundary-marking and micro-transfer reveals that this uptake is the result of various elements of the given context micro-transferring onto each other to allow for other, equally appropriate uptakes that are less anticipated or habituated. Although one of the limits of this study is that we are not yet able to see what the long-term impact of such boundary re-drawing around queer culture and identity will be, these shifts and differences that lead to new and varied uptakes are significant micro-transfer moments that would otherwise be overlooked in traditional transfer research.

Ethan: Students' Anticipated Long-Term Influence on Academic Self-Perception

In Chapter 4, I began my analysis by introducing Ethan Heiss—a junior transfer student studying business administration with a finance and accounting specialization and a minor in mathematics. Like Foster, Ethan had strong disability literacy upon entering the course. He disclosed a number of mental disabilities but had a positive attitude regarding them, in part, because he had dedicated time to informal research to better understand himself and his symptoms. In class, Ethan would ask many generative questions and would often be the first person to speak during discussions. During our interview and as I mention in Chapter 4, Ethan described his past experiences with discussion-based courses where it was rare for him to speak in class, in part, because "the nature of education…like the academic setting, was not designed for people like me." But our course's "very casual, relaxed atmosphere" and, for him, relatable subject matter made it easier for him to feel motivated to show up and participate. As he said,

it's "easier to look forward to because it's not like you're just talking to us for two and a half hours." As discussed in the study context in Chapter 3, the class was designed for frequent discussion-based class sessions. In English 281, students would begin our discussion-focused sessions with a set of free writing questions related to our readings. Following the exercise, they'd pair or group together to discuss their responses which would inspire the large group discussion. Questions were framed to encourage both likes and dislikes, agreements and disagreements and, during the discussions, I often took the role of scribe, typing notes on the lesson plan document projected onto the screen so that students could refer to ideas presented earlier and, in this way, decentering myself as the sole speaker as well as demonstrating the value of students' responses since I didn't skip over typing anyone's contribution. Varied perspectives were often shared and the frequent, extended discussions offered students possibilities for interacting with these perspectives and other's relationships to or experiences of the texts. What Ethan means, then, is that the support for frequent student-to-student interaction and hearing from more than just the instructor was more exciting and interesting for him, making it easier for him to commit to being physically present most days.

In his claims about not having participated much in other discussion-based courses, Ethan revealed former boundaries—the discursive boundary around engagement and therefore his identity or what he is capable of within the environment and the discursive boundary of the classroom. In other words, once Ethan experienced the "very casual, relaxed atmosphere from the start" the discursive boundary around the classroom became more flexible—it was no longer a space in which an instructor lectures for two hours but wants to hear from the students. This plus the subject matter made him invested in participating, enabling him to define himself as someone who (1) attends class regularly and (2) contributes to discussion in every class session. The affordances and definition of our specific environment (writing about the texts, speaking intimately about them with a partner, speaking with the large group, seeing the notes, etc.) increased the number of options he perceived as possible for responding within the spatio-temporal field, and these increased options provided more opportunities for microtransfer and uptake pathways. Beyond this, in his interview and Final Reflection, Ethan mentioned that "these readings and our class discussions of the readings were very engaging and I was excited to be involved in an environment where people are comfortable discussing these stigmatized topics." Here,

there is further movement of the spatio-temporal boundary of the classroom which became a place in which “stigmatized topics” could be discussed given the discussions can be encouraged by affordances such as the course readings, their rationales, free writing exercises, the pair-and-share approach to beginning the discussion, and the active, real-time note-taking method that focused importance and agency on student contributions as the conversation unfolded.

More broadly, Ethan further shaped the “academic setting” boundary or, more so, the boundaries around what belongs within academic settings when he wrote that “I’m just so happy that there’s finally a focus on this in the academic setting.” In other words, Ethan’s interaction with and therefore micro-transfer between his experience and the course subject matter revealed greater possibilities for discussion in academic settings therefore changing, overall, what an academic setting can be, likely contributing to one of his final statements, in the Closing Survey, that mental disability and mental health should be talked about “Anywhere and everywhere!” When asked about what the best options are for spreading knowledge about mental disability, he claimed

> I think that one of the most valuable ways that these ideas could be spread would honestly just be through like informal communication, just like chats like I mean. I've already spread a lot of information just by like chatting with people, especially those that have similar struggles to myself. So I guess personally, one of the big ways is just been through informal, like peer-to-peer communication.

He said he already “spread a lot of information just by like chatting with people, especially those that have similar struggles to myself” which inspired his belief in the power of peer-to-peer communication. In Chapter 4, we gained a bit more insight into how Ethan’s engagement and discussions with his peers might have influenced this belief in his claims about his understanding of mental disability “no longer [being] limited to my personal experience” since he was able to engage with the ideas of the authors and expand his “narrow perspective.” Commenting on my disclosure of mental disability early in the term, Ethan stated

> I truly appreciate your openness in discussing your own challenges as well, and it was very comforting to be able to relate to your personal experiences. It’s also very motivating that you’ve leveraged your personal struggles into such a powerful project and I hope that your passion gets the reception and results you’re hoping for.

This might, again, suggest an importance of the intentional, productive positionality stories of instructors to increase uptakes and the possibilities students see for using knowledge about mental disability.

Implications of Students' Engagement Within and Contribution to the Class Environment

It's no surprise that the structure of our courses, how we ask students to engage during and support them in contributing to the discussion, how we allow and mediate conversations, and the responsiveness to student comments matters for their learning. First, because transfer is social and peer-to-peer communication increases micro-transfers that support the sort of boundary-marking that increases possibilities for responding to prompts or subject matter, we need to continue implementing and increasing student-to-student interaction, engagement, and responses to one another. The composition classroom is a great location for this in that we already operate under the belief that students need to discuss and write with each other. The interdependence of micro-transfers is also important to consider in the case of instructor identity performance or use of positionality stories; when an instructor redraws the boundaries around acceptable course subject matter or relevant genres, students' boundaries around the classroom and their capabilities can change, inspiring a greater range of uptake pathways. Further, as students iteratively encounter each other in the physical space and their shared ideas, they are introducing possibilities for further micro-transfers as new knowledge and perspectives could guide them toward boundary re-marking and alternative uptake captures—possibilities for responding to one another, subject matter, and assignments.

Building a curious discussion climate and welcoming a range of perspectives seems to strongly support not only students' learning but their agency and the possibilities they see for engaging with the course content or responding to an illocutionary force. In the case of Foster and Hearts, a "safe" class environment allowed them to see a greater range of uptakes for responding in class discussions and in response to the Final Website prompt, respectively. Similarly, the discussion format, the decentered authority and balance of students' voices as well as positive responses to those varied voices might indicate that our community and discussion guidelines, establishing a culture of care, and active listening early on has the potential to increase uptakes and sell connections. Foster and Hearts both demonstrate that a sense of safety or low risk might be essential for supporting less-habituated uptakes and redrawing spatio-temporal, discursive, and identity boundaries that change what is appropriate based on who the interlocutors are and how a material space has been collectively and individually defined by action and observation. Whether the visualization of more uptakes is dependent on a sense of risk associated with

enacting a given uptake has implications for definitions and studies of transfer in that those who have been marginalized or traumatized in classrooms and other contexts might not "fit"[23] a teacher or researcher's idea of what transfer is or should look like. In other words, those who have not experienced negative responses to unique or less-habituated uptakes are more likely to have their uptake captures expanded and increase possibilities for transferring knowledge in the future.

Also, a need for more work on understanding the co-constitutive boundary fields and how discursive boundaries limit or expand definitions of the spatio-temporal; for example, when the definition of *classroom* is informed by institutional uptake residues (sedimentations of memory) or students' negative experiences with authority in the classroom, the spatio-temporal field is limited (i.e., ideas about what belongs and what is possible become restricted by the residues). This might, for now, demonstrate the necessity of instructors establishing clear definitions of their instructional space, clarifying what is welcome or unwelcome in conversation, what the expectations and etiquette for class discussions are, and implementation of community guidelines is necessary.

Based on Cara's and Hearts' incoming goals for the course, there is also room for more intentionally designing studies to address student goals and perceptions of what they will achieve in the course/how they understand course themes, outcomes, objectives. In terms of indications that the composition classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate the transfer of mental disability knowledge, the use of writing-as-thinking practice in the free writing space (which students like Cara utilized) demonstrates the utility of such low-stakes informal reflective tasks in helping students feel capable of working through difficult concepts. Some students like Cara, who used the free writing space to make connections between disability identity and queer identity, can use such informal and low-stakes writing assignments to further grasp knowledge about disability studies discourse since they can informally share their current and prior understandings with a single-person audience (the instructor) instead of sharing out to the full class if they do not feel comfortable. Additionally, the free writing

[23] To refer back to Garland-Thomson and Ahmed, "fitting" is the experience of comfort experienced by those in normate and non-marginalized subject positions (i.e., those who "fit" within the ideal in a given context) that can lead to a complacency and which results from shifting relations of power. To not "fit" is to experience discomfort as your presence within certain groups and physical spaces. In the case of transfer research as I've framed it here, "fitting" involves both the comfort of some students to perform acts of far transfer or mindful abstraction and the power the researcher has to determine what counts as a transfer act (i.e., to determine whose way of taking up knowledge "fits" within the context of a study).

exercises, when they include multiple and varied questions from which students can select, act as uptake affordances that reveal diverse possibilities for taking up the course subject matter—that is, each individual free writing question serves as an affordance that can stand alone or work with others to inform what uptake captures students have confirmed or disrupted, resulting in enactments that are [unique] to students' [unique] micro-transfers resulting from the current subject matter and writing tasks with prior subject matter and formerly developed skills. Methodologically, free writing exercises offer transfer researchers a unit of analysis for micro-transfer as we can observe students' thinking about a subject on a moment-to-moment scale as well as their gradual application of conceptual and practical skills.

Rhetorical Awareness: An Opening for Alternative Engagement and Uptake

"Before this class I had no idea what rhetoric meant. So that's one of my biggest takeaways…I know how to use the word *rhetoric* in a sentence and I'm able to provide a definition which is awesome."

–Ethan Heiss

One of the main concerns I had during the conception of this project was whether this subject matter would detract from students' learning about the basic writing concepts and skills they would ordinarily learn and practice in a general writing course. I wondered whether I would want so badly for students to learn about social/rhetorical constructions of disability that I'd forget to teach and center practicing the necessary rhetorical, analytical, invention, inquiry, research, and presentation skills they need for future writing tasks. By the end of the term, this fear dissipated, particularly as every participant, in their Final Reflection, talked about rhetoric and their beneficial learning on the concept. Though some wrote about it very briefly, others did to a much deeper extent, such as Ethan, as quoted above. This might suggest that rhetorical awareness supports critical disability literacy in that it can increase the possibilities students see for taking up knowledge. In theory, it might make sense that better understanding and more critically assessing a rhetorical situation could promote visualizing a more diverse and unique selection of uptakes for responding to social issues. More generally, understanding situations as rhetorical—as a selection of elements attuned to genre, audience, and purpose—could support the (re)drawing of boundaries around what performances "belong" in each context because those performances do not have to be seen as fixed but in flux and dependent. However, further research is needed to explore this connection. Here, I provide evidence of students' comments on their rhetorical awareness to respond to two research questions: (1) What happens to student writing as a result of this

engagement [with mental disability and disability studies discourse]? And (2) In what other ways might we find indications that the composition classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate transfer of mental disability knowledge? Below, I present examples of students' boundary-work related to the concept of rhetoric as well as how they might have redrawn discursive boundaries around mental disability because of engagement with rhetorical theory and disability studies scholarship concerned with rhetorical constructions of disability.

I place Rhetorical Awareness after Class Environment because both are closely tied to one's relationship with and interactions with others or awareness of one's influence over others and their influence on oneself. Rhetorical Awareness is also more distant from those previously presented in that it does pertain to their learning about mental disability but responds, more so, to questions of how this subject matter impacts students' learning about writing. Although most of the students demonstrated improvement in their rhetorical awareness, this theme focuses mostly on students' disclosures of the value they place on their learning about rhetoric and their expression of their own potential to influence thoughts and actions through their communication. These findings also suggest that the concepts learned and tools gained from studying rhetoric and the opportunities provided to practice reflecting on that knowledge and applying those skills, such as in their Rhetorical Analysis Memo, can increase uptake possibilities (e.g., applying rhetoric to mental disability knowledge and perceptions) and micro-transfers (i.e., through the ability to engage with different texts) to redraw boundaries for engagement with the topic. Having a space to practice applying skills can show students that they have the capacity to apply those skills elsewhere.

The improvement of rhetorical awareness and general value for their learning about rhetoric that came out of this course is significant and speaks to the ways in which disability studies' analytical practices serve as examples of not only how to analyze rhetoric but also how our own communication has consequences which shapes how students then choose to present information in their writing. In other words, presenting disability from a rhetorical perspective has the potential to do three things: first, facilitating the micro-transfers of disability and rhetoric by redrawing students' discursive boundary around mental disability through a perception of it as socially constructed physically and discursively. Second, the interaction of DS's analytical processes with students' perceptions of and interactions with mental

disability can shift their identity boundaries as they see themselves as equipped with tools to approach rhetorical analysis broadly and through those interactions. Finally, the micro-transfers between DS and students' prior and current communication practices can shape their identity boundaries as they redefine themselves as rhetors who have influence through their writing and must make intentional choices so as not to marginalize people further. The focus on composing in various genres and with different modes also proved to improve students' genre awareness and nearly all of them reflected on choices they made that aligned with the interests and needs of their intended audience. Though there is not substantial enough evidence to confirm the role genre knowledge plays in supporting the transfer of mental disability knowledge, genres act as their own form of boundary-markings since they inform what we see as possible within rhetorical situations, restricting and permitting actions, and are constantly interacting ecologically in ways that result in micro-transfers. These micro-transfers—each individual genre bumping into the next as an agent of influence—allow us to iteratively redraw genre boundaries as we shape them for their unique rhetorical situation. In these students' cases, their engagement with a variety of genres and in many modes helped them see how genres act not only on each other but on audiences, influencing the possibilities they see for constructing a genre, working within or outside of the habituated uptake enactments. In the next section, I introduce a new student, Lorraine, whose 10-week process of learning about rhetoric was made clear in her free writing reflections, analyses, interview, and course final. Her marking of discursive, spatio-temporal, and identity boundaries throughout this process supports the idea that these fields are difficult to separate and are always co-constitutive.

Lorraine: Rhetoric as a Key for Cracking Spatio-Temporal Doors

Lorraine was a senior at the time of her enrollment in English 281 and she was majoring in accounting and marketing. She is not a first-generation college student and claimed at the time to have no existing access needs. In response to the Introductory Email questions, she claimed that some of her research skills include "critical thinking, attention to detail, cross collaboration/communication, and information literacy." As she moved through the course, she developed a research website on the "Intersection of Systemic Racism and Health/Healthcare in the U.S." Early in our lessons on rhetoric, during week two, Lorraine indicated that "I have never thought of the term rhetoric specifically in the context of its meaning" which surprised her since she considers herself "relatively tuned into political

discourse" where the "word is used and tossed around a lot in discussion." Although Lorraine did not begin to explain her new understanding or demonstrate what had informed it yet, she noted that "Perhaps I just thought it meant something along the lines of a set of ideologies or a set of beliefs." In other words, Lorraine provided a sense of her discursive boundary around *rhetoric* upon entering the course. This drew a baseline for tracing the boundary-work she performed as the course progressed. She went on to engage with the readings on rhetoric as an active recipient of knowledge, leaving out much personal opinion in free writing responses and sharing, in her own words, the definitions the scholars use.

Notably, she referenced the above excerpt in her Final Critical Class Reflection and expanded on it, saying that "Learning about rhetoric, how it's used, and how it's present everywhere even when it is not intentional has made me more aware of my own writing practices and communication and the types of rhetoric I employ without even realizing it." She went on to mention that some rhetorical skills she improved on were "purpose identification, tone adaptation, and contextual awareness." As her discursive boundary around *rhetoric* was redrawn through the development of a more concrete definition, Lorraine's permeable identity boundary was also redrawn as she began to view herself as someone who (1) is rhetorical, (2) assesses rhetoric, and (3) is a more effective communicator as a result. Lorraine's comments also demonstrate the working on the spatio-temporal boundary where rhetoric existed within the realm of political discourse and now crosses into other material planes such as her writing and unintentional communication practices. In terms of micro-transfers, Lorraine illustrates that some of the micro-transfers that occurred for her in this course were her lack of exposure to or assumed meaning of *rhetoric*, her relationship and history with political discourse, the course texts, and the free writing prompts that inspired this commentary. These micro-transfers helped her take up the knowledge about rhetoric in a way that redrew spatio-temporal boundaries surrounding where we apply rhetoric or where it appears as well as her identity boundary since she established herself as a more capable rhetor by the end of the course. In addition, this redefinition of rhetoric increased uptake captures for how she could address rhetoric as a concept and tool and uptake captures for her engagement with other knowledge—defining rhetoric more concretely and seeing herself as capable of making more intentional choices might increase the number of uptake captures for responding to any information encountered in the future.

The impact of her learning on rhetoric was further illustrated in her Definitions of Rhetoric Email where she defined rhetoric as "*the art, study, and social power of using language and non language based means to effectively communicate and persuade an audience that is often but not always intentional*" and claimed that "I created this definition for myself because I think it's important to add nuance to the definition to include more than just language, since as we discussed in class, there is an incredibly wide array of things that can carry rhetoric" despite her proclaimed concerns with expressing her ideas or sharing perspectives on complex topics. As she progressed to the Rhetorical Awareness Letter, where she reviewed a day in which she explored Copenhagen, she believed that "reflecting on this day has made me realize just how frequently rhetoric appears in our lives in ways and forms that I would've never thought to identify as rhetoric before" since it is "omnipresent." Again, this is the redrawing of the discursive boundary around rhetoric which allowed her to develop the rhetorical skills she mentions have grown later on and contributes to the developing contours of her permeable identity boundary. The shaping of this discursive boundary further highlights the permeability of spatio-temporal boundaries for Lorriane. In claiming that rhetoric appears frequently and in "ways and forms" she did not expect due to its omnipresence, she indicates that rhetoric is everywhere—her knowledge of it and ability to analyze it could then be transferred into other material contexts and inform the dynamics between actors within those contexts. Whether she produced an uptake artifact or perceivable uptake enactment in response to rhetorical elements of an environment or not does not negate the fact that the shifts in the discursive and identity boundaries expanded Lorriane's uptake captures or the number of options she saw for taking up information that could now be deemed rhetorical.

In addition to changing how she defined rhetoric and dynamics of various environments, Lorraine's engagement with rhetoric impacted her engagement with mental disability. During the above, she was mostly working to redefine the term itself whereas, in our free writing exercises during week two, responding to Price and Dolmage's chapters, she wrote about the "rhetorical consequences or stereotypes and stigma associated with mental disability"[24], confirming an understanding, if not a belief that those with mental disabilities are rhetorically constructed as "incoherent, illogical" and how those who

[24] This phrasing comes from the question posed during the free writing exercise that week which read "What are the rhetorical consequences of stereotypes and stigma associated with mental disability? (p. 26)."

are “physically disabled are also deemed to have an intellectual disability.” She saw this as connected to the justifications people use to “discount, disregard, or diminish the voices of those with disabilities.” Further, she defined ableism and disablism in her own words and, the following week, in response to the question “What does it mean when Susan Wendell says, ‘Disability is not a biological given; like gender, it is socially constructed from a biological reality’?” she wrote “I think this means that so much of what disability is and isn’t is created by people’s perceptions and preconceived notions, that it’s a set of norms that’s created from what starts off as a neutral state of being.” Here, rhetoric offered Lorriane a new lens through which to see and understand disability as something that is not negative but that is perceived that way because of people’s communication about it. In other words, it’s possible that Lorraine’s study of rhetoric supported her understanding of Wendell’s argument.

Beyond this, her learning on rhetoric acted to increase the number of possible uptakes she saw for engaging with mental disability knowledge. In her initial response to Price’s chapter “Assaults on the Ivory Tower” in which Price rhetorically analyzes the frames through which the Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University mass shooting perpetrators, Seung-Hui Cho and Steven Kazmierczak, were portrayed in the media at the time of each respective shooting. Price writes that “My concern in this chapter is the way that these two events, and especially the shooters, have been portrayed in written and visual representations” (p. 142) which she follows with a statement about the sensitive and “painful” nature of the material. For Lorraine, this text was particularly difficult to read since she wrote

> I will have to say that since Blacksburg is my hometown, I found it really hard to look past the content of what was said in this piece. I tried to dig deeper into my understanding and takeaways from this piece, but given the emotional ties I have to both the event and the place, it was difficult to read it with a lens of critical analysis.

Consequently, for her Rhetorical Analysis Memo, Lorraine inquired about whether she would be able to analyze one of our course texts; I encouraged it, and she used her newfound rhetorical knowledge and skill to approach the text from a less emotional, more analytical perspective which allowed her to critique the ways that Price talked about the media representations of Cho and Kazmierczak. A few interesting boundary-markings are presented here: first, Lorriane identified herself as a resident of Blacksburg and so, someone with emotional ties to it and the tragedy as well as someone incapable of critically analyzing the media representations—a seemingly inflexible boundary around who she is and the possible

emotions she could feel toward the event. This boundary was so fixed and emotion so intense that even her more advanced rhetorical knowledge and skill was unable to penetrate the boundary around engagement with the text. However, she saw the prompt of the Rhetorical Analysis Memo as an opportunity to take up the text from a rhetorical perspective. The boundary around her abilities shifted as did the boundary around engagement with the text despite her still admitting difficulty of separating herself from the emotional charge of the event entirely. What this means is that her learning about rhetoric increased the number of uptake captures she visualized for responding to the text and the prompt, making rhetorical awareness a strong area of potential for promoting varied forms of engagement with mental disability knowledge.

If this wasn't enough to confirm how meaningful learning about rhetoric was for her, it was clear by the time of her interview. In the week seven interview, upon being asked about when she thinks what she's learned about mental disability might be useful for her, and following an initial, vague claim about others' stories and news outlets' social commentary, she stated,

> I can take away from this class that like almost everything, has like a rhetorical framework to it, and a lot of times certain phrases, or whatever we use, especially if it's like in the news in the media that we kind of just read and forget about. Those word choices are probably actually very intentional on the part of whoever was writing it and publishing it. And so I think both from what I learned about mental disability, and also just we did so much with rhetoric at the beginning. I think I will be like a lot more keen on picking up either word choices or like certain…I don't know, like stylistic choices, of how writing is done and kind of figuring out 'Okay, why do they say it this way? What are they explicitly or implicitly trying to convey with that?'

Lorraine's commentary on the rhetorical nature of various communication forms stands out not only because she is further supporting the redrawing of the discursive boundary around rhetoric and her identity boundary as someone capable of doing this sort of rhetorical analysis, but she pairs that learning with her learning about mental disability. What's also compelling about this excerpt is Lorraine's claim that "almost everything" is rhetorical which further blurs the lines between spatio-temporal boundaries of school and personal life. This, in turn, changes how she might come into contact with other elements of the material planes she traverses which could contribute to the types of micro-transfers and thus her future boundary-marking and the potential boundary-marking of others. So, by mentioning she is "more keen on picking up word choices" (i.e., directing attention to the "why" of stylistic choices), her redrawing of *rhetoric*'s discursive boundary increased the number of possible uptakes of information in her daily life,

inspiring more varied engagement with an array of content later on. In other words, this discursive shift also contributed to the construction of her identity boundary which is permeable in that she saw herself as thinking differently and from a different perspective about the messages she receives from the media. For example, the uptake residues conditioning her uptake of media led to a pattern of "kind of just read[ing] and forget[ing] about [it]" whereas her new understanding of rhetoric disrupted that residue and resulted in a new uptake capture involving inquisition and analysis which she then could enact.

As for her Final Website, Lorraine's product also suggested an influence from her developing rhetorical awareness. For the website, Lorraine wrote about the "Intersection of Systemic Racism and Health/Healthcare in the U.S." Without citing Bailey and Mobley's article on Black feminist DS, she repeated some of their claims through the emphasis of the "long history of misdiagnosing Black Americans…as mentally disabled" and her discussion of the way Black people and Black women in particular are stereotyped by medical professionals as having a higher pain tolerance. In terms of subject matter, this information demonstrates the transfer of disability knowledge across genres and contexts; in her week five response to Bailey and Mobley's "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework", she wrote

> Black women are often given the stereotype of being hypersexual, having the ability to endure pain that is much higher than other races, and able to 'surmount otherwise difficult obstacles because of their innate tenacity.' Due to these harmful perceptions, it creates an environment where Black women are not 'allowed' disability.

Lorraine saw that disability is something that is both created and denied rhetorically to perpetuate systemic racism. The rhetorical perspective from which we, and Bailey and Mobley, engaged with disability strengthened Lorraine's understanding of it as something we create or disallow due to stereotypes arising out of racist logics and histories. Rhetoric acted as an entryway into expanding the boundary around disability issues as intertwined with issues of gender and race. This attention to stereotypes might be a demonstration of how she can and does use rhetorical tools to better understand social issues and injustice. If nothing else, this can show that engagement with mental disability and rhetoric can increase the number of uptakes for engagement with social justice and, possibly, to take up social issues more rhetorically, as I will discuss later in the third theme of this chapter.

Considering my second research question presented above—in what other ways might we find indications that the composition classroom can be a space in which we can prepare to facilitate transfer of mental disability knowledge? —Lorraine's statement that "both from what I learned about mental disability [*and* rhetoric]" will make her better able to recognize and question the intentionality behind composition choices stands out. In this instance, it might indicate that teaching rhetoric through a critical disability studies lens and teaching mental disability as, in part, rhetorically constructed can be supportive of some students' writing skills and disability literacy. Practicing the skills to analyze public discourse on complex social issues *now* impacts what students are able to do *later* when faced with such topics in formal and informal conversations. The writing classroom, with its focus on rhetoric as a tool and concept, seems to be inherently supportive of students' ability to be more critically engaged participants in efforts toward advocacy which I discuss further below.

Peter: Expanding Uptake Possibilities by Teaching Disability from a Rhetorical Perspective

As stated in Chapter 4, "Peter has become one of the most exciting and arguably important characters in the narrative of this course," which requires I once again revisit his work. Because Peter did not resonate with the subject matter as much as other students, the way he latched onto and discussed rhetoric more frequently is important as a demonstration of the critical writing skills that can develop in a course with the theme of mental disability. Further, as demonstrated below, Peter's rhetorical awareness development inspired micro-transfers that expanded the uptake captures associated with the mental disability and DS subject matter. He provided a lot of evidence of his growing discursive boundary around rhetoric and the applicability and transferability of rhetorical awareness across assignments and into his future. I begin with Peter's Final Critical Class Reflection comments on rhetoric which were lengthy and, so, repeated piecemeal. The second sentence of his reflection was "What will stick with me the most in terms of writing and communication is the different types of formal writing, and all of the work we did with the concept of rhetoric." He continued, stating how important these two skills will be for "formally get[ing] my point across in an effective and efficient manner [and] can help propel [me] into higher positions, and make changes around me that can positively impact others" showcasing how he sees rhetorical skill as being beneficial for his own growth and how his work and words can be consequential in making change for the better. In these few statements, Peter worked on the redrawing of the discursive boundary around

the term *rhetoric* while also doing boundary-work on the spatio-temporal field in which he sees rhetoric being useful—that is, rhetoric was no longer just a topic we discuss in class, but became also applicable to his future career in business where he believes he can now be more capable of communicating, as he says, effectively and efficiently; as with Lorraine, Peter demonstrates the blurring of spatio-temporal boundaries that can result from the redrawing of discursive and identity boundaries as students interact with and experience micro-transfers between their goals, prior interests, and course concepts. Such crossing or blurring of spatio-temporal boundaries from redefinitions of *rhetoric* also created opportunities for more micro-transfers in those business contexts and a wider range of possible uptakes for information shared in his future business settings. In seeing the utility of rhetoric in "positively impact[ing] others", we might also be seeing an indication of how the redrawing of the discursive boundary around *rhetoric* contributed to the selection of his Final Website topic which was connected to social justice and changing educational opportunities for those in marginalized communities.

His following paragraph, spanning almost a page, focused only on rhetoric and his process of redrawing its boundaries as he began with the claim that "with such an emphasis on the plethora of definitions that rhetoric calls its own, along with the various methods and tools we studied, it would be hard not to carry some of this with me." Of the definitions of rhetoric we explored, he said that

> [George] Campbell's...has stuck with me, as it deals with the adaptation of rhetoric to fit the current need, as he defines it as 'the art of adapting discourse to its end' (1970). This…along with our class lessons and readings, allowed me to develop my own understanding of rhetoric and really put it in a way that I could fully 'get.'

He acknowledged his initial growth and the utility of these skills later, showing that they are integrated into his skill set and therefore indicate the permeability of his identity boundary that is inflexible in terms of his identity as someone pursuing a career in business, all of which reveals itself through the redrawing of the discursive boundary around *rhetoric*. He wrote, "As I continue along with my future career, flexibility in regards to forming an argument and being able to effectively convey those ideas is critical in a business setting…[and] can make or break your career's progress." He goes on, "Being able to adapt your rhetorical methods to the most effective form of communication is key in getting your ideas out there in the complicated world of business, and this class set me up to succeed in that regard." As above, these excerpts demonstrate the permeability of his identity boundary as he saw himself developing as a

communicator and having gained new skills. In addition, it's a demonstration of the flexibility and permeability of spatio-temporal boundaries as this learning crossed or was anticipated to cross material planes. Similar to Lorraine, the flexibility and permeability of the discursive boundary around *rhetoric* seemed to increase the uptake captures for the use of rhetorical skill itself and the possibilities he might see or consider later in his career. Further, Peter's statement that Campbell's definition along with the class lessons (i.e., engagement with peers) and readings influenced his ability to understand and define rhetoric for himself reveals the sort of micro-transfers that were necessary for him to redraw the discursive boundary around *rhetoric*. First, Campbell's definition was found following Peter's interaction with and uptake of the prompt for the Definitions of Rhetoric Email which required individual research and interaction with scholars in the field of rhetoric. Acknowledging the class lessons and readings also places emphasis on the micro-transfers occurring within the classroom between Peter, his peers, the scholarly work assigned, and me. Reading, writing, and discussing seem to be tools for facilitating micro-transfers and therefore the productive redrawing of boundaries that enable students to see future possibilities for responding, in Peter's case, in a professional setting.

Peter's notes in the Final Reflection were largely informed by the gradual redrawing of boundaries that occurred as he used rhetoric as a way to take up and meaningfully connect with the scholarship on mental disability. For example, during week two, Peter took time to define rhetoric over discussing the mental disability subject matter when responding to Chapter 1 of Price's *Mad at School*—a move resulting from the micro-transfers between his prior experience, the course content, and our free writing prompts which promoted his redrawing of the boundary around what the focus of the course was and could be and, in turn, increasing the number of uptake captures linked to the need to respond to the text. Responding to the question "In what ways is rhetoric a 'persuasive endeavor'? What does it mean to you for something to be persuasive?" Peter wrote "Rhetoric in itself is a 'persuasive endeavor'...[it is] essentially, the concept of persuading one's views and actions, both intentionally and unintentionally. For me, being persuasive is…being able to change other's views or actions." Initially, Peter's discursive boundary around *rhetoric* highlights his perspective of it as an act of persuasion whereas later, as illustrated above, he came to see it as a necessary part of communicating effectively. Further, selecting rhetoric as the uptake for this prompt, Peter redrew the boundaries around appropriate engagement with

the subject matter as he indirectly responded to Price's disability-heavy content. His discursive boundary around the term further developed in his reading the following week of Jack Selzer's "Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers." He wrote

> Selzer defines rhetoric as 'both a productive and interpretive enterprise.' I found this interesting because to me, Selzer is arguing that rhetoric is both a productive element, creating/finding ways to influence other 'things' and an interpretive element, understanding language and language usage in general. Normally we think of rhetoric as the former, the productive side, but getting into the realm of rhetoric being used to understand language/language usage as a whole stood out to me. Being able to both understand the two sides of rhetoric is crucial in understanding this entire concept, and to understand the more positive and negative aspects of this field.

Peter's discursive boundary continued to be worked on as he defined rhetoric and came to "get it" and find it applicable to his life, defining himself, too, as a rhetorical being. What's also interesting about Peter's engagement with *rhetoric* is that he first defined the term but then put that new conceptualization into use. Since he didn't resonate as much with the subject matter of mental disability, his free writing responses were often directed toward the rhetorical elements and effectiveness of the text with rhetoric serving as a point of entry that enabled him to take up the course conversations in a meaningful way. For example, in his response to the infographic on Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health from the African American Behavioral Health Center of Excellence, he acknowledged the newness of the genre but "appreciated being able to view this kind of rhetorical tool." He went on to discuss how the layout and structure of the information stood out to him and he discussed "other factors at play that help strengthen the argument…For instance, the usage of different font sizes for numbers/statistics helps them stand out and compels one to look at them." Further, he commented on the different colors and how they "diversify" the text, using different colors for positive and negative connotations and, finally, mentioned how the "rhetorical elements played a huge role in this infographic, and went just beyond language usage." In addition, as stated above, most participants mentioned that Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" impacted them and inspired their final research topic. However, when Peter responded to the text in his free writing exercise, he turned toward the rhetorical features, stating that what "stood out to me was the usage of 'visual' elements [which] put emphasis on information that the author, Price, wants to convey to the reader and help it stick with them." Peter's growing rhetorical awareness, then, was not only a claim he made, but something he demonstrated as he was able to

identify rhetorical elements and explain why they are being used or the impact they might have on the audience. He did so by reflecting on his own responses to the rhetorical features, and said,

> Personally, this rhetorical method really helps me grasp their argument, and thinking about it, really does help persuade my thoughts about the writing. Especially the usage of italics, which actually changes the way I read the word/phrase in my head, which is really strange now that I think about it.

In this passage, he saw himself as a valid source of evidence for the claims he made about the impacts of the rhetorical devices. Instead of stopping his conversation with those first couple of tools, he continued, "I also noticed that Price asks a lot of questions that really gets the reader thinking about the ideas within the text and how to apply those to answering the question, which Price ends up doing. This just aids with overall engagement, and can help influence the reader to answer questions that could sway their views towards Price." What he was noticing here is not only the rhetoric used by the author but what he appreciates and how he acts as a reader. To his surprise, "Just by changing some of the features of words and phrases is a critical tool when writing a compelling argument." These comments throughout the term reinforce Peter's redefinition of the term *rhetoric* and his redefinition of himself as someone who possesses rhetorical skill which he can use in writing. As such, he was able to employ these rhetorical skills in his Final Website titled "An Educational Deficit: The Impact on Marginalized Communities." For example, when discussing the way education is valued in our society, he included an image of mortarboards and, when discussing the connection of that value to the impacts of marginalized populations, he included a picture of a young Black girl carrying a significantly heavier load in her backpack which was labeled with an array of systemic issues. What he was affected by as a reader in the infographic was something he adopted in his own writing. When including a quote from George Washington Carver that he found important, he center aligned, enlarged, and italicized it, adopting what he valued from Price's text. The same was true in the section he titled "Criminal Incidents" where he used italics to emphasize a disclaimer about his presentation of educational quality as linked to criminal activity which he didn't want to be interpreted as framing Black and Brown students as criminals.

Moreover, with rhetoric at the forefront of many general writing courses, composition classrooms create opportunities for teaching mental disability knowledge from a rhetorical perspective which not only advances mental disability literacy but teaches broadly-applicable analytical skills and develops students'

understanding of the influence of various rhetorical choices. Peter's story highlights that teaching mental disability from a rhetorical perspective and teaching rhetoric through reading about disability discourse provides students multiple points of entry into class discussions and the concepts we discuss. The dynamic and nuanced position from which we discussed both rhetoric and mental disability did not require that students feel connected to the subject matter as long as the rhetorical nature of disability constructions was appropriately and broadly framed for multiple forms of engagement or multiple uptake possibilities. In other words, learning about rhetoric helped Peter connect with and remain in dialogue with DS scholars throughout the term to finish the tasks required. The interactions between the DS texts and the concept of rhetoric for Peter promoted his continued engagement with the subject matter; however, we cannot know yet what the impact of this continued engagement through a rhetorical perspective would be.

Yeni: DS as Support for Learning about Writing and Rhetoric

In Spring 2023, Yeni was double majoring in Finance and Operations and Supply Chain Management and saw these majors as gateways into a world of resolving "up-to-date issues in the society." He is not a first-generation college student and has multiple linguistic resources; therefore, in the transfer act, Yeni is not only transferring information across "learning contexts" but also "among languages" (Nowacek et al. 2024, p. 131). Like others, Yeni also made claims to his learning about rhetoric in his Final Reflection and how that will be "crucial in various business contexts such as marketing, sales, and negotiations" because "mastering rhetoric is the mastering of persuasion." His recognition of the use of that knowledge within other contexts indicates the redrawing of a spatio-temporal boundary which followed the shaping of his discursive boundary that I describe further below.

When introduced to rhetoric through our readings during week one, and within his first free writing exercise on Herrick's *The Theory and History of Rhetoric*, Yeni revealed an initial discursive boundary around *rhetoric*, saying "My understanding for rhetoric in the past is pretty vague." So, he approached the response to Herrick's text from a perspective he was familiar with, the perspective of persuasion, stating that

> As of now I only know that rhetoric is to use words and symbols to argue more effectively and persuasively. Persuasion as a term is quite broad. It can be achieved in many ways but the

> ultimate purpose is to make people change their stands, which the process involved in it is rhetoric.

This flexible-permeable discursive boundary allowed Yeni to continue approaching our readings on rhetoric and mental disability openly. Yeni was also asked to complete the Definitions of Rhetoric Email in which he said

> My understanding towards rhetoric starts quite vague at the beginning of the course because my first language is Mandarin, and even with Chinese definition, I am still confused. However, I can understand most part of rhetoric now. Rhetoric is the art of persuasion, in other words, making people believe what you think is true, in intentional manners, like speech, metaphor, audience, and so forth. These manners include basically every detail we can see in our lives.

A couple days prior to the due date for the Definitions of Rhetoric Email, he responded in class to Yergeau's "Clinically Significant Disturbance" saying that

> Yergeau defines rhetoric as 'rhetoric is everything and everywhere.' I think the intended audience might be those who have suffered from mental disabilities and those who do research on the mental issues. The style of it is really innovating this first person view makes the whole article rhetorical and touching, facilitating the audience to understand how it feels to be a mental disabled patient.

This demonstrates his developing rhetorical awareness through redrawing the discursive boundary around *rhetoric* and identifying the ways it is used within a text by rationalizing the stylistic choices of Yergeau. Beyond defining the term, Yeni showed signs of redrawing his identity boundary as well, as he used rhetorical awareness to identify and explain Yergeau's use of rhetorical tools. Yeni, like Peter, was able to engage with the subject of mental disability through a rhetorical lens that is more meaningful to him. His definition of rhetoric was further developed in his Rhetorical Awareness Letter submitted at the beginning of week four. Within the letter, he wrote

> Rhetoric is deeply embedded in our lives without most of us recognizing it. The most obvious aspect of it is how rhetoric can change the outcome of different things because it is an art of persuasion, not just a simple tool. Simple examples would be buy or not buy and accept or refuse. Rhetoric…plays an important role in help us reach to final decisions without us know it. Oftentimes, at least for me, I would just feel things by seeing, smelling, hearing, and let those feelings pass away rather than critically think about it. However, after several class sessions in ENGL 281, I started to mindfully see the world in a rhetorical way with the ability practiced through readings, discussions, and writing practices in class.

Yeni revealed in this passage the micro-transfers informing his shifting identity, discursive, and spatio-temporal boundaries. First, he emphasized that his prior knowledge interacted with the readings, discussions, and writing exercises to further establish the flexible-permeable boundary around *rhetoric*

and, in this case, the discursive boundary around things he might see, smell, or hear that may not have been considered rhetorical before. In claiming that he started to more mindfully engage with the world through a rhetorical lens, he redrew his permeable identity boundary as he defined himself as someone who has the critical skills needed to make observations about rhetoric in the world around him. Further, in shaping how he interacts with the world outside of the classroom, Yeni redrew the spatio-temporal boundaries around rhetoric and where it exists or can be perceived as well as where he can use the skills he has been practicing in class. Having authors from DS define rhetoric allowed him to develop his own understanding to access assignments and provided him a way to approach engagement with other mental disability artifacts and topics. For example, in his Rhetorical Analysis Memo submitted during the middle of week five, he was asked to analyze, and therefore given space to practice analyzing, the rhetorical features of a mental disability-related artifact. To do so, he selected an article titled “The Unbearable Lightness of Mental Health” through which he was not only able to connect rhetorically but through the author’s discussion on the impact mental distress has on productivity—a meaningful topic to him.

He also came to incorporate mental health into his Final Website in which he discussed the bidirectional relationship between obesity and mental health, something with which he had experience. One example of him adopting rhetorical tools he discussed and discovered through our readings was in his use of rhetorical questions, such as “Did you know: about 43% of adults with depression have obesity, according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)?” He also used bolded, red text to emphasize the 43% which may have been influenced by his engagement with the Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health infographic. Moreover, he built his credibility as a website creator by making claims about his commitment to “providing evidence-based information” and conforming to the genre conventions, such as in the “Contact Me” form he provided. One other rhetorical choice that may have resulted from his engagement with our course texts was his use of storytelling or including his personal experience which may have been a result of increased confidence about the boundary around website and academic writing based on the micro-transfers between his prior definitions and reading the stories of others in their academic and professional writing.

In his Final Reflection, he wrote that “mental disability rhetorics and literacy was a brand-new concept for me” acknowledging, again, his incomes—the initial boundary he had placed around rhetoric—since he said earlier that “my understanding toward rhetoric starts quite vague at the beginning of the course because my first language is Mandarin” and the Chinese translation was inaccurate and confusing for him. So, at first, Yeni’s discursive boundary around rhetoric was a bit amorphous and indistinct which led him to struggle “to understand rhetoric in the context of mental disability” and “finish the reading ahead of class”, something he said prevented him, at first, from engaging in class discussion. He later began to participate more. Ultimately, he came to see “the ability to be rhetorically aware [as] crucial to our everyday life” and as essential for being “an efficient communicator and critical thinker.” His value for rhetoric is even more clear in his statement that “If we all see this case as rhetors, which means we see it through a critical lens.” Critical thinking is a skill he claimed to have entered the class with and he saw rhetorical analytic skill as an opportunity to deepen that base ability. Although he said that he was initially worried about his ability to engage with the topic of mental disability rhetoric and literacy, in his Final Reflection, he said that “it turns out to be…that the topic is an excellent choice of honing the skills in rhetoric and analytical awareness and helping me and my classmates to truly understand existing societal issues.” In addition, he felt that “From a business student’s perspective, ENGL 281, unlike any other courses in the business school, is not that competitive though it requires much effort. It creates a peaceful academic environment for me to fully understand and well utilize the concept of rhetoric.” Although he shifted in this last statement to a mention of the nature of the course environment, he remained focused on the way that environment supported the practice of using rhetoric. With other students in this section, we can see how the DS and mental disability perspective framework complements our goals of teaching students particular writing skills, but Yeni explicitly articulated the utility he came to see in reading about DS from a rhetorical perspective and clearly showcased his learning about rhetoric in his website. Ultimately, this might alleviate some concerns instructors may have about whether a focus on mental disability would detract from students learning of necessary writing skills.

Cara: Rhetoric as an Entry-Point for Social Justice Issues of Personal Relevance

I continue Cara’s story in this section alongside Lorraine, Peter, and Yeni as an example of the rhetorical awareness that can equally develop with an explicitly deep connection to the mental disability

subject matter. As above, Cara significantly redrew discursive, identity, and spatio-temporal boundaries to develop a more defined and positive relationship to mental disability, and to purposefully adapt and transform that knowledge meaningfully within the context of her life as a member of the LGBTQ+ community. During week three, after some initial learning about rhetoric that helped Cara redraw boundaries that I discuss below, Cara offered a reflection on her past learning about rhetoric saying that Selzer's discussion on rhetorical analysis

> reminded me of the literary analysis I had to write for all my English classes in high school. We wrote most if not all of our essays discussing the author's purpose and the tools they used to persuade audiences or present their messages. I guess the whole time we were analyzing their rhetorical language without calling it rhetoric. We worked through the figurative language they used and sometimes talked about ethos, pathos, and logos but we never went in-depth on rhetoric. Looking back, I have done a lot of work with rhetoric, but never knew that was what I was doing.

In this excerpt, Cara both redefined her past experience with analysis through a new lens and made sense of the current themes by recognizing her existing relationship with that knowledge. She shows an existing, yet flexible-permeable, boundary around the term *rhetoric*. This flexibility and permeability was demonstrated in the weeks prior to her connection to past experiences as she generally worked to define what rhetoric meant through paraphrasing the authors' conceptualizations. For example, in response to Herrick's text during week one, she wrote "Rhetoric involves how we express our thoughts and beliefs to audiences…Authors and speakers use what they know about audiences to form their texts and speeches [and] are able to transform their words and language to align with audiences' beliefs." She was not yet establishing her own definition of rhetoric but writing one of Herrick's many in her own words. This opportunity to paraphrase other's work in informal, low-stakes, writing spaces could have been beneficial for her confidence in her understanding of rhetoric and therefore how she defined it for herself. The following week, in her Definitions of Rhetoric Email, she wrote that "from our discussions, I formed the understanding that rhetoric is all around us" and that "Rhetoric is a persuasive tool that can take an artistic form. We use different mannerisms, inflections, and words to enlist different emotions in our listeners to persuade them to listen to us and follow us. Just like Porter and McNally declare, rhetoric is used to create aesthetics in our speech to grab the attention of others." Importantly, Cara hinted at the micro-transfers inspiring the boundary she worked on around the term *rhetoric* as well as the identity boundary of herself and others as rhetorical beings. By stating that the discussions helped form her

understanding of the expansiveness of rhetoric, she indicated that she, her classmates, the course readings, the free writing questions, and I were all interacting to shape her boundaries. Further her engagement with Porter's and McNally's work alongside that we discussed in class and its interaction with her prior knowledge about rhetoric as well as the opportunity to synthesize and practice using this new knowledge through the assignment task also supported the redrawing of her boundaries.

Boundaries continued to be redrawn and micro-transfers revealed as she worked through the definitions to analyze rhetoric in her everyday life through the Rhetorical Awareness Letter during week three. She wrote, for example,

> To begin, in class and in readings, a lot of what was discussed was the notion that rhetoric is more than just language, it is also a multitude of forces around us. Like how the weather influences our mood, or how the architecture of the Suzzallo Library makes us feel studious and calm. I overlooked all these elements before starting this class, but now I find it hard to go about my daily life without thinking of at least a few things as rhetorical factors.

Cara prefaced her new perspective on rhetoric by reflecting on what she learned in class and from the readings meaning the discussions and readings she and her peers interacted with to generate micro-transfers supporting not only the discursive boundary around *rhetoric* as something beyond the linguistic but also her identity boundary as someone who has the skills to and who does recognize rhetoric in their everyday life. Further, the spatio-temporal boundaries of the classroom and world "outside" became blurred as she actively used her rhetorical awareness that resulted from the discursive boundary-marking. These boundary (re)markings expanded Cara's uptake captures of sensory information in that she had alternative (rhetorical) options for observing and analyzing the more-than-human such as architecture and the weather.

Cara reinforced the redrawing of these boundaries and her continual micro-transfers and uptake of the information in her Final Reflection submitted for finals week and the interview we completed during week six. In her interview she mentioned that she's "more aware of what choices authors are making" and while watching TV asking "why did the directors decide to use this scene, or like make the character." Although she thought this sounded "silly", she went on to add how it was useful for her in her other classes for "being able to close read texts more and be almost more cautious about what I'm reading and not taking it like at face value." Through the discursive boundary redrawing around *rhetoric*, Cara's spatio-temporal boundaries were also blurred and her identity boundary emphasized as she established herself

as someone who has a new way of engaging with media and within different contexts—the skills she'd learned and practiced within the course were now transportable and not contained within the classroom space because she defined herself as a possessor of the ability to apply them. Beyond reading others' words and watching TV, she went on to say that "I feel like having an understanding of rhetoric tells me to better like, articulate my ideas, and also use rhetoric to my own advantage to explain my ideas." Expanding on this point in her Final Reflection, she wrote that

> learning about rhetoric made me take a step back and realize that to be a good writer I cannot just throw a bunch of fancy words on a page in fancy grammatical structures and call it good, I must start understanding the message I want to produce through my words and the best way I can convey it my audience while also keeping them in mind.

This mindset and perspective came into play in her Final Website in which she claimed her goal was to produce "a website that informs both [queer and straight] communities" as well as "create a space for the queer community to feel safe, expand their knowledge, and express themselves." She also wanted "to create a platform that helps educate those who do not identify with the queer community on the effects and expectations of heteronormativity." To keep her audience in mind, she employed some of the tools that she admired from authors we engaged with in the course, including personal narrative and rhetorical questions. She also used accessible, colloquial language, her own and other's firsthand accounts of their coming out experiences, and definitions for and expectations of heteronormativity, emphasizing how it harms everyone. By including a positionality statement and personal account of coming out and the negative impact heteronormativity has had on her, she attempted to make the audience feel welcome, comfortable, and as if they could trust and relax into the reading of the website. So, Cara blurred the spatio-temporal boundaries determining where rhetorical awareness is useful as she imagined ways she could use the tools in other locations while also expressing that she sees herself as someone who has these tools to use and can use them to become a better writer, establishing her identity boundary as permeable into the future as well.

Although she was in a very different position in relation to mental health and disability upon entering the course, there are similarities between Cara's experience and those of the students above. Learning about rhetoric from the perspective of DS and mental disability still allowed her to write more intentionally, be more critical of other writers, consider audience, and better understand messages

through words. This, along with the stories above, seems to be an indication that the writing classroom is a space for supporting disability literacy since students were still able to acquire and recognize the importance and transferability of typical general writing course skills. This shows how we can similarly make space for discussions of other social issues that can't always be addressed in other courses although I do believe more cross-disciplinary work is required to support students holistically.

Implications of Students' Developing Rhetorical Awareness through a Disability Studies Lens

The potential of paying attention to micro-transfer and boundary-work is supported by the number of positive implications that arise out of this data. Overall, teaching about mental disability from a rhetorical perspective and rhetoric through disability studies scholarship improves students' rhetorical, audience, and genre awareness; increases the possibilities students see for taking up mental disability knowledge and other knowledge throughout their daily lives; provides alternative pathways for engagement if subject matter is unrelated for students; gives them space to practice applying rhetoric to respond to social issues; advances their perception of themselves as rhetorically influential; and allows them to apply what they appreciate in writing to their own research and communicative practices. In learning about rhetoric, Lorraine developed a perspective of mental disability as rhetorically constructed through social perceptions that lead to and reinforce stigma as she spoke about stereotypes and their consequences for those who are mentally disabled. Further, she and Peter showcase how rhetoric can serve as an alternative way to engage with mental disability and disability studies subject matter. For Lorraine, this looked like using rhetorical analysis to connect differently and more analytically with a text that produced strong emotions which she saw as limiting what she was able to pay attention to in the text. For Peter, this meant analyzing the rhetorical features of texts rather than expressing opinions on or relationships to the stories and authors, which allowed him to stay tethered to the texts he was not as able to relate to. This demonstrates the importance of providing students multiple pathways for engagement in our classrooms and presenting concepts and subjects from nuanced and dynamic perspectives that increase their uptake captures.

Most students' redrawing of the discursive boundary around *rhetoric*, for example in Lorraine's case seeing it as omnipresent, led to the redrawing of both spatio-temporal and identity boundaries as well. Lorraine and Cara both mentioned how it impacted their engagement with media and how they saw

it as applicable in their everyday lives. Further, this redefinition influenced their rhetorical choices at the end of the term as they adopted those rhetorical methods that they found valuable in the texts they read and for the goals they wanted to achieve. In Cara's case this involved storytelling and, for Peter, the use of images or non-linguistic forms of rhetoric. Interestingly, teaching rhetoric from the disability studies perspective acted as an entry point for Peter, Lorriane, and Cara to reshape the boundaries around other social issues. For example, Lorraine saw disability as intertwined with race and gender and Peter was inspired by issues of mental healthcare access in a way that allowed him to write about the lack of access to quality educational resources for marginalized communities.

These students also saw rhetoric as applicable later in their lives and careers, for example, Peter seeing the rhetorical skills as necessary for business communication which could have been even more influenced by the framing and cueing as beneficial for business futures in my rationales. In these moments, students productively redrew discursive boundaries that influenced the spatio-temporal boundary-work enabling rhetoric to be used in other contexts. We see this in Cara's comment above about how this reconceptualization of rhetoric would help her "better…articulate my ideas and also use rhetoric to my own advantage to explain my ideas." In doing so, they all recognized themselves as more capable rhetors and, as such, in need of making more intentional and meaningful choices in their communication. This, in other words, means that facilitating micro-transfers in our classrooms benefits students' redrawing of discursive and identity boundaries to support more far-reaching forms of transfer.

Agents of Change: How Micro-Transfers and Boundary-Work Influence Advocacy Efforts

In my graduate education, one of the many benefits of learning from a greater number of rhetorical scholars and reading a range of scholarship on rhetorical theory was developing a better sense of agency to advocate for myself and others. It made me more confident in my ability to communicate clearly about and increase my understanding of injustice, particularly the ways in which it is rhetorically constructed. These feelings were furthered through my ability to speak with others on the topics and concepts that mattered to me, providing me evidence of my capabilities. This sense of advocacy and confidence to advocate for change seemed to also occur for students in my course. Having a vocabulary with which to speak about complex issues and a space to practice doing that speaking may be essential for inspiring students to transfer knowledge about any social issue and, in this case, mental disability. The

Agents of Change theme arose out of my discovery of students' significant interest and investment in making change related to either mental disability/disability broadly and/or their specific research interests, projects, and majors. Therefore, this theme was identified by any mention of a desire to act or make change within their writing, research, and interviews. The *in vivo* code that inspired the theme label is Foster's mention that their parents always encouraged them to be an "agent for change." Change, solution, and advocacy were already on my list of words to pay attention to, but this solidified and acts as an *in vivo* code to my observations. Every student provided either a solutions, future directions, or resources page on their website. This was interesting because it was not listed as a required element of their website in the prompt (Appendix XXXVII). In their Project Proposal (Appendix XXXIV), they were asked to share "Objectives" such as "goals and motivations, what inspired your choice of topic, what you want to achieve, and what you hope to resolve in your research" and a "Solution" which included their "deliverable" and the following:

- Describe whether you are developing an explicit argument or generally trying to inform an audience. Tell me why.
- Explain what conclusions you anticipate you will come to. This may change, but it's good to think forward.
- Tell me when and where the information you are going to present will be useful to you in the future.

Further, they were asked to share "Costs" of the "anticipated limitations of your research…as well as what obstacles you anticipate you might face" in addition to "the stakes of the project: what will be lost if this information is not presented to your intended audience? Who are you wanting to benefit or inform?" Following the Proposal, students completed the Website Sketch (Appendix XXXV) which asked them to make decisions about which tabs and pages to include based on the following questions:

- What do you want to achieve?
- Who will use [the website]?
- How will they use it?
- Where will they use it?
- What information do they need?
- What information should come first?

- What needs to be the most readily available for readers?
- What will readers do with the information?

When speaking of the goals or what they wanted to achieve they all made claims to inform, educate, promote, inspire, support, help, address, make aware, build community, contribute, encourage, create, etc. and were very future forward. I found this latter point incredibly interesting for the discussion of transfer, especially from the perspective of its traditional definition, in that far-road transfer involves knowledge moving across future contexts. As you will see, students make many statements about what they hope to achieve, who they want to benefit, and what role they see themselves filling within those conversations, but I'm unsure how much of this stems directly from engagement with the course subject matter or if the students saw these calls for action and change as a requirement of the research paper and website genre especially considering many of their projects pertained to social justice. It's possible, however, that with social justice being part of the course theme and other conversations throughout the term, students might have perceived a greater number of possible uptakes for responding to the research website prompt because they saw that they were allowed to engage with such topics. Additionally, my inability to follow these students on their journeys after the project prevented me from determining the degree to which this advocacy was actualized. Because of this uncertainty, I have saved this theme for the final leg of my findings and as a segue into more extensive conversations about the future of this work.

Cara: Listening, Learning, and Challenging Perspectives

One of the most unique things about Cara was her early desire to write about mental health. As demonstrated above, she took the most explicit advocacy stance upon entering the course and disclosed in her Introductory Email that she intended to major in "Sociology with a double minor in Human Rights and English Writing" since she had an interest "in how our societies alter our politically moral beliefs [such as] human rights, equality, and mental health perceptions." She expanded on this further stating that, "I have always wanted to start a blog about my journey with mental health, but I have never felt comfortable in my knowledge to publicly express my thoughts." Although this statement does not indicate a level of advocacy, she followed it up with an explanation of her goals for the course being "to gain more knowledge through our readings and discussion to feel comfortable enough in my understanding to create

a platform to express my thoughts and help others." In these statements, Cara worked on her identity boundary as well as the discursive boundary around what it means to help others. First, Cara defined herself as someone who cares about mental health but also saw herself as limited by her lack of knowledge and confidence, therefore not having the tools to help others which she defined as, in part, sharing personal stories. Her identity boundary is demonstrated to be flexible-permeable in these instances as well, as she expressed openness to attaining new skills and knowledge. To start the course, Cara saw sharing personal stories as part of the task of helping individuals experiencing adverse mental health symptoms. Her personal experience, then, could be leveraged as a tool for helping others make sense of their similar conditions. However, she felt that she didn't yet have the other communicative tools and knowledge to make her feel confident sharing this story which hindered her on her existing journey of advocacy. This also shows her drawing of a spatio-temporal boundary: her current boundary around her identity restricted where she saw it as possible to discuss mental health. I assumed that her early claims would mean she naturally spent a large part of the course seeking out opportunities to reach her goals of attaining new knowledge and helping others. In other words, because the knowledge about mental disability was already meaningful to her, I assumed she would be more likely to engage in the sort of boundary-marking that supports advocacy or long-term transfer. As mentioned above, a more explicit focus on students' incoming course goals is needed as well as more attention throughout the term on what personal, academic, and professional goals students are trying to achieve with each writing task.

At the beginning of the term, during week two, Cara's tone toward the issues presented in the readings might indicate the redrawing of her identity boundary as she "find[s] problems with the way that authoritative figures belittle the mental health of others in the name of capitalism." This shows the permeability of her identity boundary; as she gained knowledge about mental disability and how providers might respond to it, she was able to identify a problem and identify herself as someone who cares about that problem. The terminology here, such as *authoritative*, *belittle*, and *in the name of* indicate a tone of upset or discomfort with the issue which may be a necessary component in the process of advocacy. Within the same free write, in her response to Price's first chapter of *Mad at School*, she presented a story about how she was belittled by a male medical professional showing the interaction between her past, experiential knowledge and the current learning—one of the micro-transfers informing the redrawing

of her identity boundary. Importantly, she came to make sense of her prior experience with the medical provider through her learning about the experiences of others and made sense of the new knowledge through her own mental health experience, almost as if her prior negative feelings about that interaction were finally validated. The micro-transfer of her past experience interacting with Price's analysis of the *DSM* allowed her to take up her past experience as a negative one and to define an issue with the healthcare system; in other words, it is in the micro-transfer that there were greater uptake captures or through which earlier captures became disrupted, allowing the prior experience to be reframed as something that needed to be responded to from the perspective of capitalist critique.

Cara's potential for advocacy and to be an agent of change is supported in her later writing as well. In her week five response to the infographic on Black LGBTQ+ mental health, she wrote that

> What stood out to me was how large of an impact discrimination has on physical and mental well beings. I knew that discrimination was harmful but my privileges have allowed me to not realize the extent to which it reaches. 95% of people reporting that discrimination affected their physical well-being was shocking to me…I feel like everything about the infographic and podcast are important to educate the population on the impacts of discrimination and lead people to curve away from it.

In stating "I knew", Cara shows the initial boundaries of her knowledge around the harms of discrimination and "but" is her awareness of the limits of that knowledge and "was shocking to me" illustrates her acquisition of new knowledge that resulted in her identity boundary-marking. Here, she identified herself as someone who has specialized knowledge about mental health and physical well-being as well as someone who is in a privileged subject position. Beyond this, the shock Cara experienced when she learned that discrimination impacts physical well-being works on the discursive boundary around both physical and mental health as they both become interconnected and more social in their being influenced by other's actions. The redrawing of her identity and discursive boundaries, her knowledge and heightened awareness, also inspired her to feel more passionate about change and advocacy. Focusing on the importance of education and the need to "curve away from it" are inklings of her positioning herself as an agent of change or to redraw her identity boundary to define herself as someone who is capable of and who has the tools to be an agent of change.

Eventually, Cara moved beyond statements about education that were detached from any particular actor. In her Proposal for her website during week six, she said

> The goal of the proposed project is to bring a definition of heteronormativity to the world and raise awareness of its harm. [This] proposal outlines the issues of heteronormativity and its effect on the LGBTQIA+ community, identifies the goals for bringing awareness to these issues, and leaves readers with an understanding of the steps needed to divulge the systems in place.

Initially, I thought that the early focus on awareness was too abstract to be indicative of increased agency and advocacy. However, one of the first steps in advocacy is to identify and accept an issue; that is, it requires the redrawing of a discursive boundary that allows one to identify a phenomenon or event as a problem. Cara defined herself as someone who can help others identify and accept heteronormative expectations as a problem as well which could lead to other's embrace of "the steps needed to divulge the systems in place." Further, this involved the redrawing of her discursive boundary around the website: it, too, could raise awareness and present steps for social change. In addition, Cara redrew the spatio-temporal boundary that allowed her to push this information outside of the classroom. Moreover, this segment demonstrates her continual and iterative practice of redefining herself and redrawing her identity boundary as she committed herself to advocating for the queer community and reinforcing her position as a part of that community through her desire to build a more equitable world for those who identify as LGBTQIA+.

During the same week, Cara completed her interview with me over Zoom. Throughout the interview, she made statements about her role in conversations regarding mental disability, such as "So if we want to talk about it, like everyone has to contribute to the conversation in some way, even if it is like I mentioned earlier, like just listening and learning." She went on to mention that "like my goal, might be to spread awareness. But right now my role, in like our class, is to just learn and expand my understanding, so I can talk about it more efficiently" which supports her goals from the beginning of the class to be able to have the confidence to write her blog. Similar to the earlier statements on raising awareness, listening and learning did not initially stand out to me as demonstrations of "actual" activism; however, I recognized that listening and learning are prerequisites for engaging in more active forms of advocacy like "talk[ing] about it more efficiently." Thus, Cara's identity boundary was redrawn as she shifted the discursive boundary around advocacy and, consequently, who she is within those conversations. In this redrawing, she presented herself as someone who has yet to have the power to engage in active forms of advocacy as she was limited by her need to learn more which resulted in her uptake and transfer occurring "behind

the scenes." In other words, the uptake residues attached to her definition of what it means to respond to knowledge about social justice—that is, her memory of what it means to advocate for others—informed her uptake captures or what she saw as possible responses to the information. Her uptake enactment—resulting action in response to the newly attained knowledge—is the act of listening and being open to learning (i.e., accepting that she had more to learn about the topic and other's experiences) which was a form of advocacy she expected of and wanted to replicate for the audience of her Final Website. One unique uptake affordance of the classroom was that it offered Cara a space for engaging in that form of activism since she had others to listen and learn from through scholarship and interactions with her peers. This could be an indication that, by reading DS scholarship in which the authors advocate for disabled people in writing as well as through the use of their personal stories, students' discursive boundary around *advocacy* is being redrawn in ways that allow them to position themselves as agents of change in social justice conversations.

In looking at the micro-transfers between her prior knowledge, peers, disability studies scholarship, and the collective definition of the classroom through our practices, it is possible to see her unique process of potentially reaching high-road and far transfer in that a certain degree of preparation and confidence is needed to apply learned knowledge in future contexts. This listening and learning, said differently, is Cara's way of priming herself to make connections and framing how she might approach spreading awareness later. Without paying attention to micro-transfer, I might be less attentive to what happened "behind the scenes" as Cara mentally transformed the knowledge to make sense of it and, therefore, reveal connections for future application. This further demonstrates the limits of the "carrying" model for valuing students' unique transfer processes.

Following her statements about listening, learning, and expanding her understanding, I asked Cara what it means or would look like for her to spread awareness. She said,

> when we were talking about…[Sara Ahmed's] 'feminist killjoy' in class today like bringing [injustice] up in situations that may be uncomfortable, and like talking at people who like have the like set image of like what it means to be like mentally disabled or have a mental disability and like kind of try to educate them and what it really might be compared to their understanding. So, I think it's like…just trying to, yeah, challenge their perspectives.

She expanded on this later when she mentioned that she aims to use this knowledge and experience to talk to her family about mental disability as she said "I'm from rural Illinois, [and] like they have some set

views on like mental disability, and like those aspects so just being able to like have those uncomfortable conversations with them" is a way to spread awareness and contribute to the conversation. Four things stand out to me in these excerpts: (1) the underscoring of Cara's identification of herself as someone who is (or will be) capable of being an active agent in these conversations; (2) the redrawing of the spatio-temporal boundaries of home and school; (3) the uptakes made possible through the facilitated interactions of Ahmed's concept, disability scholars' work, and Cara's lived experience; and (4) the attention to discomfort. First, in adding onto claims of listening, learning, and spreading awareness, Cara continued to work on the permeable discursive boundary around advocacy; here, it also included challenging perspectives. In addition, she further showed the permeability of her identity boundary—not only is she defined as someone who can listen and learn but as someone who has the potential to challenge other's hard-set beliefs about mental disability. In speaking about her family in rural Illinois, she highlighted the flexible-permeable nature of the spatio-temporal boundaries around home and school. This was made possible through the micro-transfers between the scholarship, in-class conversations, and her personal experience with her family. In their interaction, these elements changed Cara's uptake captures, expanding the possible enactments in response to her family's remarks or beliefs about mental disability. Additionally, in speaking about this potential scenario in which she might engage in challenging beliefs, Cara framed and primed herself for how she might perform far transfer in the future, providing another demonstration of how facilitating micro-transfers in our classrooms is not only necessary but also already possible within the structure of most writing courses. Finally, and more speculatively, Cara's repetition of "uncomfortable" (inspired by Ahmed's comments on discomfort of those in privileged positions) might tell us that a certain degree of discomfort is needed to engage in boundary-marking that enables far-reaching forms of transfer in the same way that Ahmed observes the productivity of discomfort to bring awareness to systemic issues and in the same way that we are often taught one must be challenged and made uncomfortable to experience intellectual growth. I wonder, then, if this implies, even generally, that supporting knowledge transfer involves one's discomfort—by this I refer to varying degrees of discomfort that may take the form of questioning a definition, reflecting on a personal experience (i.e., being disrupted into the past), or even, simply, *noticing* which can be a discomfort of drawing us further into or out of the present moment or seeing the world from another's perspective or

one of our previous perspectives. If this is the case, then is it maybe justifiable to say that writing classrooms, spaces in which we often encourage discomfort for the sake of learning and engage with texts that we anticipate will make some students uncomfortable, are an appropriate, if not one of the best, places to facilitate the transfer of disability studies discourse? Again, this is speculative but raises questions for further exploration and offers another element of student experiences that might help us better understand their complex transfer acts.

To turn back to Cara's advocacy, her potential to be an agent of change appeared, too, as she contemplated the future of mental disability in her life. She said "I kind of want to go down a similar path of like advocating for mental disability and like myself and that kind of stuff. So, I definitely think [learning about mental disability will] be useful for me." The class discussions' and readings' interaction with her incoming goals is evidenced in her claims that "I kind of want to go into like the journalism aspect of like activism. So I feel like just…like being able to write about mental health from my own perspective will be helpful and like having the tools and knowing how to do it." Additionally, upon submitting her Final Website, Cara stated she wanted to "create a space for the queer community to feel safe, expand their knowledge, and express themselves" and "create a platform that helps educate those who do not identify with the queer community or the effects and expectations of heteronormativity." Similarly, she noted that "It should be the responsibility of everyone, queer or not, to educate themselves and advocate for diversity, equality, and inclusion." As mentioned, Cara entered the course sharing that she wanted to start a blog to help others with similar disabilities and mental health experiences which here she articulated is a form of activism, expressing an explicit desire to be an agent of change. Reflecting on the course and its utility, Cara established herself again as someone capable of advocacy both in the future and in the project at hand. Her identity boundary was permeable as she allowed the new knowledge about mental disability and heteronormativity to be integrated into her repertoire and identified herself as capable of using that knowledge in a productive manner to make change. In doing so and in tandem with her journalism goals, she shaped the spatio-temporal boundaries around both the classroom and the public as a future journalist and current producer of a published website. As she emphasized the practice of "tools" and the opportunity to write about mental health from her perspective in this course, she reinforced that the course served as a sort of primer and framework for her goals, increasing the possible uptakes of

mental health and disability knowledge and the possibilities for being an agent of change. Similar to my experience in the introduction of this section, Cara believed she would develop a vocabulary, and the skills needed, to talk about these issues: to transfer this knowledge into other contexts. In addition, completing the website for the course helped her reach her goal of advocating for the LGBTQIA+ community.

One other aspect of Cara's potential advocacy that struck me was that her boundary around genres for communicating about mental disability remained relatively fixed, that is inflexible-permeable. In our interview, she mentioned that she sees "personal statements" as one of the best genres for talking about mental disability since "they can be more powerful than like a second-hand story." The personal nature of some of the readings, despite them being academic, was striking to her, "especially because, like in high school, we were always taught like you can't use personal pronouns, so it almost felt like off limits to use your personal statements and my input in your writing." In *As We Have Always Done*, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson writes

> My body and my life are part of my research, and I use this knowledge to critique and analyze. I will not separate this from my engagement with academic literature, because in my life these things are not compartmentalized. I write from the first person, because within Nishnaabewin, this is a mechanism of accountability for my own thoughts, critique, and analysis, and a recognition that these will necessarily vary from other Nishnaabeg thinkers. (p. 31–32)

She goes on to reflect on her experience reading Lee Maracle's *I am Woman* which felt as if "she wrote it *to me*. It feels truthful. It feels real because it is" (p. 32) and

> She didn't back it up with academic references. She didn't qualify it. She didn't say maybe it isn't like this for everyone…She just spoke her truth, without apologies. And then she published it herself. As if this is normal, as if it is her birthright, because, as she demonstrates to us, it is. (p. 32–33)

These excerpts stood out to Cara as meaningful and conflicted with prior knowledge about academic writing. She referenced these moments in her interview, saying that "I don't remember exactly what reading it was, but we talked about how like her writing just was because that was her experience. So I feel like that can be very powerful when talking about mental disabilities, because our experiences are our own experiences, and these are facts, because they happened to us." In addition, Cara referred to Yergeau's "Clinically Significant Disturbance", stating that "[they] are using [their] personal voice to spread a message and not fit into the academic mold. I guess. So that was powerful" which caused her to "take

breaks from reading." From the beginning of the term, the personal was important for Cara to make change, to help people, as she disclosed in her Introductory Email; this was confirmed in her Final Website where she claimed she is "a queer individual (she/her) with mental disabilities that wants to share her experiences and educate on the issues of society." So, using the personal is part of the boundary she redrew around what it means to advocate for others with mental disabilities and the boundary around academic writing. This boundary, however, is inflexible in that she still saw advocacy as linked to reporting on personal experiences. Yet, the permeability of the boundary that allowed her to read, appreciate, absorb, and be affected by the stories of Simpson and Yergeau, in particular, contributed to her redrawing of her identity boundary as she accounted for the increased ability to advocate for others through the reinforcement of her prior beliefs about the utility of sharing the personal and her increased confidence. Seeing established scholars use their personal histories as evidence to support arguments about systemic issues was validating for Cara and secured an uptake capture that had not fully come into frame and inspired uptake enactments for mental health advocacy. In other words, it's possible that being affirmed in our beliefs, particularly if we hold them with uncertainty, and having evidence to support those beliefs increases possible enactments by showing us that they are okay or, as in Hearts' and Foster's cases above, that those uptakes do not hold as much risk therefore increasing the likelihood of finding opportunities to transfer.

Ethan Heiss: Public-Facing Genres as Opportunities to Practice Advocacy

Similar to Cara's website serving to support the LGBTQIA+ community, Ethan's Final Website was a step toward more actively contributing to mental health advocacy. Some of his project goals were to "reevaluate public discourse surrounding mental disability," "stimulate thoughtful conversation and promote a more nuanced and empathetic discourse around mental health," and to "introduce novel angles for both media and academic communities to explore the complexities of mental disability." Producing the website with the goal of shifting public discourse and impacting those involved in media production and academic conversations, Ethan worked on the spatio-temporal boundaries that distinguish the public, private, academic, and classroom material fields. The flexibility and permeability of these boundaries, as we have seen with other themes, blur the lines between material fields and reinforce the understanding that students' work, school, and personal contexts are always interlocking and

overlapping. This blurring seems essential for promoting disability literacy, influencing uptake captures, and inspiring alternative uptake enactments as students see greater possibilities for where and when this knowledge can be adapted for use. These spatio-temporal lines were also blended through Ethan's process of redrawing the discursive boundary around his writing as it was no longer limited to English 281 but public and had the power to influence ("stimulate") the thoughts of others. His belief in his writing as having such influence is also a demonstration of Ethan's work on his identity boundary; he established himself as someone who was knowledgeable on public discourse, capable of analyzing it, and thus communicating about it in a way that could guide the public toward more thoughtful engagement with mental health and disability. In other words, Ethan might have seen himself and the writing he did as increasing the number of possible uptakes for mental health knowledge specifically but also public discussions that people try to make sense of through placing blame on mental health or disability. He was acting as or perceiving himself to be an agent of change in the spatio-temporal and discursive fields that tend to hold more negative perceptions of these conditions and experiences. Such boundary-marking was made possible through the micro-transfers occurring between his personal knowledge and experience, our class discussions, and the work of disability scholars who impacted his uptake captures and enactments by modeling that these conversations have a place in public and academic discourse.

Throughout his project, Ethan also critiqued the "prevailing narrative" that "portrays mental disability as a 'hijacker' of one's mind" and which "can inadvertently foster a culture where individuals with such conditions evade personal responsibility" therefore "eclipsing other contributing factors such as personal beliefs or societal influences." He acknowledged the "complex and multifaceted" nature of mental disabilities and mental health challenges, claiming that this narrative "reduce[s] these conditions to a single, oversimplified narrative" and "misrepresents the lived experiences of those with mental health conditions…[and] impedes the development of effective support systems and treatments tailored to their unique needs." Ethan's repetition of the term "narrative" signals a further redrawing of the boundary around *mental disability* that may have contributed to his desire to act as an agent of change in mental health conversations. *Mental disability*, in the case Ethan's described "oversimplified narrative", became a character in a series of misconnected events that resulted in this character being scapegoated, drawing attention away from other issues that may affect negative actions as well as resources that benefit those

with mental health challenges. Further, Ethan established mental disability as a character that is caricatured in mainstream portrayals that emphasize the most sensational elements of these conditions and ignore the nuances of each individual experience and contextual factors that influence behavior. By analyzing the ways that this narrative manifests in society, Ethan advocated for challenging it, striving for understanding individual struggles, “moving beyond”, and inspiring a “shift in perspective” that more adequately accounts for the nuances of mental health experiences.

As stated in Cara’s section, one of the first steps in advocacy, be it personal or social, is identifying and accepting that there is an issue—that is, defining and (re)drawing a boundary around it. In Chapter 4, I speak in detail about Ethan’s change in perspective and his claims that the course and course readings allowed him to think of mental health outside of his own experience. This shift in “mental health challenges” (as he calls them) transforming from solely personal to reified and negatively framed in the media/through discourse pushed Ethan’s reflections and discussions of it beyond his own experience and allowed him to see his knowledge of and proximity to the topic as an opportunity to advocate for change. In other words, upon recognizing mental health issues as connected to discourse and rhetorical constructions, Ethan reframed his experience as an issue beyond the personal which inspired him to want to advocate for change. This also supports the power Ethan might perceive himself to wield in countering mainstream narratives of mental disability. Ethan’s language of reduction and misrepresentation in the media as well as the ways that misrepresentation interferes with adequate support of mentally disabled individuals indicates his identification of a problem, particularly a problem outside of his own experience with mental disability. So, Ethan’s boundary-work is discursive in as much as he defines the problem and mental disability, spatio-temporal due to the interconnections he establishes between the media and healthcare (i.e., support systems and treatments), and identity-related as he presented himself as educated enough on disability discourse to contribute to shifting narratives. This identity boundary was redrawn as he centered movement, shifting, novelty, and stimulation—words associated with change, suggesting that Ethan can act as an agent for said change in his belief or hope that his Final Website can operate effectively in the rhetorical ecology to better support those with mental disabilities. Toward the end of his project, he noted that “the dynamic nature of mental health discourse and media representation necessitates ongoing research and analysis.” Arguing for ongoing actions that support positive changes

in mental health discourse is a form of advocacy even if it means convincing the audience into agreement regarding the public support needed for those of us who are mentally disabled. Part of Ethan's observed dynamism might be a result of his redefinition of mental disability as part of a larger narrative in reports about violence, hate speech, or other harmful behaviors. Seeing mental disability as part of a broader story, as a character interacting with other elements of each context, supports Ethan's perception of the dynamic nature of "mental health discourse" that "necessitates ongoing research and analysis." Evident within this portion of Ethan's journey are the micro-transfers between Ethan's personal experience as someone who grew up around and has been diagnosed with mental disabilities, his informal research on the conditions, Price's chapter on media representations of mental illness as they relate to acts of violence, Ethan's observations of media representations of celebrity hate comments or odd behaviors, and the genre of the website as an opportunity to reach a public audience. Price's influence is apparent in Ethan's reflection on her chapter during week three where he wrote that "she challenges the notion that mental health issues are inherently linked to violent, dishonest, or immoral activities, and she advocates for a more nuanced understanding of the many complex factors that play a role in these disasters." With a focus on media representations of mental health conditions and a desire to promote a similarly nuanced public perspective of such conditions, it's clear that Price's analysis impacted the uptakes that Ethan saw as possible for responding to the research project prompt. This combined with his history with and personal interest in learning more about mental disability led to an uptake enactment that contributed to the redrawing of spatio-temporal boundaries since he saw himself as "incredibly lucky to have personally experienced mental disability" in that it "positioned me to examine and discuss these issues from the perspective of *understanding* rather than just observing" as stated in his Project Proposal during week six.

Particularly interesting in all cases related to advocacy is the possibility of the website genre serving as a catalyst for advocacy stances or, rather, a catalyst for redrawing identity and spatio-temporal boundaries that position students as advocates for social change. In other words, the website project prompt served as an uptake affordance which informed the type of permissible genres (uptake captures) students might perceive as available for responding to social issues. The sort of micro-transfers contributing to observations of a wider range of uptake captures were the moment-to-moment interactions of the social justice-oriented readings on disability, citational politics, intersectionality, colonialism in

research, and ethical land relations; the students' varied interpretations of the readings and what they were willing to share with others in class; the assignment prompts; and the sample papers we reviewed together. Working together, these elements of the class context supported each other as affordances that influenced the boundary-marking activity around definitions of *advocacy*, content that "belongs" in the classroom, and locations in which such advocacy can occur. Further, student knowledge about and analyses of the genre conventions of the website alongside their need to write about a relevant issue interacted to support their addition of advocacy-like pages on their websites. In this case, although I would need more data to support it, the course content and the opportunity to produce a public-facing genre likely increased the possible uptake enactments in Ethan's conversations regarding mental health—rather than it being only a personal interest that he informally researched in his free time, he now had an avenue for responding that positioned him as an advocate for others. I will talk more about the influence this potential has on future directions of this research in Chapter 6. It's hard to say whether this desire to advocate would have existed identically given the course theme were different but it is worth noting that the course theme gave Ethan the opportunity to make connections between the personal and public he may not have otherwise and, too, the structure of the course provided Ethan a space to practice communicating about these connections and applying new knowledge; this practice itself is an act of priming, cueing, and framing that makes similar uptake enactments possible in future contexts, particularly those in which mental health and disability are being discussed.

Foster(ing) Agents of Change by Supporting Self-Advocacy

It would be an injustice to close this section without sharing more of Foster's story given they were the inspiration for the *in vivo* code "agent for change" and the resulting theme that holds this section of my project. So, I begin with our week six interview in which Foster detailed their emotional response to Yergeau's "Clinically Significant Disturbance", claiming that it "was very emotionally charging to read the one about hospitalization…it was just like…that made me really frustrated…as someone who was about to be hospitalized." During this time, they noted that they were "the one who was really advocating for [hospitalization] at first" and they were "very thankful that my parents let me make the choice to not hospitalize myself" by proposing that Foster give themselves two weeks to see if the distress passed before making such an important decision. They mentioned that "my parents never like treated me like I

was, I guess, crazy or insane…my parents raised me to be very independent, and my own kind of agent for change." Moments prior, Foster noted that it's "not true for a lot of like other disabled people, but my parents have always let me be my own advocate, and like they just made me feel safe enough to a point where I can understand my own needs, and that's not always necessarily true [for others]." Like Ethan, Foster's self-advocacy was strong at the beginning of the term as they expressed their access needs in their Introductory Email. Further, they spent much of their free writing space identifying issues and passively suggesting social change is necessary. For example, in their response to Price's first chapter of *Mad at School* and Dolmage's first chapter of *Disability Rhetoric*, they wrote

> I think that it's incredibly important to bolster one's ability to speak or write persuasively if society will most likely not give equal opportunity to voices speaking out on certain topics. Although it is rather unfortunate and discouraging that society has this system of prioritization (making it somewhat of a protest to not try to persuade anyone), it makes it all the more important to challenge societal values and be exemplary of the 'underdog.'

As above, the language and tone of the terms *unfortunate* and *discouraging* that Foster used indicates the redrawing of a boundary around certain social relations as negative, presenting an issue and, at the end, indicating a desire for challenging the social dynamics that position some perspectives as less than others. In other words, Foster's claims for change are not directed toward a particular actor but their attention to challenge and change suggests their redrawing of an identity boundary around their own influence to contribute to initiatives for change.

Later in the term, Foster defined themselves as a model for change related to how we approach conversations and care for those who experience sexual assault, particularly on college campuses. When discussing their project in their Final Reflection, Foster noted that "I tried to redirect the generalized attitudes towards survivors to have a more compassionate and empathetic approach. With putting this approach at the forefront of my work, I am able to model to others how delicate this topic is and how people might go about treating and supporting survivors in their own lives." As they did when identifying society's "system of prioritization" as an issue, Foster redrew a discursive boundary around societal responses and attitudes toward survivors of sexual assault, identifying approaches to support and responses to survivors' experiences as less than "compassionate and empathetic." The discursive identification of an issue enabled Foster to work on their identity boundary as they portrayed themselves as someone who is capable of, through their research and experience, to "redirect" and "model to others"

how to support survivors. This modeling took place in their Final Website titled “Bodymind and Collegiate Assault” which was produced “to develop deeper empathy for survivors with longer-term trauma responses,” “better understand how colleges can foster sexual assault and how they handle cases of this nature,” and “push forward new policies in colleges that favor supporting survivors as they continue their education at the institution.” The terminology “develop deeper,” “better understand,” and “push forward” suggest Foster’s reinforcement of their identity boundary, seeing themselves as someone capable of advocating for and influencing change. In the redrawing of these discursive and identity boundaries, Foster also worked on that of the spatio-temporal—an act that seems to be essential for advocacy because the experiential knowledge and learning about current support systems for survivors must cross spatio-temporal boundaries to impact how others (i.e., university officials in this case) change their approach to treatment and support. Redrawing these boundaries that might restrict discussions of and support for survivors to private spaces supported them inserting their personal history into the classroom and, consequently, into the public in the form of research demonstrating the bodymind response to trauma and the lack of support provided to sexual assault survivors on college campuses.

The boundaries of Foster’s project were further redrawn in their discussion of “Future Use of Information” in their Project Proposal where they stated that

> The information gathered and presented within this project will be of aid to survivors, community members, college students, and collegiate institutions. The project will help normalize a lot of the trauma responses survivors may encounter, helping them facilitate a greater community and lessen the sense of feeling isolated in how they are handling things post-assault.

Spatio-temporal boundaries became more blurred as Foster argued for the passing of survivorship and support into communities beyond the collegiate setting. Foster then redrew their identity boundary which was flexible-permeable as they did not see themselves as fundamentally changed, but their ability to enact change increased. For example, they argued that “The project will also give me more content to speak on with fellow UW students, faculty, and staff on the matter of sexual assault and how colleges have historically dealt with such cases.” This positioned Foster as an *active* agent of change within the broader UW community and outside of the space of their website produced for English 281. Their desire to inspire community members to “become better allies and supporters” of survivors suggests they saw themselves as someone who has the knowledge and skills necessary for influencing attitudes and

motivations of the UW community. Beyond helping survivors directly, Foster also claimed that their findings "are a call to action for universities…[to] keep survivors and their well-being at the forefront." Such blurring of spatio-temporal boundaries that allow for this advocacy was part of Foster's process of taking up the instructions of the website assignment prompt. In being told "to write about a topic inspired from *any* of our course readings and discussions," Foster's interaction with the prompt inspired a reflection on our discussed readings and concepts; in their case, this was most significantly Price's concept of *bodymind*. The micro-transfers between Price's text, Foster's experience, our class discussion, and the prompt impacted the uptake captures for the encounter and Foster's resulting uptake enactment which Foster believed could serve as an affordance that disrupts uptake residues linked to sexual assault cases on college campuses. Foster's experience reinforces some of my claims above, contributing to the implications and conclusions made within this theme.

Implications for Student Agency and Advocacy

The first implication of the links between micro-transfer, boundary-work, uptake, and student advocacy is that students' discursive boundary-work, for example in Cara's redefinition of mental and physical well-being as interconnected, highly influences their identity and spatio-temporal boundary-work that informs their likelihood of or interest in advocacy for social issues. For Foster, this involved the marking of the boundary around collegiate sexual assault as not only a private issue but one for the institution and others therein. As such, and because of their personal experience with sexual assault, their identity boundary was marked as someone who can be an advocate for survivors and also expanded the contexts in which such advocacy was possible. The same was true for Ethan in his redefinition of mental health challenges as not only personal but social and working in dynamic relationship with media representations which transformed the boundary around where and when he could talk about mental health and disability. In other words, the micro-transfers that are facilitated and successful within the course, those that result in boundary-marking, influence how students define knowledge and, consequently, what they believe it can be used for, and where. Their uptake captures—pathways for taking up social issues—expand and multiply as their personal experience interacts with the personal experiences and scholarly, intellectual work of DS scholars as well as rhetoricians. This might also suggest that spatio-temporal boundary-work or blurring is *necessary* for advocacy work in the same way

that having the space (i.e., composition classroom) to practice how to *be* an advocate is necessary in the process of committing to and being active as an advocate for social justice. This practice also seems, in the three cases presented here, to be beneficial for preparing students for advocacy and indicates that the composition classroom can serve as a sort of primer for advocacy work that demonstrates to students how they might apply knowledge and skills meaningfully in the future. Using micro-transfer as a method of analysis helps show us the process involved in advocacy (e.g., listening, learning, practicing) that prepare us for transfer into other, broader, more influential contexts. This is just one example of how ignoring boundary-work and the micro-transfers that support it, can diminish and occlude students' transfer acts.

Another connected consideration is that of assignment prompts and the necessity of their open-endedness to allow for personal and individual interpretation and connections. As mentioned for Foster, being able "to write about a topic inspired from *any* of our course readings and discussions" increased the number of possible uptakes and provided an opportunity to research and be an advocate for a topic that was already of interest. This also showcases the necessity for a more expansive and nuanced approach to studying transfer in that all of these students "appropriately" responded to the prompt and course reading in various ways. So "appropriate" applications of knowledge are dependent on a number of complex factors including those that are associated with issues of privilege and trauma, for example. In thinking about these complex factors, Cara's incomes and early desire for advocacy also comes to mind. Incomes, particularly those related to investment in social justice, have an impact on goals for and practices of advocacy and are also intertwined with those other elements of our identities. What Cara's experience—entering with advocacy desires, listening and learning, and making plans for the future—shows us is that more attention should be given to students' individual profession, personal, and academic goals when they enter the course. This could allow transfer scholars another metric for understanding student learning and if awareness of learning and personal goals can influence engagement with course subject matter and writing tasks.

Some implications, or more so questions, for the future of this work are related to the issue of "risk" and the degree to which risk—associated with positionality and experience—might contribute to students' uptake captures around advocacy. Similarly, Cara brought to light the possibility that being affirmed in our beliefs about what "counts" as advocacy (e.g., using personal stories) through engagement with disability

or other social justice scholarship could increase not only uptake captures but reshape identity boundaries that allow someone to define themselves as equipped with the tools needed to be an advocate. In the same vein, I'm interested in more focused attention on the feeling of *discomfort* that might be required for far-reaching forms of transfer and, though to lesser degrees, boundary redrawing. Finally, one of my research questions that remains unanswered is "What genre possibilities do students see for engaging the content we have covered in the course?" Though I can say that students saw the website as an appropriate genre, given they were asked to write one, it's unclear how much engagement with or practice in different genres contributed to their advocacy goals or how it might have primed them for future engagement with mental disability and DS knowledge or, more broadly, advocacy and social justice work overall.

Though the past two chapters have left me with many insights and provided evidence for claims regarding the future of transfer work, disability literacy, and writing studies, they have also left me with numerous questions and, therefore, a multitude of potentiating paths for future research. The following chapter, Chapter 6, reflects and expands on the implications outlined in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 and proposes future directions for this work and invitations for other scholars to take up and adapt this work to further benefit and value students' unique transfer processes.

Chapter 6. The Implications of a Micro-Level Analysis of What Students do With Mental Disability Knowledge in the Writing Classroom

Reflecting in his interview on how our conversations about disability might be useful for him later, Ethan Heiss stated that

> I think it's put me in a very valuable position where I can like challenge a lot of the issues that have been ongoing…and I think that we're in this class being empowered to, I guess, kind of, well…20 people aren't probably enough to revolutionize the whole perspective, but it's definitely pushing things in the right direction. It's definitely starting to like, I guess, foster that like thinking in the back of people's minds, even if they're not passionate about it. It's something that they're now aware of.

This dissertation project began with the ultimate goal of building writing curricula that promote greater disability literacy, particularly mental disability literacy, for students across university and college campuses. Part of achieving that goal involved further adopting the tools and principles of knowledge transfer studies within the writing classroom to support students' likelihood of making DS perspectives on disability meaningful and, therefore, more likely to be retained and transferred into other contexts. This remains one of my central goals as a researcher and, based on the findings in Chapters 4 and 5, transfer principles seem to be an effective framework for supporting student uptake and their ability to make meaningful connections to, sometimes unrelatable, subject matter. My findings indicate that writing classrooms rooted in explicit and implicit commitments to knowledge transfer curricula and praxis can be useful spaces for promotion of critical disability literacy. In responding to my research questions, these findings also bring to light a number of implications relevant for transfer scholars, writing studies scholars and instructors, WPAs, and disability studies scholars.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the broad question of "what happens in the writing classroom when we center discourses of disability and mental disability specifically?" has been engaged through the identification of five central themes in the data: students tend to experience shifts in their relationships to disability; students take up, adapt, and transform disability knowledge in unique and varied ways; students' ability to transfer is influenced by the class environment and interactions with peers and instructors; students gain greater rhetorical awareness; and students demonstrate a desire to act as agents of change in conversations about social justice issues. Examining these themes from the micro-level, rather than attempting to study how students transfer and engage with mental disability knowledge between classroom and other contexts, revealed the complex moment-to-moment interactions (micro-

transfers) and shifts in perspective (boundary-work) that determine whether students see a particular uptake pathway as possible and *which* uptake pathways they see as possible; these observations have important implications for teaching for transfer (TFT), the study of transfer, and better supporting students' learning about disability beyond dominant discourses of deficit. In other words, by approaching studies of transfer from a micro-level, I have identified the varied interactions (micro-transfers) occurring that influence students' acts of boundary-marking (i.e., their practices of defining things, self, others, space, and time) which close off or open up diverse uptake pathways that then influence what possibilities they *could* see in future, more dissimilar contexts (i.e., their likelihood of performing the macro-phenomenon of transfer that has been traditionally studied).

This micro-level approach returns us to the title of Chapter 1: "The 'Theoretical Alliance' of Disability Studies and Transfer in Writing Studies." These findings support such an alliance as they demonstrate the utility of transfer frameworks for supporting disability literacy, the need for more capacious and inclusive transfer definitions, and the role that writing classrooms play in supporting knowledge transfer broadly but also disability literacy. In this chapter, I begin by discussing the implications of this research for writing course and curricular design and the decisions we can make as instructors to positively impact students' ability to perceive and make unique connections in their writing. To follow, I return to the role that disability studies scholarship and perspectives can play in our classrooms. This is followed by discussions on what these findings mean for WPAs and their connection to WAC/WID programs and courses. Turning to interventions, I discuss how this research advances work in disability studies and knowledge transfer scholarship before discussing the methodological changes and challenges this research presents. I close with the pathways forward for transfer studies and disability studies in light of the limitations of this work.

What's Transfer Got To Do With It? Making Transfer More Central to Course Goals and Explicit in Class Discussions

Meaningfulness, Motivation, and Future Utility

In terms of teaching, I do believe there is room for instructors to more intentionally implement and more explicitly frame their courses with transfer principles in mind, and my findings have generated a number of ideas as to how we can leverage what we know about supporting students' transfer of subject matter and writing skills knowledge to positively impact their likelihood of successful far transfer. However,

I also want to acknowledge that the suggestions and implications I share in regards to instructors' course design and WPA decisions build on work we are already doing. So my goal is not to negate nor challenge the wonderful work WPAs and writing instructors are currently doing but to extend their/our work into that which is more supportive of students' knowledge transfer.

In Chapter 4, the themes of Relationship to Disability and Adapt and Transform both emphasize the impact of students' incoming relationship to subject matter on the boundaries they draw around *mental disability* as a term and concept and around their ability to use their new knowledge about mental disability for other tasks. Further, this showcases students' unique and individual process of taking up information based on what is meaningful to them or their prior experiences. As instructors, it's important, then, that we do not standardize our expectations for how students will take up subject matter in their projects and, instead, try to understand the connections they *are* making or the connections they might be avoiding. The connections students make can be dependent on their relationship to subject matter, as we see here with that of mental disability. In framing the course with a theme, particularly one that is challenging or connected to social issues and constructions, we can give students the opportunity to narrate themselves in relation to the subject matter which has the potential to increase the number of connections that are possible or to confront and make sense of those that may be conflicting or that they may unintentionally be avoiding.

If we want students to practice and transfer certain skills, then we need to ensure there are multiple ways that students can connect with and make meaning out of those topics and skills since students' perception of the utility of a writing task or topic is connected to their ability to make it meaningful which impacts the degree of motivation for completing the writing task. This is demonstrated, for example, in Peter's use of rhetoric to maintain engagement with mental disability conversations, as well as Cara's and Foster's different uptakes of Price's text on *bodymind*. Building opportunities for students to visualize alternative pathways could involve providing alternative frameworks for approaching a reading, opening up genre opportunities for students to choose those they might engage in the future, or letting students select their own research topics. Such opportunities support the need for instructors to also assign students genres that will be useful for them later to reinforce perceived real-world utility of the writing task and process. Of course, this would also require providing rationales and framing for

assignments that clearly state when and how that genre or those skills will be useful for a range of situations. This also means avoiding genres that are not relevant for students, or more so, not relevant for the majority of students since it would make it less likely for students to recognize the utility of transferable skills when coming into contact with future genres. The topics students in my course selected are also revealing in terms of perceived utility—if they attach their writing task to a real-world issue, a community problem, or work with communities, they are more likely to perceive the utility of that task; in other words, when students feel that their work has meaning and can be of actual influence, they are more likely to be invested. At the very least, pushing students to imagine real-world audiences and real-world exigences for their work can support their investment and, consequently, their likelihood of transferring knowledge and skills.

Thinking from the perspective of uptake, micro-transfer, and boundary-work, asking students to visualize a real-world audience or situation in which their writing can be applied (e.g., the public-facing website), can help them redraw the boundaries around where knowledge can be shared, what a particular genre is or can do, who has the authority to speak within a particular space, or what influence they are capable of having in conversations about a real-world issue. In addition, this engagement with public-facing genres, or writing with an envisioned audience that can truly be impacted by the writing, can expand the possible applications students see for using those writing skills and applying that knowledge because they are being exposed to a greater number of “beyond classroom” situations in which those skills may transfer. Having the space to do such practice can also increase their confidence in their ability to participate in conversations and use those skills later, for example, in Cara’s case of seeing herself engaging in difficult conversations with family members with her new-found skills.

Defining the Classroom Space

What many of the students in this study demonstrate (e.g., Cara, Hearts, Foster) is that how we and students define our classrooms matters for the limits they place on their engagement and what information they believe can be brought into the classroom from their experience. Being explicit about how we, as instructors, are defining our classroom space and what we expect in terms of welcoming varied ideas and perspectives in our discussions can benefit students who make unique connections to the readings therefore increasing the possible uptakes they see for the knowledge we are sharing.

Moreover, framing the course with a set of class discussion expectations and affirmations to support those who may be hesitant to share generally and more specifically about their unique understandings can be beneficial and is something I wish I had done in the study courses for this project. Similarly, what would have been useful for students' engagement and the possibilities they were able to envision for taking up knowledge within the course is an initial reflection on what they want to achieve and how they see the course helping them fulfill those achievements. This activity can also serve as a boundary-marking activity related to the course theme and that might affect how students relate to subject matter. This could be followed with weekly reflections on how the subject matter and/or skills can be useful for supporting their unique goals and a demonstration of the boundaries they are (re)drawing related to the subject matter. Such reflections can help cue students for connections they will make in other contexts and provide the researcher additional points of analysis.

Although we do need to be intentional in our design decisions, I want to echo Medina's claim that "while teachers have a good deal of agency, all of the boundary-work that occurs in a classroom is the result of interactions" (p. 217). What this means is that the work students are doing to cross boundaries in ways that could result in more mindful abstraction or far transfer is more so a result of the facilitation of interactions between students, things, and ideas; further, this emphasizes that the definition of the classroom is an ever-evolving co-construction—including the co-construction of boundaries—between students and instructor. So, one important definitional aspect of the classroom that was revealed through this study is the need to center collaboration and peer-interaction as integral to their learning. As Hearts reminded us, focusing on an individual's knowledge is insufficient, particularly in transfer studies, without studying the interactions of an individual with others. For example, the connection Cara made between Margaret Price's text and her queer identity might not have been possible if our class discussion didn't address the difficulties of coming out or if her and Foster's desire to engage that topic had been received more negatively by others in the class. The ways in which students' uptake captures were expanded as a result of their engagement with their peers reinforces the need to avoid individualizing writing tasks and indicates that supporting frequent, and maybe even reflective, peer interaction is an important way for us to support their transfer of both subject matter and skills knowledge since writing and transfer are social and communal. Keeping students in constant dialogue with one another as co-constructors of the

classroom and each other's learning means supporting a constant circulation of micro-transfers as students' identities and experiences bump into one another and create greater possibilities for engagement and understanding for others.

In promoting students' frequent interactions with one another, we also recognize how their varied experiences and backgrounds have the potential to inspire boundary-work that can lead to greater investment, agency, and likelihood of long-term transfer, for example, in Peter's case of feeling more motivated to learn about mental disability upon recognizing his peers' knowledge about the topic. And to consider such consequences of the interaction of students' varied and multiple experiences is also to avoid standardizing our expectations around what knowledge students will draw on and take up as they find ways to meaningfully complete writing tasks. Importantly, and as suggested in my discussions of Cara and Hearts, student interactions with their peers and their co-construction of the classroom as a "safe space" could possibly lead to a decrease in the perceived level of risk associated with taking up knowledge in new and creative ways as well as exploring genre possibilities or disrupting habituated uptakes. In future work, I intend to more directly explore this possibility, asking questions related to students' history within the writing classroom, responses to particular uptake enactments, and responses to particular subject matter when discussed in various contexts.

Instructor Influence in Course Co-Construction

Hearts and Ethan also demonstrate the influence of instructor interactions on students' uptake captures and enactments. To repeat Medina's calls again, "a micro-transfer perspective is especially useful for instructors because it allows them to consider what sort of force they might exert to help students gradually—through a series of these micro-transfers—develop more productive boundaries and trajectories through this class" (p. 218). For this reason, maintaining a strong degree of self-reflexivity and continuing to ask questions about how we are storying ourselves in the course and the academy can be beneficial for students' transfer and their ability to build critical literacy about social issues. In thinking about the instructor's role, I also feel that one of the under-explored and under-utilized resources for supporting transfer throughout my course was the feedback space. Although I offered frequent and detailed feedback throughout the entire writing process, I hadn't imagined initially that the feedback activity could involve more cueing, priming, and framing for connections between texts, to class

discussions, and into future writing contexts since I was still in the process of learning about transfer as I designed and conducted the studies and courses. This is something I have committed myself to doing more of in my courses since and intend to do in future studies of transfer.

Disability as Subject Matter in the Writing Classroom

Building Relationships with Disability and Other Social Issues

Although the students presented in this study responded very differently to the subject of mental disability, they all did experience changes in their general perceptions of and personal relation to disability, including increased perceptions of the available possibilities for engaging with the topic of and those who experience disability. For example, because this 10-week course was enough to empower and assure Cara in her identity and challenge Peter to connect with important social issues, the findings show that transfer principles can be used to support at least some initial learning about and transfer of critical disability studies perspectives. For Peter and others, such as Lorraine, Foster, and Cara, our discussions on this topic created possibilities for engaging with other social issues, such as lack of educational resources, racism in healthcare, heteronormativity, and sexual assault on college campuses. To repeat Yeni regarding his initial hesitancy about learning about rhetoric from a disability studies perspective, "it turns out to be…that the topic is an excellent choice of honing the skills in rhetoric and analytical awareness and helping me and my classmates truly understand existing societal issues." In these moments, mental disability became intertwined with issues of race, gender, and educational access. In particular, approaching conversations about disability (or other social issues) from a rhetorical perspective can assist students in their engagement with a topic that might otherwise seem unapproachable or unrelatable. DS scholars should turn more explicitly to transfer studies for ideas on how to implement DS in our courses and then, to study the impact of such implementation, beyond those courses specifically labeled as DS-related. Because most of the students indicated some level of future-reaching desire to engage with disability topics, there do seem to be possibilities for further building students' disability literacy.

The Impact of a DS Focus on Student Writing Knowledge

In 2014, Yancey et al. wondered "is it the case that all content supports students' transfer similarly, or is some content more useful than other content in assisting students with transfer?" (p. 3)

prior to demonstrating the success of a writing about writing (WAW) approach to instruction in supporting student writing knowledge transfer. WAW, or teaching writing from a disciplinary writing perspective, has been proven to be effective in helping students build a theory of writing that they then can carry into other academic and professional contexts. I mentioned in Chapter 5 that a concern I had upon developing the study and teaching the subject matter was that my emphasis on the social, rhetorical construction of disability would interfere with students' progress as writers. However, each student wrote in their Final Reflection about the benefits of learning about rhetoric, how their definitions of it changed, or how it will help them in their future writing and career endeavors. This provides pedagogical implications for supporting students' development of writing skills *while* fostering greater critical disability literacy.

Beyond simply stating that the rhetorical perspective was useful for their writing journey, the study participants demonstrated strong genre and rhetorical awareness skills in their Final Websites as they made intentional decisions about images to include or used personal narratives as evidence or framing for their arguments. That students improved their rhetorical awareness and that their value of rhetoric increased throughout the course reveals that disability studies' analytical practices might serve as strong examples of how to analyze various forms of communication and the consequences of our communication choices, therefore influencing how they make decisions in their own writing. Most students also redrew or blurred spatio-temporal boundaries in their redefinitions of rhetoric; Lorraine saw rhetoric as useful for being more critical of the media, Peter recognized the utility of rhetoric for guiding him toward success in his business career, and Cara saw it as a way to better articulate her ideas. This blurring of spatio-temporal boundaries—similar to how Cara blurred boundaries between the classroom and family life to claim how she will approach difficult disability conversations in the future—seems to be essential for promoting the transfer of knowledge across contexts and discourse communities as it makes the knowledge or skills more widely applicable or adaptable.

These students also demonstrated the power of a rhetorical perspective for influencing possibilities for engagement with mental disability. In response to the Rhetorical Analysis Memo prompt, Lorraine reflected on her reading and reactions to Margaret Price's chapter "Assaults on the Ivory Tower." Her history—being a resident of Blacksburg—led her to have a strong emotional response to the reading which she believed hindered her ability to think about Price's overarching argument. However, learning

about rhetoric and having the space to practice rhetorical analysis increased the uptake captures she saw for responding to the prompt and the reading as she chose to rhetorically analyze Price's chapter, using rhetoric as a framework for critiquing Price's work beyond her emotional response. Peter also found utility in rhetoric as an entry point for engagement with the disability studies content as he often used the free writing space to identify rhetorical elements of the texts instead of discussing his personal connections or opinions.

Beyond offering alternative paths for engagement, rhetoric also assists students in advancing their understanding of and relationship to mental disability. For example, once Lorraine was able to redefine rhetoric, she began to notice the "rhetorical consequences or stereotypes and stigma associated with mental disability" which she recognized as consequential for the treatment of mentally disabled people. In this way, rhetoric allowed Lorraine to see mental disability as not inherently negative but as something partially constructed through our communication about it. By the end of the term, Lorraine had explicitly paired her learning about rhetoric with her learning about mental disability. Cara, too, in her reclamation of her disability identity, developed a more social, rhetorical view of disability as a label that is placed on someone and not so much the essence of who they are.

What this means for teaching is that, with rhetoric as a central component of general writing courses, particularly those FYW courses that many students are required to enroll in, we have a unique opportunity to build critical disability literacy through our teaching of rhetoric while still improving students' broadly-applicable writing skills and emphasizing the relevancy of both in their everyday lives and futures. Further, in our consistent commitments to social justice and supporting students' ability to be critically engaged at a social level, rhetoric can be seen as a way to offer multiple points of entry (or uptake pathways) for topics that might otherwise be difficult for them to approach emotionally or personally. My suggestion is, first, that we maintain rhetoric as a central element of our teaching and, second, that we consider teaching it more substantially—beyond *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*—to inspire students to analyze the way certain identity categories or social issues are constructed within public texts. Though this will require a greater amount of intellectual labor on the part of instructors, particularly those who are not rhetorical scholars, the benefits certainly seem to outweigh the costs.

The WPA as an Advocate for Transfer Frameworks and Disability Literacy

Supporting Transfer in Programmatic Outcomes and Teacher Development

These implications for individual instructors can also be considered in broader programmatic design by writing program administrators. For example, in training instructors being introduced to our writing programs, it could be beneficial to offer more transfer studies and transfer theory for new instructors to build a framework, particularly if they do not have a history of teaching or pedagogical philosophy yet. It can be difficult as a first-time instructor to know where to begin in terms of genres to assign, skills to center, or texts to have students engage. Transfer, being so universal and integral to writing programs, is a good theoretical basis and place for instructors to ground themselves in course development. With a more general understanding of transfer, traditionally understood, instructors can also be guided toward an understanding of transfer consistent with what my findings show: that the adaptations and transformations of knowledge that students perform across contexts actually begin more subtly in moment-to-moment interactions despite much of transfer theory and research being focused on the application of knowledge across contexts. One logical area of training in which to include this "micro-level" understanding of transfer is in conversations surrounding linguistic difference, antiracism, positionality, and intersectionality, all of which were part of my own teacher training process. In discussing the varied backgrounds and identities of our students, micro-transfer can be included as a way to concretize how students' experiences can impact their response and uptake of assignment prompts, willingness to engage in class discussion, or practice new skills, for example. In other words, it can be a tool for instructor reflexivity as they assess their prompts, classroom atmosphere, and how they respond to students more comprehensively to consider an array of boundary-markings that students bring to each interaction.

Similarly, it would be useful—considering transfer's already implicit position in programmatic outcomes—to more explicitly mention transfer goals in our outcomes, explanations for model syllabi and reading lists, and course descriptions. Although many instructors already provide lists of learning objectives and outcomes alongside their assignments, it might be worth promoting the use of more detailed rationales that frame assignments and skills specifically for transfer, as I did in this study. Framing for transfer can also appear in rationales for course readings and the promotion of intertextuality

so that students do not see each text as existing in a vacuum. As we observed, intertextuality can (re)shape discursive boundaries around central course concepts and student identities regarding what they see as possible performances for themselves. This framing can ensure an ongoing commitment to knowledge transfer by instructors across programs.

Such a commitment can also be enacted through an emphasis on student difference and peer interactions. The students' stories presented in Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate that each micro-movement in a transfer process matters since each moment and interaction can productively complicate the number of enactments students might find possible to perform in various rhetorical situations. And, if transfer occurs as an accumulation of micro-transfers through which students iteratively make meaning, then inspiring micro-transfers through a series of writing stages, low-stakes writing assignments, frequent interactions, and reflections on readings, discussions, and the impact of others in the course on their learning is necessary. This could inspire instructors to implement more reflective informal writing exercises, such as reflections on the prompts (and students' prior experience with similar experiences), their expectations of the course, their experience in particular class sessions, etc., or to ask students to keep a "learning log" or "journal" in which they reflect regularly to reveal those micro-level transformations that can be hidden when we only look at transfer on a broader scale/timeline. This can allow students a space to make connections but also a space for instructors to better understand how texts, assignments, students, and themselves are speaking to one another in ways that construct certain boundaries. This is necessary in that, as Peter shows us, micro-level moments of learning and uptake can be hidden when we view application of learning across longer periods of time and space, resulting in claims to unsuccessful transfer. As above, continuing to value student difference in our classrooms can help us more appropriately support students' unique transfer and meaning-making processes; as many WPAs do, implementing and promoting course goals associated with accessibility, antiracism, and translingualism can support students who may perceive a greater degree of risk with performing certain uptakes in response to readings and assignments. Yancey et al. (2014) hint at this potential association between transfer and risk perception when reviewing the work of Doug Brent (2012) who emphasizes the way learners draw on the range of all of their writing experiences to make decisions in new writing situations (p. 45). What Brent demonstrated was that learners tend to remember specific writing tasks, genres,

formats, and skills that help them “survive varied academic writing tasks” (p. 47) when transitioning into workplace writing situations. The idea of survival in relation to writing is compelling and suggests that when learners associate success (and therefore little risk) with particular genres and skills, they are more likely to draw on those genres and skills later. Micro-transfer can be used to support boundary (re)drawing that leads to long-term transfer of skills and knowledge since the instructor can identify moment-to-moment opportunities to support student difference and demonstrate the survival potential of a wider range of genres and skills.

Collaboration among students can also be more intensely encouraged by WPAs as instructors design their courses. Individualizing writing tasks limits what students see as possible in terms of what topics they can discuss and how they can present those topics in their writing. Engaging more frequently with their peers means generating a greater degree of excitement for and confidence in taking up a genre or topic that might initially have felt untouchable for students. And, since collaboration is a necessary part of the writing process, it can seamlessly be incorporated more significantly through collaborative writing projects, reflections on the collaboration process, and reflections on one’s own contribution in collaboration.

Supporting the Development of Greater Disability Literacy

In terms of promoting greater, more critical disability literacy, these students showcase the positive perspectives that can be fostered even when they have no prior experience with the topic of disability. For Cara, discussing the topic alongside peers allowed her to feel more confident and empowered in her identity and ability to advocate for others through challenging and uncomfortable conversations. And Ethan, even with his stronger initial disability literacy, was able to expand his thinking about disability as something that is not only individual and private but socially constructed through media representation. Further, students such as Mason were able to reckon with the double-binds in their experience with disability’s negative effects and the conversations we were having about disability’s potential. As Ethan said in the quote at the beginning of this chapter, even when students do not have experience with mental disability and might not immediately feel compelled to think about or discuss the disability content, incorporating critical disability studies into the classroom can foster that thinking in the back of their minds, supporting them in future conversations about or interactions with disability. As such,

in addition to the accessible and UDL frameworks promoted during training, instructors could be encouraged to more explicitly explain why those frameworks are being used based on disability studies scholarship. This would mean providing incoming instructors with the resources and theories needed to demonstrate their knowledge on disability to their students in a way that makes them feel comfortable and confident engaging with the topic openly as well.

One apparent struggle in this process is supporting teachers who feel ill-equipped to talk about disability studies or who are concerned with how to respond if a student, such as Hearts, disclose self-harm or intense emotional distress. Although maybe not the case at all universities, at the University of Washington, there are resources for student support and guidelines for reporting harm that can help us feel more confident supporting students. This task and these skills are important for instructors since, as argued by Neil Simpkins (2018) in “Towards an Understanding of Accommodation Transfer: Disabled Students’ Strategies for Navigating Classroom Accommodations”, students’ willingness to seek accommodations or to seek information from instructors on accommodation processes increases when they feel as if the instructors are educated on the topic. Having disability studies scholarship implemented centrally and consistently in teacher training can support both instructors and students alike.

Implications for Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing in the Disciplines

In line with supporting instructor training and professional development, writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID) programs and courses serve as a good basis for focusing on transfer. With the goal of preparing students for writing in other disciplines, WAC and WID are inherently shaped by investments in the transfer of writing knowledge. To be successful, these courses require students to reconstruct or cross boundaries, first around knowledge about writing (e.g., what skills and genres are, where they belong, who can use them, how they can be used, etc.) and around disciplines (e.g., how they define the discipline, who has the authority to speak and construct knowledge within that discipline, what writing is welcome and appropriate within it, etc.). This also requires students to identify similarities between writing tasks in the writing-intensive courses and their disciplinary courses to do such crossing and (re)drawing of boundaries. In other words, students must be able to recognize the utility of skills and knowledge learned in WAC/WID courses for their discipline by connecting them to disciplinary writing values and practices. Because these courses involve supporting boundary-marking

and making connections, they are inherently invested in students' transfer of writing knowledge, making it the responsibility of the instructor to guide students toward connections between their writing course and disciplinary writing tasks.

In the same way we might ask students in general writing courses to articulate long- and short-term goals and reflect on how class activities support those goals throughout the term, WAC/WID instructors could promote connections across disciplines by asking students to describe their discipline, disciplinary values, and expectations and, then, reflect on how daily and weekly writing tasks are connected to those descriptions or how they might help them transition into experiences in the discipline. These descriptions are discursive, identity, and spatio-temporal boundary-marking activities that highlight how students are defining the discipline, themselves in relation to it, and the tools/skills necessary to participate in it. Because these boundaries might need to be (re)drawn to support the identification of cross-disciplinary connections, micro-transfer is useful for informing where instructors find moment-to-moment opportunities to gradually shape students' understandings of a discipline. Reflecting on daily and weekly writing tasks can reveal students' boundary-work and the effectiveness of certain interactions for supporting their awareness of a discipline's values and expectations—as well as their confidence in transitioning to work within a discipline—which can guide the instructor toward more intentional and directed acts of cueing, priming, and framing for far transfer, therefore more effectively supporting communication across contexts.

Further, what my findings demonstrate (by showcasing how students' writing process supports boundary (re)drawing and perceptions of knowledge and skills utility across contexts) is that writing is important as a learning tool that supports literacy for engagement with any topic. Because WAC and WID use writing, in part, as a method of learning how to participate in a discipline and, therefore, how we define disciplines, this research generally reinforces the utility of WAC/WID programs. In addition, micro-transfer and boundary-work encourage a redirection of attention from solely cross-disciplinary or cross-course transfer to the importance of transfer *within* courses since transfer within a single context impacts on transfer within others (i.e., the series of micro-transfers occurring *within* a course are just as important to pay attention to as support of transfer across disciplines). Moreover, and consistent with the above discussions on motivation and perceived utility, WAC/WID operates under the evidence that relevancy

and real-world application supports the transfer of writing knowledge. These programs offer opportunities for service-learning, community engagement, and production of public genres that generate a greater range of micro-transfers and uptake possibilities and, consequently, support longer-term knowledge transfer. Real-life instances of change resulting from the application of writing knowledge helps students "integrate successfully into the communication needs in another activity system, even though the specific context and situational needs [might be] different" (McManigell Grijalva, 2016, p. 156). Micro-transfer analysis has also demonstrated that moment-to-moment decisions and realizations about real-life connections influence student uptake and class engagement.

The instructor's responsibility to guide students toward cross-disciplinary connections by analyzing where to incorporate interactions that result in necessary boundary-marking demonstrates the necessity of transfer frameworks to support instructors in training not only in WAC/WID but also more general writing courses. WAC/WID serves as evidence that these frameworks are effective, making the explicit implementation of transfer theory in training necessary. Adopting WAC/WID goals and values within more general course preparation can also provide justification for reflection on the real-world utility of writing tasks and skills. Further, this knowledge can also support new instructors as they can be better equipped to transition from teaching general writing courses to disciplinary writing courses which can create greater opportunities for professional development.

Interventions in Current Conversations

In the field of writing studies, an explicit emphasis on and investment in transfer of learning is relatively new despite the century-old discussions of it in education and psychology as well as earlier writing studies, such as that of McCarthy's Dave (1987) who illustrated a general lack of transfer across dissimilar disciplinary contexts. Writing studies scholars, however, have maintained a strong commitment to supporting writing knowledge and skills transfer. In addition, emphasis on accessibility and UDL in curricular design has increased in recent years, making issues of disability a central concern for writing studies scholars invested in embracing and supporting student differences. Within this section, I outline the main interventions my research makes in the fields of disability, writing, and transfer studies.

Disability Studies

In Chapter 1, I mentioned that some DS scholars have argued for the inclusion of DS over disability alone in our courses (Price, 2007) and to promote DS and literacy throughout the academy (Samuels, 2013). This need has been supported more recently by scholars such as Simpkins (2022) who notes that a lack of vocabulary to talk about disability differences can cause frustration and lead to an inability to share disability issues with others (p. 143). In writing transfer scholarship, it has been suggested that a vocabulary is also necessary for crossing boundaries into new contexts. For example, Yancey et al. (2014) note that "students need a vocabulary for writing in order to articulate knowledge and ensure more successful transfer…[and] such a vocabulary contributes to the passport students need to transition to new contexts" (p. 101). Moreover, in *Toward a New Rhetoric of Difference*, Kerschbaum (2014) reminds us that "teachers and students alike are *always* confronted with otherness and that processes of marking difference can help us recognize ways that we take up and respond to our own and others' positions" and "when we build these interactional opportunities into our classroom practices, we assume the value of contact with others for developing students' writing and communication skills" (p. 80–81). These voices together demonstrate that (1) students need a vocabulary with which to speak about disability, (2) disability studies should be more central in our courses, (3) tools should be adopted for promoting disability literacy and vocabularies across our campuses, and (4) students should be placed in settings to interact with one another and discuss their relationships to difference. My research responds to these threads.

First, my findings show the utility of including DS scholarship in the classroom to develop a stronger vocabulary and develop more distinct discursive boundaries related to disability so that they can more confidently and appropriately discuss the topic and transfer disability knowledge to other contexts. Further, the confirmation of the existence of micro-transfers supports Kerschbaum's claims about the impact of interactions of varied self- and institutional identifications on students' perceptions of themselves and their relationships to others. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, micro-transfer revealed the sort of discursive and identity-related boundary-work that takes place when students are confronted with disability and DS, positioning themselves in relation to the topic and therefore others in the course. Attention to micro-transfer also has the potential to support us on our task of expanding literacy across

the university in that we can cue and prime on the moment-to-moment level to help students see connections between the DS subject matter and future social contexts. The principles of transfer studies were also shown to be productive in supporting students' disability literacy progress and therefore can serve as a starting point for tools that will help us promote such literacy across the university as a whole.

Multiple Theories and Expansive Definitions

In 2012, Driscoll and Wells questioned how we might focus "on multiple theories of transfer" to better understand student incomes, movement, and dispositions and, consequently, how we can best support them. Moreover, in the introduction of their volume mapping the transdisciplinary life of transfer research and theories, Nowacek et al. (2024) highlight the definitional challenge transfer has faced since "all learning involves transfer in some sense" (Perkins & Salomon, 2012); yet, many promote the distinction between transfer of learning and learning alone. Further, *transfer* often brings with it suggestions of "carrying" discrete packages of knowledge across contexts. My study responds to both of these concerns. The attention to micro-transfer supports Perkins and Salomon's claim about all learning involving transfer since micro-transfer involves boundary-marking activity that influences transfer over time and space. Combining *micro-transfer* with more traditional definitions can capture the true complexity of transfer processes. As we saw in Peter's case, micro-transfer can show us that "what did not appear to transfer from the researcher's vantage has perhaps been incorporated by the learner into other practices of invention or resistance" (Nowacek et al., 2024, p. 9) and responds to one of Nowacek's (2011) earlier claims that transfer is "experienced not just by [some] students but by all students" (p. 47). The learner's invention or resistance beyond the "target context" is, as demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5, connected to student incomes, prior knowledge, and dispositions.

Incomes, Prior Knowledge, and Dispositions

Following the work of Driscoll (2011), Driscoll and Powell (2016), Driscoll and Wells (2012), Reiff and Bawarshi (2011), Yancey et al. (2014), Sommers and Saltz (2004), and Rounsaville (2008), my findings further illustrate the complex relationship between knowledge transfer and student incomes and dispositions. For example, Cara's prior experience with mental health professionals and within the queer community impacted her reclamation of her disability identity and her uptake of the prompts for the Rhetorical Analysis Memo and Final Website. Peter, who had no prior experience with the course subject

matter, found it difficult to relate and, therefore, difficult to take up the subject matter. However, he was able to use our rhetorical analysis frameworks for understanding mental disability constructions to engage with the course texts and continue conversing with DS scholars. Further, Mason's prior experience with a disabled family member and his own learning disabilities resulted in his initial resistance to the idea of disability desirability or the idea that disability is not inherently negative, leading to his assessment of ADHD as overdiagnosed. Each of these students' prior experiences resulted in different uptake captures and enactments and demonstrates Nowacek's (2011) statement that transfer "is not simply an intellectual accomplishment [but] an emotional experience" (p. 27).

Uptake Possibilities

In Chapter 1, following my discussion of uptake conversations in RGS, I introduced Dylan Dryer's (2016) uptake vocabulary and argued that it offers a more precise means of approaching analyses of transfer and uptake; I then used this vocabulary as part of the discourse analysis I completed in Chapters 4 and 5. The above examples demonstrate that transfer studies scholars could grant more attention to uptakes in our analyses of knowledge transfer. Following Wardle (2007), Yancey et al. (2014) noted that much of transfer's focus had remained on the individual rather than the "interactions between individual learners and contexts" or the larger activity system. They note that "transfer in its historical definitions, as we have seen, tends to isolate the individual from the system" (p. 10) which has continued to be an issue since. Uptake theory contributes to resolving this issue because it lends attention to an individual's transfer but expands our attention to the interactions with other individuals and within particular materials contexts. In other words, turning toward uptake in our transfer studies and analyses can prevent a siloing of student experience and, therefore, make overlooking certain elements of student transfer processes less likely. More broadly, this research has also shown that uptake is deeply tied to transfer acts and that micro-transfers are particularly influential in inspiring the number of uptake pathways students can choose from as they navigate and negotiate classroom tasks as well as anticipate connections and uptakes that might be possible in the future. Because uptakes are so elusive, micro-transfer offers one lens through which we can begin to observe their complexity despite those observations always being incomplete.

If we return to RGS scholars' engagement with uptake theory, we can see possibilities for transfer researchers and uptake scholars to further engage each other's work. As reviewed in Chapter 1, RGS

scholars have focused on uptake as a way to describe relationships and pathways between genre performances. As such, uptake can draw our attention to "how individuals move and translate across genres" (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2016, p. 11). With this in mind, transfer scholars can recognize the role that uptake plays in knowledge transfer processes as it involves such movement and translation across contexts and genres to participate in varied contexts and can direct us toward the connections learners make as they determine how best to respond or which knowledge to draw on in new situations. In addition, uptake scholars could find it useful to merge with transfer scholarship and micro-transfer in finding ways to study uptake since pathways, movements, and translations between enactments can be revealed through attention to the moment-to-moment interactions.

Methodology

Methodologically, the findings from my study have a lot to offer transfer scholars. I greatly valued and therefore took up Medina's concept of micro-transfer because he acknowledged the confusion and frustration I was experiencing in my reading on knowledge transfer; as he claims "many early studies have suggested that transfer either is successful or not successful" (p. 207) and, despite our research advancing to include a focus on dispositions, emotions, and transformations, similar judgments about students' transfer processes have been sedimented, often suggesting that there is little evidence of students transferring skills from general writing courses into other disciplines. Thankfully, a recent replication of a foundational writing transfer study has countered this idea, demonstrating that we are on the right path to appropriately supporting students' transfer of writing skills across disciplines and contexts (Bergmann & Zepernick, 2007; Rothschild et al., 2024). Unlike those who made claims about the lack of evidence of the hoped-for transfer we have been seeking, I do not believe we have limited evidence or that students are unlikely to transfer writing skills and knowledge; rather, I believe there are limiting definitions of and frameworks for studying transfer that prevent us from recognizing how dynamic students' individual transfer processes are.

My research shows that these dynamic elements have often gone unnoticed in part because of methods used to study transfer. In tracing students' interactions with one another and the course subject matter and assignments, I have shown that these micro-transfers *do* exist and are influential for the boundary-work required for students to transfer across contexts in a more traditional way. In addition, that

boundary-work and micro-transfer are bidirectional and co-constitutive has also been confirmed: a micro-transfer can direct a boundary redrawing that then allows for more diverse micro-transfers that might lead to another act of boundary-marking. To access and trace micro-transfers and boundary-work, Medina's three co-constitutive boundary fields—the discursive, identity, and spatio-temporal—were particularly useful. The discursive field involves the work learners do to define things and ideas whereas identity boundaries involve definitions of the self in relation to others. Spatio-temporal boundaries involve defining features of particular material spaces and moments (i.e., defining who and what belong where and when). Each field constantly works on the others, supporting the iterative process of (re)drawing boundaries. To repeat from Chapter 4, Medina argues that "micro-transfer…[is] part of boundary-work, and specifically the interactions that occur across iterations of boundary-markings that influence the way each new boundary is redrawn" (p. 203). As such, boundary-marking and micro-transfer work together in the process of acquiring and applying new knowledge.

The methods that made boundaries and micro-transfer tangible in my study were those informed by Medina's boundary fields which helped draw attention to students' boundary-work or definitions. Because boundary (re)drawings influence micro-transfer possibilities and micro-transfers lead to the (re)drawing of boundaries, identifying a boundary as such enabled me to trace what interactions might have supported the boundary-work students were performing. In short, looking at how students defined people, places, and things and tracing the interacting elements that led to the articulation of those definitions made it possible to access boundaries and micro-transfers as units of analysis.

It was also beneficial to begin looking at boundaries within the frameworks of individual themes. Beginning, for example, with "Relationship to Disability", allowed me to narrow my focus on the boundaries students were drawing around the term itself, themselves in relation to disability specifically, and the locations in which disability knowledge could be accessed based on those relationships. For the theme of "Class Environment" as well I was able to focus on students' definitions of the classroom, the roles and agency of those within it, and the knowledge allowed to be shared and by whom. This is to say that thematic analysis made tracing boundaries and micro-transfer more manageable while also providing a range of lenses through which to analyze and look for these phenomena. Thematic and discourse

analysis are not unusual approaches for analyzing transfer acts, but they can be enriched with a micro-transfer and boundary-work focus to make our methods more comprehensive and inclusive.

Adapting our definitions and frameworks to include those moment-to-moment details of transfer acts—changing what transfer we "hope for" or otherwise abandon hoping for anything at all—is more inclusive and equitable because it can challenge the standardization of "transfer" which can limit our gaze and which might favor those students who associate relatively low risk with certain enactments. Further, it helps us partially respond to the issue of transfer's ephemerality and the "subtle and hard to identify" traces of transfer (Nowacek, 2011, p. 3). Moreover, micro-transfer should not be dismissed as being inconsistent with the foundations of our transfer definitions because "like transfer, but on a moment-to-moment scale, it involves the effects of past experience on present and future contexts" (Medina, p. 198–9). These moment-to-moment effects have an impact on what knowledge and skills are performed in far-reaching forms of transfer. In short, transfer studies have the potential to rely more heavily on attention to the interdependent, bidirectional relationship between boundary-marking activity and micro-transfer as my research has demonstrated.

In my own work, part of granting this attention involved combining my analysis of larger assignments with those smaller, lower-stakes assignments such as the free-writing exercises, writer's memos, and discussion posts. These smaller assignments revealed students' thinking between larger writing tasks and their moment-to-moment learning about disability that could be responded to in less habituated ways since the assignments allowed students to respond in ways that made sense to them rather than requiring a particular format or style. This allowed me to better identify those shifts in boundaries that occurred through interactions with texts and the perspectives of their peers as they reflected on their responses to the readings and what influenced decisions they made in the larger assignments. This approach contrasts with most transfer studies that focus on knowledge's movement across contexts (into or outside of a given classroom or learning environment) and benefits analysis of the transfer work that is occurring within and as students move through the course. Further, using students' already-required course assignments as the core data for these analyses might have been beneficial for student-participants to focus on their learning and progress rather than fixating on the researcher's expectations. Thankfully, one of my most effective methods in making this contribution to

transfer research is that I did not allow preconceptions of what transfer is or should look like to determine what the data was telling me which led to evidence of a greater complexity in transfer processes.

I also believe it was beneficial to perform disclosure during my recruitment process not only as a way to contribute to restorying disability within the academy but as a way to emphasize my own position in relation to the knowledge that could promote disability literacy. I believe this method was useful for students to more willingly position themselves in relation to the subject matter as it demonstrated the personal connection one might have to research and how discussions of disability were welcome within the classroom. This supports the claims I have made about the social nature of transfer and how generating frequent interactions between students is necessary for supporting boundary-work.

Social Nature of Transfer

As mentioned, we are unable to remove students from their context and interactions with their classmates, so transfer studies are incomplete without the study of student difference and how that difference appears and interacts within classrooms through writing and dialogue. To repeat, Cara served as a prime example of the influence of peer engagement on micro-transfer, boundary-marking, and varied uptake pathways as she felt supported in her uptake of Price's article from the perspective of her queer identity and experience. In addition, she was explicit about the influence of her peers' actions in class discussion in shifting her toward a more positive perception of disability since they spoke about it so openly and unashamedly. These findings draw on work such as Nowacek et al.'s (2019) study of "transfer talk" in which they observed the dialogue of students and writing tutors as they negotiated possibilities for their writing in progress. Here, they emphasize the social, collaborative elements of transfer and the naturalness of these processes that occur more often than metacognitive models of transfer suggest. Some elements of transfer, in this case "transfer talk", are not intentional like self-reflective approaches and, the authors argue, deserve to be observed in action. Furthermore, "transfer talk" is co-constructed and Nowacek et al. suggest a transfer focus on how our prior experiences surface in dialogues as we ask questions, tell stories, share memories, engage empathy, and perform reciprocal discussion. In short, their study of transfer dialogue in writing center contexts provides evidence that transfer is more subtle and social than many studies suggest. My research expands on these findings by providing micro-transfer

as a way to more deeply examine and describe how these complex social interactions impact knowledge transfer and writing choices.

Methodological Limitations and Future Approaches

In Chapter 2, I described more deeply my process of selecting micro-transfer as my unit and method of analysis. This study began with the goal of determining the influence of DS knowledge on students' learning throughout and by the end of a 10-week quarter. However, upon analyzing the data of the pilot study, I noticed the limits of this goal and how it narrowed my attention toward details of the course that were not relevant to determining how students were taking up the knowledge uniquely rather than in the anticipated or hoped-for ways. Exploring Medina's work allowed me to identify the minute details of students' learning and transfer acts. Despite its potential, in Chapters 1, 2, and 4, I acknowledge that observing "what happens" on the micro-level or in terms of transfer processes at all is difficult due to the ephemerality of transfer. As mentioned, Nowacek et al. (2024) emphasize that the selection of tracing a particular behavior can limit the gaze of the researcher. Therefore, despite my claims about the utility of micro-transfer as a method and unit of analysis to create a more capacious understanding of transfer and my demonstration that these micro-transfers do exist, it is still a process that is complex and my research by no means completes the circle of our understanding about student learning and their application of that learning elsewhere.

Moreover, due to the time constraints of completing a doctoral program, the students' position in their programs as mostly juniors and seniors, and my decision to conduct single-term studies, one of the limitations is that students' long-term transfer was not able to be observed apart from Cara who revealed to me in informal correspondence later her application of her learning into a student newspaper column on queer experiences across campuses. That said, there is still much to be discovered about the role of micro-transfers in students' longer-term transfer processes although there is significant value in these shorter-term studies that allow rich descriptions of student experiences. My hope is to conduct further studies with research questions focused more on micro-transfers themselves and/or what I know about micro-transfers now; this would involve implementing a greater number of opportunities for interactions that might result in boundary-work as well as further engaging students in conversations about the inner-workings of the course on their learning and writing process. Moreover, responding to these time

constraints will involve creating more longitudinal studies in which students are followed from one term to the next to determine how boundary-work in one domain is influencing that in other domains. Without as many time constraints I could also conduct more than one interview each with the participants. In addition, I ideally want to create an opportunity to observe the work and process of one or two students whose work I follow across courses in a single term and then trace beyond. Both of these future directions would allow for the rich descriptions offered by the moment-to-moment interactions while also furthering our understanding of the consequences of these moment-to-moment interactions in the long-term.

Another time-constraint-related limitation was my realization that the timed free-writing exercises might have caused some students a level of distress that detracted from their ability to respond or reflect meaningfully. This presented an issue of accessibility that did not align with my teaching philosophy or the topic of the course. Further, the flexible deadline structure of the course presented some limitations; despite it being a practice that I continue for accessibility purposes, for students such as Peter, who completed a few of the earlier assignments for submission during week nine, this complicated the process of tracing the boundary-work and micro-transfers throughout his process. Another minor limitation that I briefly mentioned in Chapter 4 is that I made the mistake of not collecting students' names for their initial survey, meaning I was unable to appropriately trace their developing definitions of mental disability, understanding of stigma across campus, and willingness to advocate based on a Likert scale. One way that future studies can respond to the free writing and deadline issues is by removing the study from the classroom or detaching it from the work students are already doing for the course for a grade. This would allow learners to have more time to complete informal writing and would apply less pressure for the tasks overall. In terms of the survey, which could have been more useful had I not made the name-collection mistake, I plan to be more thorough in my production of the surveys and to add questions that focus on interactions or influences rather than only definitions, perspectives, and locations of learning. I'd be curious to learn more about their initial beliefs about disability and mental disability since, in the same way that student beliefs about writing influence their ability to transfer, knowledge about their beliefs regarding mental disability can provide insights into their willingness to transfer such knowledge.

Generally, the data I was able to collect and observations I was able to make were limited by my position as both the teacher and the researcher for this study. This was unavoidable in terms of requiring my own expertise on the rhetorical constructions of disability to carry the course. This did allow me access to all of the students' writing and gave me agency over the presentation of information in the assignment prompts and the direction and climate of class discussions that led to more appropriate analyses of students' micro-transfers. However, this also led to inconsistencies in class recordings (i.e., sometimes forgetting to start a recording or not starting one altogether) and an inability to take thorough field notes beyond my real-time notes during discussion and post-class reflections. Being able to immerse myself more in the environment as a third-party observer would be beneficial in future studies.

The rationales provided on the readings and assignments were also beneficial for cueing and framing connections for students as well as accessing and assessing micro-transfers that might have resulted in increased uptake captures through the interaction of my ideas with the experiences of the students. However, providing my own rationales didn't provide students the space to express their own understanding of the purpose of our readings and assignments that could have revealed other forms of boundary-work and therefore greater instances of micro-transfer influences. In other words, reading my rationales to students might not have resulted in the critical thinking necessary for students to recognize the possible connections. Asking students to compose their own rationales for the course, readings, and assignments allows them to make their own meaning of the course and draw more distinct lines between the work they were doing in their future writing contexts as a way to further support transfer. This would also allow me to be more attentive to student difference in dispositions and incoming goals and interests to identify "starting points" for the boundaries students will mark within our courses and studies as well as identify which students' specific interests, experiences, and perspectives are interacting to result in boundary-marking. I also believe that seeking out student perspectives on what the class is for and how it will help them achieve their goals can provide us and them a point from which to trace their transfer of knowledge. Along with attention to student dispositions and interests, greater attention to student positionalities and experiences associated with those positionalities can help respond to the question of what role *risk* plays in transferring skills or subject matter knowledge. For the instructor and researcher, these student-produced rationales can provide feedback on whether an assignment or course is

communicating the appropriate goals and outcomes and can be a unit of analysis for boundary-work and micro-transfer.

Similarly, it was particularly useful to analyze students' writer's memos and free writing exercises. Having access to some of students' informal, stream-of-consciousness writing provided me with information on their incomes, points of contention, personal connections, and the trajectory of their decisions on research topics or rhetorical choices. Further, students' acknowledgments of other's class contributions and influence were particularly useful and important for understanding students' co-construction of the class environment, the micro-transfers this produced, and then the boundary-work that resulted. What could be improved in future work is an increase in students' reflections on group work and the impact of their peers on their writing and research decisions. Since students were interacting with one another almost daily, there were undoubtedly interactions and influences to which I was not privy and which students were not reflecting on meaningfully. Reflecting on the consequential relationship between peers would give me another point of analysis and could give the students one more avenue for more deeply understanding themselves and others as rhetorical beings.

One transfer question that remains unanswered by these data is "What genre possibilities do students see for engaging the content we have covered in the course?" In Chapter 3, I noted that using business genres to cue the students for future transfer in their writing journeys as business employees, since they were almost all students of the Foster School of Business, was a method of challenging uptake residues that might restrict what knowledge students perceive to be appropriate to place within particular genres and different contexts. This was also attached to the goal of supporting the possibilities they might envision to meshing genres. My argument centered around the idea that combining relevant genres and genre knowledge with "taboo" subject matter could inspire creative uptake artifacts. However, there is not enough evidence to determine whether such juxtapositions can serve as catalysts for spatio-temporal and discursive boundary-work. The students discussed in the final section of Chapter 5, under the theme of Agents of Change, also suggested the possibility of engagement with various genres inspiring greater advocacy since the practice of advocating for a particular point of view in a public-facing genre could build confidence in one's ability to do so later. This question could have implications for transfer scholars and disability studies scholars alike.

Finally, three positionality-related questions arose throughout this study that will deserve further attention. First, if transfer processes vary depending on histories and dispositions, then are there differences in the transfer processes of mentally disabled and neurodiverse students compared to those who are normate or neurotypical? Such a question raises ethical concerns about disclosure and a right to know as well as a perpetuation of the us vs. them dichotomy that can present disability to "other" than the norm or ideal. However, it would be worth exploring in that it could make transfer and writing studies scholars and instructors even more supportive of student difference by further demonstrating unique uptakes and connections that arise based on identities. This might inspire the implementation of teaching and assessment methods that are more inclusive. Second, if transfer processes vary depending on identity and experience, how does linguistic difference impact transfer processes, particularly for those students who use English as a second language? This question builds on Nowacek et al.'s (2024) claim about the requirement of second-language learners to transfer first across languages and then across contexts and is consistent with values of difference and inclusion that can allow us to better support multilingual writers. And, third, if certain uptakes are only seen as possible given they are associated with relatively low risk for the performer, then how do issues of power and privilege play into our interpretations of successful transfer? How can we begin assessing transfer in ways that account for such issues? My research offers one way to begin approaching these questions; from the perspective of micro-transfer and attention to the nudging of experience and identity against students' subject matter and skills knowledge, we can pinpoint the relevance of differences in transfer processes and therefore change our approach to supporting transfer or the expectations we have of students who we expect to do said transferring.

Closing

Despite the study's limitations, I return to Ethan Heiss and his comment in his Final Reflection that our Intermediate Expository Writing course was "one of the most valuable college courses I've taken to date" and that such a course has the "power to revolutionize perspectives on mental health rhetoric." As such, he encouraged me and "the English Department to maintain disability rhetoric as a core focus for some writing classes." Overall, it sounded like our writing course was something Ethan had been waiting for although he might not have known it yet. Ethan's story, and the other stories I've shared,

reassure me that this class has the potential to do for students what I needed a class to do for me as an undergraduate. Being provided the theories offered by critical disability studies, particularly those of the social model, could have prevented a great deal of shame and promoted a more positive relationship with my own disabilities so that I had the wherewithal to advocate for others and analyze injustice and exclusion.

Just as impactful is the compatibility of such learning with the teaching of writing. It is no injustice to students' learning of general writing skills to promote critical disability literacy, and the tools students gain for approaching writing can be equally as useful for critiquing negative constructions of disability. Even for Peter, who found the subject of mental disability unrelatable, this focus did not detract from his ability to gain meaningful rhetorical awareness and research skills that he found necessary for success in his career. Peter's case is one that deserves particular attention and has immense potential for scholars and instructors of writing because he has allowed me to demonstrate that there is more happening for students in terms of learning and writing development than our traditional approaches to studying knowledge transfer show us. Not only does this support arguments for the adoption of more micro-level analytical approaches but also emphasizes the value of writing courses for supporting students' acquisition of long-term skills and subject matter knowledge.

References

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2019). *(Re)considering what we know: Learning thresholds in writing, composition, rhetoric, and literacy*. University Press of Colorado.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2013). Making feminist points. *feministkilljoys*. https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

Bailey, M., & Mobley, I. A. (2019). Work in the intersections: A Black feminist disability framework. *Gender and Society*, *33*(1), 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218801523

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Barnett, S., & Boyle, C. (2016). *Rhetoric through everyday things*. University of Alabama Press.

Barton, E. (2002). Inductive discourse analysis: Discovering rich features. In E. Barton & G. Stygall (Eds.), *Discourse Studies in Composition* (pp. 19–42). Hampton Press.

Bawarshi, A. (2015). Accounting for genre performances: Why uptake matters. In N. Artemeva & A. Freedman (Eds.), *Genre Studies around the Globe* (pp. 186–206). Inkshed.

Bawarshi, A., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). Rhetorical genre studies. In *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy* (pp. 78–104). Parlor Press; The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/bawarshi_reiff/chapter6.pdf

Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genre and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the New Rhetoric* (pp. 79–99). Taylor & Francis, London.

Beach, K. (2003). Consequential transitions: A developmental view of knowledge propagation through social organizations. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn & Y. Engestrom (Eds.), *Between School and Work: New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary-Crossing* (pp. 39–62). Emerald Group Publishing.

Becker, T. (2023). The spatial metaphors of transfer. *Composition Forum*, *51*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/51/spatial-metaphors.php

Bergmann, L. S., & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *Writing Program Administration*, *31*(1), 124–149.

Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press.

Black LGBTQ+ mental health. (2022). Center of Excellence on LGBTQ+ Behavioral Health Equity. https://lgbtqequity.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Black-LGBTQ-Mental-Health-Infographic.pdf

Blythe, S. (2016). Attending to the subject in writing transfer and adaptation. In C. Anson & J. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* (pp. 49–68). The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/ansonmoore/transfer.pdf

Bou Ayash, N. (2019). *Toward translingual realities in composition: (Re)working local language representations and practices*. Utah State University Press.

Boyle, C. (2018). *Rhetoric as posthuman practice*. The Ohio State University Press.

Bransford, J. D., & Schwartz, D. L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with multiple implications. *Review of Research in Education*, *24*(1), 61–100.

Brent, D. (2012). Crossing boundaries: Co-op students relearning to write. *College Composition and Communication*, *63*(4), 558–92.

Brown, N., & Leigh, J. (2018). Ableism in academia: Where are the disabled and ill academics? *Disability & Society*, *33*(6), 985–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1455627

Brueggemann, B. (1999). *Lend me your ear: Rhetorical constructions of deafness*. Gallaudet University Press.

Brueggemann, B. J., Feldmeier, L., Dunn, P. A., Heifferon, B., & Cheu, J. (2001). Becoming visible: Lessons in disability. *College Composition and Communication*, *52*(3), 368–398.

Ceci, S. J., & Ruiz, A. I. (1993). Transfer, abstractness, and intelligence. In D. K. Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on Trial: Intelligence, Cognition, and Instruction*. Alex Publishing Corporation.

Cedillo, C. V. (2018). What does it mean to move?: Race, disability, and critical embodiment pedagogy. *Composition Forum*, *39*. https://www.compositionforum.com/issue/39/to-move.php

Cedillo, C. V., & Brata, P. (2019). Relating our experiences: The practice of positionality stories in student-centered pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, *71*(2), 215–240.

Chavez, K. R. (2015). Beyond inclusion: Rethinking rhetoric's historical narrative. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *101*(1), 162–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2015.994908

Cherney, J. L. (2019). *Ableist rhetoric: How we know, value, and see disability*. Penn State University Press.

Clare, E. (2015). *Exile and pride: Disability, queerness, and liberation*. Duke University Press.

Cloud, D. (2018). *Reality bites: Rhetoric and the circulation of truth claims in U.S. political culture*. The Ohio State University Press.

Colton, J. S., & Holmes, S. (2016). A social justice theory of active equality for technical communication. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, *48*(1), 4–30.

Condon, F., & Young, V. A. (2016). *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado.

Cooper, M. M. (2019). *The animal who writes: A posthumanist composition*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cvetkovich, A. (2012). *Depression: A public feeling*. Duke University Press.

Detterman, D. K. (1993). The case for prosecution: Transfer as an epiphenomenon. In D. K. Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on Trial: Intelligence, Cognition, and Instruction*. Alex Publishing Corporation.

Dolmage, J. (2014). *Disability Rhetoric*. Syracuse University Press.

Dolmage, J. (2017). *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education*. University of Michigan Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvr33d50

Dolmage, J. (2013). Essential functionaries. In S. L. Kerschbaum et al. Faculty members, accommodation and access in higher education, *MLA, Profession*.

Dolmage, J., Helquist, M., & Wood, T. (2020). Connecting writing programs and faculty with disability services. *Kairos Praxis Wiki: Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, *24*(2). https://praxis.technorhetoric.net/tiki-index.php?page=PraxisWiki%3A_%3Adisability_praxis

Donahue, C. (2016). Writing and global transfer narratives: Situating the knowledge transformation conversation. In C. M. Anson & J. L. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* (pp. 107–136). The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/ansonmoore/transfer.pdf

Donaldson, E. (2011). Revisiting the corpus of the madwoman: Further notes toward a feminist disability studies theory of mental illness. In K. Hall (Ed.), *Feminist Disability Studies*. Indiana University Press.

Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done. (2021, April 16). [Video]. MEOPAR. https://youtu.be/D5pStSuvFbw?si=L5cPNi-geQFKMTgZ

Driscoll, D. L. (2011). Connected, disconnected, or uncertain: Student attitudes about future writing contexts and perceptions of transfer from first year writing to the disciplines. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.2.07

Driscoll, D. L., & Powell, R. (2016). States, traits, and dispositions: The impact of emotion on writing development and writing transfer across college courses and beyond. *Composition Forum*, *34*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1113424.pdf

Driscoll, D. L., & Wells, J. (2012). Beyond knowledge and skills: Writing transfer and the role of student dispositions. *Composition Forum*, *29*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php

Dryer, D. (2016). Disambiguating uptake: Toward a tactical research agenda on citizens' writing. In M. J. Reiff & A. Bawarshi (Eds.), *Genre and the Performance of Publics* (pp. 60–79). Utah State University Press.

Elon statement on writing transfer. (2015). Elon University Center for Engaged Learning. https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/elon_statement_writing_transfer.pdf

Engle, R., Lam, D., Meyer, X., & Nix, S. (2012). How does expansive framing promote transfer? Several proposed explanations and a research agenda for investigating them. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(3), 215–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.695678

Erevelles, N. (2011). "Coming out crip" in inclusive education. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(10), 2155–2185.

Esposito, J., & Evans-Winters, V. (2021). *Introduction to intersectional qualitative research*. SAGE Publications Inc.

Fairclough, N. (2018). CDA as dialectical reasoning. In J. E. Richardson & J. Flowerdew (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. Routledge.

Freadman, A. (2002). Uptake. In R. M. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change* (pp. 39–53). Hampton Press.

Garland-Thomson, R. (1997). *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature* (Twentieth Anniversary edition). Columbia University Press.

Garland-Thomson, R. (2011). Integrating disability, transforming feminist theory. In K. Q. Hall (Ed.), *Feminist Disability Studies* (pp. 13–47). Indiana University Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Sociology Press.

Glenn, C. (1997). *Rhetoric retold: Regendering the tradition from antiquity through the renaissance*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Gonzales, L., & Butler, J. (2020). Working toward social justice through multilingualism, multimodality, and accessibility in writing classrooms. *Composition Forum*, *44*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/44/multilingualism.php

Gonzalez, L. (2018). *Sites of translation: What multilinguals can teach us about digital writing and rhetoric*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9952377

Goodley, D. (2014). *Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism*. Routledge.

Green, A., Dura, L., Harris, P., Heilig, L., Kirby, B., McClintick, J., Pfender, Carrasco, R., & _ A. (2020). Teaching and researching with a mental health diagnosis: Practices and perspectives on academic ableism. *Rhetoric of Health and Medicine*, *3*(2). https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rhm/vol3/iss2/1

Gries, L. E. (2015). *Still life with rhetoric: A new materialist approach for visual rhetorics*. Utah State University Press.

Gries, L. E., & Brooke, C. G. (2018). *Circulation, writing, and rhetoric*. Utah State University Press.

Haas, A. M. (2007). Wampum as hypertext: An American Indian intellectual tradition of multimedia theory and practice. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, *19*(4), 77–100.

Hanganu-Bresch, C., & Berkenkotter, C. (2019). *Diagnosing madness: The discursive construction of the psychiatric patient, 1850-1920 (Studies in Rhetoric/Communication)*. University of South Carolina Press.

Hannabach, C. (2007). Anxious embodiment, disability, and sexuality: A response to Margrit Shildrick. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, *8*(3), 253–261.

Hayes, H., Ferris, D. R., & Whithaus, C. (2016). Dynamic transfer in first year writing and WID settings. In C. M. Anson & J. L. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* (pp. 181–213). University Press of Colorado.

Henze, B. (2018). Teaching genre in professional and technical communication. In T. Bridgeford (Ed.), *Teaching Professional and Technical Communication: A Practicum in a Book* (pp. 72–88). Utah State University Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/62707

Herrick, J. A. (2021). *The history and theory of rhetoric: An introduction* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Hitt, A. H. (2021). *Rhetorics of overcoming: Rewriting narratives of disability and accessibility in writing studies.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Ho, A. B. T., Kerschbaum, S. L., Sanchez, R., & Yergeau, M. R. (2020). Cripping neutrality: Student resistance, pedagogical audiences, and teachers' accommodations. *Pedagogy*, *20*(1), 127–139.

Inoue, A. (2019). *Labor-based grading contracts: Building equity and inclusion in the compassionate writing classroom*. The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado.

Iskra-Paczkowska, A., & Paczkowski, P. (2016). Ancient doctrines of passions: Plato and Aristotle. *Studie Humana*, *5*(3), 21–28.

Jarratt, S. (1998). *Rereading the sophists: Classical rhetoric refigured*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Jung, K. E. (2011). Chronic illness and educational equity: The politics of visibility. In K. Q. Hall (Ed.), *Feminist Disability Studies* (pp. 263–286). Indiana University Press.

Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist queer crip*. Indiana University Press.

Kerschbaum, S., Eisenman, L. T., & James M. Jones (Eds.). (2017). *Negotiating disability: Disclosure and higher education*. University of Michigan Press. 10.3998/mpub.9426902

Kerschbaum, S. L., Garland-Thomson, R., Oswal, S. K., Vidali, A., Ghiaciuc, S., Price, M., Dolmage, J., Meyer, C. A., Brueggemann, B. J., & Samuels, E. (2013). Faculty members, accommodation, and access in higher education. *MLA, Profession*. https://profession.mla.org/faculty-members-accommodation-and-access-in-higher-education/

Kim, J. B., & Schalk, S. (2021). Reclaiming the radical politics of self-care: A crip-of-color critique. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *120*(2), 325–342.

Lawson-Tancred, H. (1992). Introduction. In Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*. Penguin Random House.

Liboiron, M. (2021). A wee primer on colonialism. In *CLEAR Lab Book*. CLEAR.

Linton, S. (2005). What is disability studies? *PMLA*, *120*(2), 518–522.

Literacy. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/literacy_n?tab=meaning_and_use#38959559

Lobato, J. (2008). When students don't apply the knowledge you think they have, rethink your assumptions about transfer. In M. Carlson & C. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Making the Connection: Research and Teaching in Undergraduate Mathematics* (pp. 289–304). Mathematical Association of America.

Lu, M.-Z., & Horner, B. (2016). Translingual work. *College English*, *78*(3), 207–218.

Macklin, M. (2019). *Lost in uptake translation: Examining genre negotiations in students' writing performances*. Dissertations & Theses @ University of Washington WCLP; Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA); ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest One Literature. https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/lost-uptake-translation-examining-genre/docview/2291447480/se-2

Martinez, A. Y. (2020). *Counterstory: The rhetoric and writing of critical race theory*. National Council of Teachers of English.

McAlexander, P. J. (2003). Using principles of universal design in college composition courses. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing universal design in higher education* (pp. 105–114). Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

McManigell Grijalva, R. A. (2016). Minding the gap: Writing-related learning in/across multiple activity systems. In C. M. Anson & J. L. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* (pp. 139–160). The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado.

McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. NYU Press.

Medina, D. L. (2017). *A transfer subject: Tracing boundary-work and micro-transfer in first-year composition* [University of Washington]. Research Works Archive. https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/40559/Medina_washington_0250E_17705.pdf?sequence=1

Meleo-Erwin, Z. (2012). Disrupting normal: Toward the "ordinary and familiar" in fat politics. *Feminism & Psychology*, *22*(3), 388–402.

Meyer, C. (2013). Beyond the overcoming narrative. In S. L. Kerschbaum et al. Faculty members, accommodation and access in higher education, *MLA, Profession*.

Minich, J. A. (2016). Enabling whom? Critical disability studies now. *Lateral*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.9

Minich, J. A. (2017). Thinking with Jina B. Kim and Sami Schalk. *Lateral*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.25158/L6.1.15

Misko, J. (1998). Do skills transfer? An empirical study. *VET Research: Influencing Policy and Practice*, 289–300.

Mott, C., & Cockayne, D. (2017). Citation matters: Mobilizing the politics of citation toward a practice of "conscientious engagement." *Gender, Place, & Culture*, *24*(7), 954–973.

Nielsen, D. (2013). Universal design in first-year composition—Why do we need it and how can we do it? *CEA Forum*, *42*(2), 3–22.

Nowacek, R. S. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Nowacek, R. S., Bodee, B., Douglas, J. E., Fitzsimmons, W., Hausladen, K. A., Knowles, M., & Nugent, M. (2019). "Transfer Talk" in talk about writing in progress: Two propositions about transfer of learning. *Composition Forum*, *42*(22). https://compositionforum.com/issue/42/transfer-talk.php

Nowacek, R. S., Lorimer Leonard, R., & Rounsaville, A. (2024). *Writing knowledge transfer: Theory, research, pedagogy*. The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado.

Perkins, D., & Salomon, G. (1992). Transfer of learning. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed.). Pergamon Press.

Pickens, T. A. (2019). *Black madness: Mad blackness*. Duke University Press.

Pimentel, O., Pimentel, C., & Dean, J. (2016). The myth of the colorblind writing classroom: White instructors confront white privilege in their classroom. In *Performing Antiracist Pedagogy in Rhetoric, Writing, and Communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933

Poulakos, J. (1983). Toward a Sophistic definition of rhetoric. In M. Porrovecchio & C. M. Condit (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.

Price, M. (2007). Accessing disability: A nondisabled student works the hyphen. *College Composition and Communication*, *59*(1), 53–76.

Price, M. (2011). *Mad at school: Rhetorics of mental disability and academic life*. University of Michigan Press.

Price, M. (2013). Crip time and procedure for accommodation In S. L. Kerschbaum et al. Faculty members, accommodation and access in higher education, *MLA, Profession*. https://profession.mla.org/faculty-members-accommodation-and-access-in-higher-education/

Price, M. (2015). The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain. *Hypatia*, *Disability Studies Issue*. https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12127

Pryal, K. R. G. (2017). *Life of the mind interrupted: Essays on mental health and disability in higher education*. Blue Crow Books.

Redish, J. C. (2000). What is information design? *Technical Communication*, *47*(2), 163–166.

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication*, *28*(3), 312–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311410183

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2016). Introduction: From genre turn to public turn: Navigating the intersections of public sphere theory, genre theory, and the performance of publics. In M. J. Reiff & A. Bawarshi (Eds.), *Genre and the Performance of Publics* (pp. 3–22). Utah State University Press.

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2021). “How to turn accumulated knowledge into action”: Uptake, public petitions, and the climate change debate. In S. Auken & C. Sunesen (Eds.), *Genre in the Climate Debate* (pp. 150–178). De Gruyter Open Poland. https://doi.org/10.1515/9788395720499-009

Relationship. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/relationship_n?tab=meaning_and_use#25958517

Rothschild, K., Driscoll, D. L., Powell, R., & Wells, J. (2024). Disciplinarity and transfer ten years later: A multi-institutional investigation into students' perceptions of learning to write. *College Composition and Communication*, *76*(1), 149–180.

Rounsaville, A., Goldberg, R., & Bawarshi, A. (2008). From incomes to outcomes: FYW students’ prior genre knowledge, metacognition, and the question of transfer. *Writing Program Administration*, *32*(1), 97–112.

Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.

Samuels, E. (2013). Response. In S. L. Kerschbaum et al. Faculty members, accommodation and access in higher education, *MLA, Profession*. https://profession.mla.org/faculty-members-accommodation-and-access-in-higher-education/

Schalk, S. (2017). Critical disability studies as methodology. *Lateral*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.25158/L6.1.13

Schalk, S., & Kim, J. B. (2020). Integrating race, transforming feminist disability studies. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *46*(1), 31–55.

Schell, E., & Rawson, K. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Rhetorica in motion: Feminist rhetorical methods and methodologies*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schneider, B. (2006). Ethical research and pedagogical gaps. *College Composition and Communication*, *58*(1), 70–88.

Selzer, J. (2003). Rhetorical analysis: Understanding how texts persuade readers. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices* (1st ed., pp. 279–307). Routledge.

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

Siebers, T. (2019). Returning the social model. In D. T. Mitchell, S. Antebi, & S. L. Snyder (Eds.), *The Matter of Disability: Materiality, Biopolitics, Crip Affect*. University of Michigan Press.

Simpkins, N. (2018). Towards an understanding of accommodation transfer: Disabled students' strategies for navigating classroom accommodations. *Composition Forum*, *39*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/39/accommodation-transfer.php

Simpkins, N. (2022). Disability identity and institutional rhetorics of difference. In J. R. Daniel, K. Malcolm, & C. Rai (Eds.), *Writing Across Difference: Theory and Intervention*. Utah State University Press.

Simpson, L. B. (2017). *As we have always done: Indigenous freedom through radical resistance*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c

Souto-Manning, M. (2014). Critical narrative analysis: The interplay of critical discourse and narrative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *27*(2), 159–180.

Sommers, N., & Saltz, L. (2004). The novice as expert: Writing the freshman year. *College Composition and Communication*, *56*(1), 124–49.

Stainton, T. (2001). Reason and value: The thought of Plato and Aristotle and the construction of intellectual disability. *Mental Retardation*, *39*(6), 452–460.

Stormer, N., & McGreavy, B. (2017). Thinking ecologically about rhetoric's ontology: Capacity, vulnerability, and resilience. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, *50*(1), 1–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.5325/philrhet.50.1.0001

Thorndike, E. L. (1923). The influence of first year Latin upon the ability to read English. *School and Society*, *17*(424), 165–168.

Thorndike, E. L., & Woodworth, R. S. (1901). The influence of improvement in one mental function upon the efficiency of other functions. *Psychological Review*, *8*(3), 247–261.

Titchkosky, T. (2007). *Reading and writing disability differently: The textured life of embodiment*. University of Toronto Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442683839

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities* (pp. 223–248). SAGE Publications Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781544329611

Tuomi-Gröhn, T., & Engestrom, Y. (Eds.). (2003). *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Uthappa, N. R. (2018). The uses of disclosure: Building a rhetorical scaffolding to fight stigma in the writing classroom. *Pedagogy*, *18*(3), 566–572.

Vidali, A. (2008). Discourses of disability and basic writing. In C. Lewiecki-Wilson, B. J. Brueggemann, & J. Dolmage (Eds.), *Disability and the Teaching of Writing: A Critical Sourcebook* (pp. 40–54). Bedford/St. Martins.

Vidali, A. (2015). Disabling writing program administration. *WPA: Writing Program Administration Journal*, *38*(2), 32–55.

Vidali, A. (2017). Diagnosing disability, disease, and disorder online: Disclosure, dismay, and student research. In S. L. Kerschbaum, T. Eisenman, & J. M. Jones (Eds.), *Negotiating Disability: Disclosure and Higher Education*. University of Michigan Press.

Walters, S. (2010). Toward an accessible pedagogy: Dis/ability, multimodality, and universal design in the technical communication classroom. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *19*(4), 427–454.

Walters, S. (2018). A different kind of wholeness: Disability dis-closure and ruptured rhetorics of multimodal collaboration and revision in The Ride Together. *Composition Forum*, *39*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/39/wholeness.php

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding 'transfer' from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *WPA: Writing Program Administration Journal*, *31*(1/2), 65–85.

Wardle, E., & Clement, N. (2016). Double-binds and consequential transitions: Considering matters of identity during moments of rhetorical challenge. In C. M. Anson & J. L. Moore (Eds.), *Critical transitions: Writing and the question of transfer* (pp. 161–179). The WAC Clearinghouse, UP Colorado.

Wong, A. (2018). *Intersectionality* (34) [Broadcast]. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2018/09/24/ep-34-intersectionality/

Wong, A. (2019a). *Black mental health* (65) [Broadcast]. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2019/12/01/ep-65-black-mental-health/

Wong, A. (2019b). *Disability studies* (46) [Broadcast]. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2019/03/10/ep-46-disability-studies/

Wood, T. (2017). Cripping time in the college composition classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, *69*(2), 260–286.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Utah State University Press.

Yergeau, M. R. (2013). Clinically significant disturbance: On theorists who theorize theory of mind. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *33*(4), n.p.

Yergeau, R. (2017). *Authoring autism: On rhetoric and neurological queerness*. Duke University Press.

Young, V. A. (2014). *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy*. Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Appendix I

English 110: Critical Composition Student-Participant Biographies

1. Ermin identifies as a first-generation, male college student from San Juan, Puerto Rico who grew up in Tacoma, Washington and majors in electrical engineering. [Name] is also an ESL student with a strong awareness of linguistic difference and broad concerns about reading comprehension. He identifies as having no accessibility concerns implying able-bodymindedness. In his family, mental health was rarely, if ever, discussed. Despite this, he has a positive outlook toward expanding discussions of mental health and illness. His disposition toward writing is positive as he claims that he would love to learn more about research and topics that interest him. Ermin is passionate about informing the public about Puerto Rico's relationship with the US and its consequences.

2. Ed identifies as a 19-year old female from Kenya who majors in nursing and practices English as a second language. She moved to the United States in 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic and has a great interest in healthcare justice. She claims to have no accessibility concerns, implying able-bodymindedness. Her disposition toward writing is positive as she expresses a desire to grow as a writer and researcher.

3. Tanner identifies as male and is a computer science major from Brazil who identifies as having no accessibility concerns, implying able-bodymindedness. However, he has disclosed his diagnosis of Asperger's syndrome in writing and conversation. He is not a first-generation college student and has a positive, growth-oriented disposition toward writing. Tanner is a passionate music listener.

4. Zion is a male, student athlete majoring in psychology. He is from Belarus and is not a first-generation college student. He practices English as a second language and identifies as having no accessibility concerns implying able-bodymindedness. His disposition toward the course is positive. Zion is a passionate music listener.

5. Gillian identifies as a white, female student athlete with a vested interest in informing others about the time management struggles of student athletes. Her major is undecided and she is a first-generation college student. She also identifies as having no accessibility concerns, implying able-bodymindedness. In the past, she has enjoyed writing personal narratives and has an engagement-oriented disposition toward writing.

6. Emma identifies as a sister, friend, daughter, teammate, student, and collegiate athlete. Her major is undeclared and is not a first-generation college student. She also identifies as having no accessibility concerns, implying able-bodymindedness. However, she discloses that she works better with visual aids. Emma has a strong desire to succeed and "To find more joy in writing."

7. Natasha identifies as a cisgender, Mexican-American female. She is a (grand)daughter, sister, undergraduate, bilingual, first-generation college student. She is also a caregiver in an assisted living facility. Her strongest values are caring, patience, and wellness. As such, she majors in pre-health sciences with the goal of becoming a physician's assistant. Natasha mentions she has accessibility concerns, claiming she cannot stay focused for long periods of time. Her disposition toward the course is comfort- and confidence-oriented.

8. Eight uses they/them pronouns and is a first-generation college student majoring in neuroscience with an interest in sociology and anthropology. They claim that “my love-hate relationship with the brain fluctuates, but the hate is mainly for my own brain, not the brain itself and the different processes varying from everyone else” and express no accessibility concerns. Eight has disclosed facing recent trauma related to death and grief and expresses positive learning experiences with understanding instructors. They hold a positive disposition toward the course and learning, desiring to “branch out” with their learning style. Finally, they identify as an artist who is interested in the experiences of artists who engage their craft as both professionals and amateurs.

9. Jay uses he/him pronouns and identifies as Armenian. He is a business and real estate development major. He claims to have no accessibility concerns, implying able-bodymindedness. His disposition toward the course is positive as he wants to “elevate” his level of writing and be an active participant in the course.

10. Angelica uses she/her pronouns and is a first-generation, eldest Mexican daughter. She is a commuter student with a great interest in discussing and sharing the difficulties of being one such student. Angelica is an avid learner.

Appendix II

English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing Student-Participant Biographies

1. Hamilton, a sophomore at the time of his enrollment, identifies as a male who is not a first-generation college student. Although he indicates he is a part of the POC community, his specific race and ethnicity are not disclosed. He stated he has a passion for business and meeting new people and found that sales and consulting is a good path for him to live a life doing those two things. He claims to have strong research skills and, at the time, did not have any concerns about using UW research tools. Hamilton claims he does not have any access concerns, suggesting able-bodymindedness that persisted throughout the term. He had goals to strengthen his writing skills, specifically in a professional setting.

2. Ethan Heiss is a white male who was in his junior year at the time of his enrollment in English 281 and a non-first-generation transfer student from a Washington state community college. Upon entering the course, I had communicated with Ethan about his DRS accommodations which I received notification of through email from the DRS office. He quickly disclosed his diagnoses optionally and communicated clearly about what he needed in the course as a result. Ethan was also a business administration major and his prior knowledge about mental disability was advanced due to the research he did in his free time to understand himself better. Ethan's story and relationship to mental disability is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

3. Peter is a white male and was a senior information systems major at the time of his English 281 enrollment. He is not a first-generation college student and claims to have had little to no experience engaging with the topic of mental disability prior to our course despite having written a paper on war veterans' coping mechanisms in Tim O'Brien's "The Things They Carried." Peter's story and relationship to mental disability is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

4. Mason, a white male, was a first-year student during Spring Quarter 2023 and was pursuing a double major in entrepreneurship and marketing with a minor in political science. He was directly admitted into the business school which he stated early in the term. Although he disclosed his diagnoses of ADHD and dyslexia, he does not claim to have any need for accommodations and states that his diagnoses do not interfere with his ability to complete coursework. Mason has a long history of exposure to mental disability experiences through his own diagnoses but also those of his family members. Mason's story and relationship to mental disability is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

5. In Spring 2023, Yeni was double majoring in Finance and Operation Management and Supply Chain Management in order to pursue his goal of solving current issues in society. Yeni is not a first-generation college student, is Chinese, and has multiple linguistic resources. He does not claim to have a history of mental disability but does center his final research paper around his experience with obesity and the mental health issues that resulted from that condition. Yeni's story and relationship to mental disability is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

6. Foster was a first-year student when they enrolled in the course and identified as a white, queer-identifying female. At the time, Foster was majoring in archeological science with a minor in informatics. They are not a first-generation college student but often feel ill-prepared since their father went to college and not a four-year university. Early in the term, Foster disclosed their learning disability and, later, their anxiety disorder that led to a near-hospitalization. Like Ethan,

they entered the course with a great deal of disability literacy and understanding of themselves as someone with connections to mental disability. Foster's story and relationship to mental disability is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

7. During her enrollment in English 281, JT was in the process of applying for the biology major with a focus in physiology, making her the only non-business major in the course. She had the ultimate goal of becoming a physician's assistant because she enjoys learning about the human body. She is not a first-generation college student and had never had much experience with research. She "grew up in a suburban neighborhood in the East San Francisco Bay Area." In her positionality statement for her Final Website, she noted that her parents were very open about mental illness and therapy. Her experience working at a nursing home inspired her to write about mental and physical burnout from healthcare worker shortages.

8. Cara, who I speak about at length in Chapters 4 and 5, was a first-year student during the time of the study. Her experience growing up in rural Illinois with a relatively conservative family made it difficult to express her queer identity and her mental health issues with them. However, this instilled in her a goal of sharing her own experience with others who might be in similar situations. Cara identified as mentally disabled (major depressive disorder and an eating disorder she did not specifically name) and a white, queer woman. Since the end of the course, Cara has written posts on an online newspaper column to support queer students in college.

9. Hearts, who I introduce in Chapter 5, was interested in pursuing business administration when she was enrolled in my course although her major was undecided. As a first-generation college student, she was proud of her position at UW and was excited about the opportunities the class would offer. Hearts is an L2 student and disclosed during the term that she had experienced self-injury in the past which inspired her research topic.

10. Polly was pursuing a double major in marketing and psychology when she enrolled in my course. She expressed interest in how external factors impact human behavior. Early in the term, she disclosed that her position as a first-generation student caused her to experience certain challenges in navigating the academic world though she expressed an excitement to learn and recognition of the resources available to her. She claimed that she does not have any access needs.

11. It was Lorraine's final quarter when she enrolled in English 281. At UW, she majored in accounting and marketing and is not a first-generation student. She claimed that she did not have any access needs but later mentioned mental health struggles during her interview. Lorraine was raised between the U.S. and China and is fluent in English and Mandarin. In her positionality statement for her Final Website, she mentioned a love for travel and valuing cultural diversity. Her experience in courses involving race in American history and law inspired her to write about racism in healthcare though she acknowledged the intersections of her marginalization and privilege that prevented her from fully understanding the experiences of Black, Indigenous, and other POC within the healthcare system.

12. Tosh was a "fifth-year undergraduate student" studying finance and information systems during Spring 2023. He is a low-income, first-generation student and had an interest in the equity market. For his Final Website, Tosh wrote about "Technological Advancement Impact on Marginalized Communities" as a member of marginalized groups himself. He claimed that "As an avid technology user, I strive to explore the transformative potential of technology while advocating for its ethical and equitable application in creating a more just and inclusive society."

13. Hilda was a senior in Spring 2023 who was double majoring in communication and political science. As a self-proclaimed feminist, she wanted “to have a career in political public relations [to] be able to increase the female presence in politics” and had previously written a paper that analyzed “how women in the Democratic Republic of Congo are affected by rape…as a weapon of war.” Though she did not claim a need for any accommodations, she did disclose experiences with anxiety and paranoia resulting from “past trauma.” Hilda wrote her Final Website on “Mental Disability in Philosophically Perfect Societies.”

Appendix III

In-Class Recruitment Script for a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the First-Year Composition Classroom

(to be presented to English 110 students at the University of Washington)

Good morning everyone,

So far, we have taken some time to get to know one another and to talk about English 110 broadly as well as the assignments you will complete this term. Before we continue, I want to provide some information about the structure of this course and some of the opportunities offered in this particular section of English 110.

One of the pros of being a part of a Research 1 institution like UW is that we are given the opportunity to contribute to the production of knowledge (or, one way of producing one form of knowledge). Thus, in addition to being your instructor this term, I will also be conducting research for my doctoral dissertation. My dissertation is concerned with the use of introducing critical frameworks related to mental health, disability, and illness in first-year composition classes, like this one, to determine whether or not composition studies is a field that should be concerned with rhetorics (or discourses) of mental health, disability, and illness.

I was brought to this research as a result of my own undergraduate experience struggling with and trying to make sense of my symptoms of mental illness which led to multiple hospitalizations and diagnoses, among them bipolar II disorder (or manic depression), post-traumatic stress disorder, and mild obsessive compulsive disorder. I was lucky during this time to have some professors who were understanding and who made accommodations for me to complete schoolwork over nearly two months of absence.

Although some were understanding, others were not, which required me to withdraw from classes. Being white, cisgender, and female, I was more likely to be listened to and accommodated, and have access to appropriate healthcare, than other students. I knew there needed to be more kindness extended to students living with mental illness, particularly those who fill multiple marginalized subject positions.

I recognized that the University as an institution was not built to be inclusive of people like me or like people you know or even yourself if you live with psychiatric disabilities. It is for this reason and with this experience that I enter this research as well as this classroom.

I conduct this research with the goal of benefiting current and future students who have psychiatric disabilities by making the University more accessible for them via teaching design, practice, and policy as well as empowering students to better advocate for themselves and each other by adopting critical viewpoints and open-mindedness.

You will notice that most of our course readings are related to disability broadly as well as mental disability. This does not mean you are required to write about mental health, disability, or illness or to disclose your mental or psychiatric disabilities to me and your classmates. Rather, these texts serve as critical thinking tools for approaching your research and everyday life and as examples of how to conduct research with a critical lens.

That said, as you read and write in this class, I would love to extend to you the opportunity to produce knowledge in the fields of composition studies, rhetoric, and disability studies. I would also love to extend to you the opportunity to positively influence the experiences of students living with mental illness on university campuses.

To participate in this study, I would ask that you grant me your permission to use your in- and out-of-class writing, questionnaire and survey responses, and in-class comments as data to be analyzed. I will

approach your comments and writing with curiosity, openness, kindness, and gratitude. And I will always, always encourage you to share your input on the course design and research practices.

To participate, you must be 18 years or older and you will have the ability to remain anonymous. You also have the ability to withdraw from the study at any point during the term. Your grade will in no way be affected by your decision to participate, not participate, or withdraw from this study. It is not an obligation to grant me permission to use your work in this study. I want you to make the decision that you feel is best for *you* as a student.

If you decide you are interested in participating in this study and would like to receive more information, please send me an email or let me know after class. Once you do, you will be sent a consent form including all of the information needed for you to grant me informed consent to include you as a research participant this term.

Whether you choose to participate in this study or not, I will be sending out a consent form for you to grant me permission to audio record our class sessions. The purpose of recording our class sessions is to ensure true transcription of research participants' comments. Other students' comments will not be transcribed and will not be stored considering all audio will be destroyed following its transcription.

My contact information is included on our syllabus and Canvas homepage as well as written on the board. What questions do you have for me before we continue our lesson for the day?

Thank you. I'm really looking forward to working and researching with those of you who choose to participate.

Appendix IV

In-Class Recruitment Script for a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the Composition Classroom

(to be presented to English 281 students at the University of Washington)

Good morning everyone,

So far, we have taken some time to get to know one another and to talk about English 281 broadly as well as the assignments you will complete this term. Before we continue, I want to provide some information about the structure of this course and some of the opportunities offered in this particular section of English 281.

One of the pros of being a part of a Research 1 institution like UW is that we are given the opportunity to contribute to the production of knowledge (or, one way of producing one form of knowledge). Thus, in addition to being your instructor this term, I will also be conducting research for my doctoral dissertation. My dissertation is concerned with the use of introducing critical frameworks related to mental health, disability, and illness in composition classes, like this one, to determine whether or not composition studies is a field that should be concerned with rhetorics (or discourses) of mental health, disability, and illness.

I was brought to this research as a result of my own undergraduate experience struggling with and trying to make sense of my symptoms of mental illness which led to multiple hospitalizations and diagnoses. I was lucky during this time to have some professors who were understanding and who made accommodations for me to complete schoolwork over nearly two months of absence.

Although some were understanding, others were not, which required me to withdraw from classes. Being white, cisgender, and female, I was more likely to be listened to and accommodated, and have access to appropriate healthcare, than other students. I knew there needed to be more kindness extended to students living with mental illness, particularly those who fill multiple marginalized subject positions.

I recognized that the University as an institution was not built to be inclusive of people like me or like people you know or even yourself if you live with psychiatric disabilities. It is for this reason and with this experience that I enter this research as well as this classroom.

I conduct this research with the goal of benefiting current and future students who have psychiatric disabilities by making the University more accessible for them via teaching design, practice, and policy as well as empowering students to better advocate for themselves and each other by adopting critical viewpoints and open-mindedness.

You will notice that most of our course readings are related to disability broadly as well as mental disability. This does not mean you are required to write about mental health, disability, or illness or to disclose your mental or psychiatric disabilities to me and your classmates. Rather, these texts serve as critical thinking tools for approaching your research and everyday life and as examples of how to conduct research with a critical lens.

That said, as you read and write in this class, I would love to extend to you the opportunity to produce knowledge in the fields of composition studies, rhetoric, and disability studies. I would also love to extend to you the opportunity to positively influence the experiences of students living with mental illness on university campuses.

To participate in this study, I would ask that you grant me your permission to use your in- and out-of-class writing, questionnaire and survey responses, and in-class comments as data to be analyzed. I will

approach your comments and writing with curiosity, openness, kindness, and gratitude. And I will always, always encourage you to share your input on the course design and research practices.

To participate, you must be 18 years or older and you will have the ability to remain anonymous. You also have the ability to withdraw from the study at any point during the term. Your grade will in no way be affected by your decision to participate, not participate, or withdraw from this study. It is not an obligation to grant me permission to use your work in this study. I want you to make the decision that you feel is best for *you* as a student.

If you decide you are interested in participating in this study and would like to receive more information, please send me an email or let me know after class. Once you do, you will be sent or provided a consent form including all of the information needed for you to grant me informed consent to include you as a research participant this term.

Whether you choose to participate in this study or not, I will be sending out a consent form for you to grant me permission to audio record our class sessions. The purpose of recording our class sessions is to ensure true transcription of research participants' comments. Other students' comments will not be transcribed and will not be stored considering all audio will be destroyed following its transcription.

My contact information is included on our syllabus and Canvas homepage as well as written on the board. What questions do you have for me before we continue our lesson for the day?

Thank you. I'm really looking forward to working and researching with those of you who choose to participate.

Appendix V

Invitation to Participate in a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the First-Year Composition Classroom

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu)

1. Research Purpose

This research is the basis of my dissertation in the Department of English at the University of Washington, Seattle, USA. The purpose of this research is to better understand the value of including mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and research frameworks in the first-year composition course. I want to examine the impact such rhetorics and frameworks have on students' writing, research, and critical understanding of mental health and illness. Further, I am curious about how frameworks for thinking critically about mental health, disability, and illness transfer outside of the composition classroom as a result of writing about and with such frameworks. I am also hoping to develop a greater understanding of how writing about and with such frameworks might contribute to student agency and self-advocacy outside of the composition classroom and in everyday discussions about mental health and illness. Ultimately, I aim to understand why and how rhetorics of mental health, disability, and illness should be a concern for composition studies and what makes composition classrooms the best place for this work.

You are invited to participate in this study because you are enrolled in English 110: Critical Composition at the University of Washington "mental disability as methodology." Students who choose to participate in this qualitative study will agree to have the work we do together in English 110—in the form of class discussions, in-class and out-of-class writing, and surveys and questionnaires—collected and analyzed. Later in the term and during Autumn Quarter 2023, you may be invited to participate as a focal student in which case we will also produce additional data through interviews and other written correspondence. Analysis of all the data collected in this study will be shared with my dissertation committee as well as other professionals interested in rhetorics of mental health and illness, disability studies, and knowledge transfer in the composition classroom.

2. Procedures

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be giving me your permission to include what you say during class discussions, interviews (if applicable), in your in- and out-of-class writing, and during our other interactions related to the study in my writing, including in any resulting scholarly publications or conference proceedings.

Please do not give permission if you do not feel completely comfortable with this decision. Please also do not give your consent if you are under 18.

Once you have agreed to participate in the study, you will be given an initial survey related to your understanding of mental health, disability, and illness. In your initial survey, I will ask if you would like to be recognized by name in my research, or if you would prefer to remain anonymous. If you would like to remain anonymous, I will ask you to choose a pseudonym that I can use to refer to you in my analysis. I will ask again at the end of the study if you would like to remain anonymous or be recognized by name, and you may change your original decision. You may choose to not answer a question or to withdraw your consent to participate in the study at any time.

I will be both teaching our English 110 class sessions and observing our discussions, writing, and interactions as data. As a result, I will be observing our interactions online, in person, during conferences, before or after class, and any other events that constitute our working together during English 110. Observations and reflections will be recorded in personal journals and word processing programs. In addition, class sessions will be recorded to ensure true transcription of the conversations being had about

writing and mental disability frameworks. I will be intentional about asking you to review details about your discussion contributions and writing.

Because the majority of the data collected for this study will be fulfilled as a requirement of the English 110 course (e.g., writing assignments and essays, free writing exercises, class discussions, student conferences, and so forth) little extra time will be required of you during the 10-week quarter for which you have agreed to participate. However, as previously mentioned, those of you who are invited to participate as focal students in the study will require an estimated 1–4 hours of your time per quarter. This time will be dedicated to interviews, one-on-one or group meetings with other focal students, and other work such as emailing, reviewing documents, and so forth. Interviews can take place either in person or online depending on what is more accessible and comfortable for you.

For focal students, I would like to interview you at least twice between January 2023 and March 2023 though this timeline may shift. Those who previously enrolled in the study will be contacted via email during Autumn Quarter 2023 to complete follow-up interviews if that is of interest. Participants will be compensated with gift cards for completing Autumn Quarter interviews. Interviews will last approximately 30–60 minutes and will take place via Zoom for ease of transcription. Interview questions will focus on your perceptions of and understanding of mental health, disability, and illness and your experience engaging and writing with our course concepts beyond the course. The interviews are semi-structured, and you are invited to ask questions of me as well. I imagine the interviews as an open conversation. The interviews will be recorded, and these recordings will be transcribed for further analysis. All audio recordings and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after transcription. If you choose to participate anonymously, all of the information that you provide will remain confidential, and I will remove all names from transcripts. This includes all names of individuals, the names of places, and any other additional information closely associated with you. Throughout the study, I may consult you about my interpretations of your words or actions. I will do this in an effort to reach common understanding and represent you as responsibly as I can.

3. Uses of the Information

The information you provide during this study will be used for research purposes. I will use it for analysis in order to write my doctoral dissertation and possibly other pieces of writing such as academic articles or a book, and I may use this information in presentations at professional conferences. Resulting publications may be publicly available and may contain quotations from your interviews or interactions that we have.

I will make every effort to use your words responsibly. To me, that means interpreting their meaning as accurately as I can and consulting you to reach a common understanding. I want to represent your words and opinions respectfully.

You may choose to be named or remain anonymous at any point in this research process, and you may change your decision later in the research process. If you choose to participate in this study anonymously, I will make every effort to ensure that you cannot be identified from your words. At the time of written informed consent, I will assign a pseudonym and will link it to transcripts and notes associated with your participation. Your pseudonym will be kept in a separate digital file that contains your name and pseudonym. Recordings, transcripts, and any information you provide will be stored digitally, in a password-protected format to which only I have access. Please note that information sent by email is not completely secure.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, the records of your participation may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk of harm. I will keep records of this research for the length of time required by my institution.

You may ask me at any time to refrain from using a particular quote or other piece of data; please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu to let me know.

4. Rights and Risks of participation

If you choose to participate in this research, I will ask questions on topics that you may find sensitive or personal, such as but not limited to where you have heard discussions of mental health and illness take place, what your relationship is to research and how you feel about it in general, and how you see discussions on mental health and illness fitting into our writing. These topics have the potential to cause emotional discomfort.I will approach these topics with respectful curiosity, and my goal is to understand your views and experiences. I do not intend to cause you personal or professional harm.

As a participant in this study, you have the right to refuse to answer any question at any time. You may also request that I do not include certain words of yours or certain information about you in my study. You also have the right to withdraw your participation in this research at any time.

In closing…

I invite you to participate in this research as a co-collaborator. As a result, I will always welcome your feedback and opinions on research procedures, including this process of informed consent. Please consider this research an open and ongoing conversation. I truly appreciate your willingness to join me. Thank you.

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu).

Once you have read through the details and asked any questions necessary, please answer the following question and sign below.

Do you give consent to participate in this research project?

____ Yes. I consent to participate in this research project.

____ No. I do not consent to participate in this research project.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix VI

Invitation to Participate as a Focal Student in a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the First-Year Composition Classroom

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu)

1. Summary

If you have been given this document, you are already participating as a co-collaborator alongside your peers in a study on the uses of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in the first-year composition classroom. The following information is consistent with the initial consent form you signed when you agreed to participate as a co-collaborator on this research with the exception of emphasis added to information relevant specifically to focal student participants. All other information regarding the research purpose, procedures, use of information, and rights and risks of participation are consistent with your participation as a general co-collaborator. Please review the information below carefully before determining whether you would like to participate in this study as a focal student.

2. Research Purpose

This research is the basis of my dissertation in the Department of English at the University of Washington, Seattle, USA. The purpose of this research is to better understand the value of including mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and research frameworks in the first-year composition course. I want to examine the impact such rhetorics and frameworks have on students' writing, research, and critical understanding of mental health and illness. Further, I am curious about how frameworks for thinking critically about mental health, disability, and illness transfer outside of the composition classroom as a result of writing about and with such frameworks. I am also hoping to develop a greater understanding of how writing about and with such frameworks might contribute to student agency and self-advocacy outside of the composition classroom and in everyday discussions about mental health and illness. Ultimately, I aim to understand why and how rhetorics of mental health, disability, and illness should be a concern for composition studies and what makes composition classrooms the best place for this work.

You are invited to participate in this study because you are enrolled in English 110: Critical Composition at the University of Washington which will have as its theme "mental disability as methodology." Students who choose to participate in this qualitative study will agree to have the work we do together in English 110—in the form of class discussions, in-class and out-of-class writing, and surveys and questionnaires—collected and analyzed. **Later in the term** and during Autumn Quarter 2023**, you may be invited to participate as a focal student in which case we will also produce additional data through interviews and other written correspondence**. Analysis of all the data collected in this study will be shared with my dissertation committee as well as other professionals interested in rhetorics of mental health and illness, disability studies, and knowledge transfer in the composition classroom.

3. Procedures

If you choose to participate in this study, **you will be giving me your permission to include what you say during class discussions, interviews (if applicable), in your in- and out-of-class writing, and during our other interactions related to the study in my writing, including in any resulting scholarly publications or conference proceedings.**

Please do not give permission if you do not feel completely comfortable with this decision. Please also do not give your consent if you are under 18.

Once you have agreed to participate in the study, you will be given an initial survey related to your understanding of mental health, disability, and illness. In your initial survey, I will ask if you would like to be recognized by name in my research, or if you would prefer to remain anonymous. If you would like to

remain anonymous, I will ask you to choose a pseudonym that I can use to refer to you in my analysis. I will ask again at the end of the study if you would like to remain anonymous or be recognized by name, and you may change your original decision. You may choose to not answer a question or to withdraw your consent to participate in the study at any time.

I will be both teaching our English 110 class sessions and observing our discussions, writing, and interactions as data. As a result, I will be observing our interactions online, in person, during conferences, before or after class, and any other events that constitute our working together during English 110. Observations and reflections will be recorded in personal journals and word processing programs. In addition, class sessions will be recorded to ensure true transcription of the conversations being had about writing and mental disability frameworks. I will be intentional about asking you to review details about your discussion contributions and writing.

Because the majority of the data collected for this study will be fulfilled as a requirement of the English 110 course (e.g., writing assignments and essays, free writing exercises, class discussions, student conferences, and so forth) little extra time will be required of you during the 10-week quarter for which you have agreed to participate. However, as previously mentioned, **those of you who are invited to participate as focal students in the study will require an estimated 1–4 hours of your time per quarter. This time will be dedicated to interviews, one-on-one or group meetings with other focal students, and other work such as emailing, reviewing documents, and so forth. Interviews can take place either in person or online depending on what is more accessible and comfortable for you.**

For focal students, I would like to interview you once or twice between January 2023 and March 2023 though this timeline may shift. Those who previously enrolled in the study will be contacted via email during Autumn Quarter 2023 to complete follow-up interviews if that is of interest. Participants will be compensated with gift cards for completing Autumn Quarter interviews. **Interviews will last approximately 30–60 minutes and will take place in the medium of your choosing. Interview questions will focus on your perceptions of and understanding of mental health, disability, and illness and your experience engaging and writing with our course concepts. The interviews are semi-structured, and you are invited to ask questions of me as well. I imagine the interviews as an open conversation. The interviews will be recorded, and these recordings will be transcribed for further analysis. All audio recordings and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after transcription. If you choose to participate anonymously, all of the information that you provide will remain confidential, and I will remove all names from transcripts. This includes all names of individuals, the names of places, and any other additional information closely associated with you. Throughout the study, I may consult you about my interpretations of your words or actions. I will do this in an effort to reach common understanding and represent you as responsibly as I can.**

4. Uses of the Information

The information you provide during this study will be used for research purposes. I will use it for analysis in order to write my doctoral dissertation and possibly other pieces of writing such as academic articles or a book, and I may use this information in presentations at professional conferences. Resulting publications may be publicly available and may contain quotations from your interviews or interactions that we have.

I will make every effort to use your words responsibly. To me, that means interpreting their meaning as accurately as I can and consulting you to reach a common understanding. I want to represent your words and opinions respectfully.

You may choose to be named or remain anonymous at any point in this research process, and you may change your decision later in the research process. If you choose to participate in this study

anonymously, I will make every effort to ensure that you cannot be identified from your words. At the time of written informed consent, I will assign a pseudonym and will link it to transcripts and notes associated with your participation. Your pseudonym will be kept in a separate digital file that contains your name and pseudonym. Recordings, transcripts, and any information you provide will be stored digitally, in a password-protected format to which only I have access. Please note that information sent by email is not completely secure.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, the records of your participation may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk of harm. I will keep records of this research for the length of time required by my institution.

You may ask me at any time to refrain from using a particular quote or other piece of data; please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu to let me know.

5. Rights and Risks of participation

If you choose to participate in this research, I will ask questions on topics that you may find sensitive or personal, such as but not limited to where you have heard discussions of mental health and illness take place, what your relationship is to research and how you feel about it in general, and how you see discussions on mental health and illness fitting into our writing. These topics have the potential to cause emotional discomfort.I will approach these topics with respectful curiosity, and my goal is to understand your views and experiences. I do not intend to cause you personal or professional harm.

As a participant in this study, you have the right to refuse to answer any question, at any time. You may also request that I do not include certain words of yours or certain information about you in my study. You also have the right to withdraw your participation in this research at any time.

In closing…

I invite you to participate in this research as a co-collaborator. As a result, I will always welcome your feedback and opinions on research procedures, including this process of informed consent. Please consider this research an open and ongoing conversation. I truly appreciate your willingness to join me. Thank you.

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu).

Once you have read through the details and asked any questions necessary, please answer the following question and sign below.

Do you agree to participate in this research project as a focal student?

____ Yes. I consent to participate in this research project as a focal student.

____ No. I do not consent to participate in this research project as a focal student.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix VII

Invitation to Participate in a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the Composition Classroom

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu)

1. Research Purpose

This research is the basis of my dissertation in the Department of English at the University of Washington, Seattle, USA. The purpose of this research is to better understand the value of including mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and research frameworks in the composition course. I want to examine the impact such rhetorics and frameworks have on students' writing, research, and critical understanding of mental health and illness. Further, I am curious about how frameworks for thinking critically about mental health, disability, and illness transfer outside of the composition classroom as a result of writing about and with such frameworks. I am also hoping to develop a greater understanding of how writing about and with such frameworks might contribute to student agency and self-advocacy outside of the composition classroom and in everyday discussions about mental health and illness. Ultimately, I aim to understand why and how rhetorics of mental health, disability, and illness should be a concern for composition studies and what makes composition classrooms the best place for this work.

You are invited to participate in this study because you are enrolled in English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing at the University of Washington. Students who choose to participate in this qualitative study will agree to have the work we do together in English 281—in the form of class discussions, in-class and out-of-class writing, and surveys and questionnaires—collected and analyzed. You may be invited to participate as a focal student in which case we will also produce additional data through interviews and other written correspondence. Analysis of all the data collected in this study will be shared with my dissertation committee as well as other professionals interested in rhetorics of mental health and illness, disability studies, and knowledge transfer in the composition classroom.

2. Procedures

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be giving me your permission to include what you say during class discussions, interviews (if applicable), in your in- and out-of-class writing, and during our other interactions related to the study in my writing, including in any resulting scholarly publications or conference proceedings.

Please do not give permission if you do not feel completely comfortable with this decision. Please also do not give your consent if you are under 18.

Once you have agreed to participate in the study, you will be sent an email asking if you would like to be recognized by name in my research, or if you would prefer to remain anonymous. If you would like to remain anonymous, I will ask you to choose a pseudonym that I can use to refer to you in my analysis. I will ask again at the end of the study if you would like to remain anonymous or be recognized by name, and you may change your original decision. You may choose to not answer a question or to withdraw your consent to participate in the study at any time.

I will be both teaching our English 281 class sessions and observing our discussions, writing, and interactions as data. As a result, I will be observing our interactions online, in person, during conferences, before or after class, and any other events that constitute our working together during English 281. Observations and reflections will be recorded in personal journals and word processing programs. In addition, with full class consent, class sessions will be recorded to ensure true transcription of the conversations being had about writing and mental disability frameworks. I will be intentional about asking you to review details about your discussion contributions and writing.

Because the majority of the data collected for this study will be fulfilled as a requirement of the English 281 course (e.g., writing assignments and essays, free writing exercises, class discussions, student conferences, and so forth) little extra time will be required of you during the 10-week quarter for which you have agreed to participate. However, as previously mentioned, those of you who are invited to participate as focal students in the study will require an estimated 1–4 hours of your time per quarter. This time will be dedicated to interviews, one-on-one or group meetings with other focal students, and other work such as emailing, reviewing documents, and so forth. Interviews can take place either in person or online depending on what is more accessible and comfortable for you.

For focal students, I would like to interview you at least twice between March 2023 and June 2023 though this timeline may shift. Interviews will last approximately 30–60 minutes and will take place in the medium of your choosing. Interview questions will focus on your perceptions of and understanding of mental health, disability, and illness and your experience engaging and writing with our course concepts. The interviews are semi-structured, and you are invited to ask questions of me as well. I imagine the interviews as an open conversation. The interviews will be recorded, and these recordings will be transcribed for further analysis. All audio recordings and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after transcription. If you choose to participate anonymously, all of the information that you provide will remain confidential, and I will remove all names from transcripts. This includes all names of individuals, the names of places, and any other additional information closely associated with you. Throughout the study, I may consult you about my interpretations of your words or actions. I will do this in an effort to reach common understanding and represent you as responsibly as I can.

3. Uses of the Information

The information you provide during this study will be used for research purposes. I will use it for analysis in order to write my doctoral dissertation and possibly other pieces of writing such as academic articles or a book, and I may use this information in presentations at professional conferences. Resulting publications may be publicly available and may contain quotations from your interviews or interactions that we have.

I will make every effort to use your words responsibly. To me, that means interpreting their meaning as accurately as I can and consulting you to reach a common understanding. I want to represent your words and opinions respectfully.

You may choose to be named or remain anonymous at any point in this research process, and you may change your decision later in the research process. If you choose to participate in this study anonymously, I will make every effort to ensure that you cannot be identified from your words. At the time of written informed consent, I will assign a pseudonym and will link it to transcripts and notes associated with your participation. Your pseudonym will be kept in a separate digital file that contains your name and pseudonym. Recordings, transcripts, and any information you provide will be stored digitally, in a password-protected format to which only I have access. Please note that information sent by email is not completely secure.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, the records of your participation may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk of harm. I will keep records of this research for the length of time required by my institution.

You may ask me at any time to refrain from using a particular quote or other piece of data; please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu to let me know.

4. Rights and Risks of participation

If you choose to participate in this research, I will ask questions on topics that you may find sensitive or personal, such as but not limited to where you have heard discussions of mental health and illness take

place, what your relationship is to research and how you feel about it in general, and how you see discussions on mental health and illness fitting into our writing. These topics have the potential to cause emotional discomfort. I will approach these topics with respectful curiosity, and my goal is to understand your views and experiences. I do not intend to cause you personal or professional harm.

As a participant in this study, you have the right to refuse to answer any question at any time. You may also request that I do not include certain words of yours or certain information about you in my study. You also have the right to withdraw your participation in this research at any time.

In closing…

I invite you to participate in this research as a co-collaborator. As a result, I will always welcome your feedback and opinions on research procedures, including this process of informed consent. Please consider this research an open and ongoing conversation. I truly appreciate your willingness to join me. Thank you.

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu).

Once you have read through the details and asked any questions necessary, please respond below.

If you would like to participate in this research study, please complete the following:

____ Yes. I consent to participate in this research project.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix VIII

Invitation to Participate as a Focal Student in a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the Composition Classroom

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu)

1. Summary

If you have been given this document, you are already participating as a co-collaborator alongside your peers in a study on the uses of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in the composition classroom. The following information is consistent with the initial consent form you signed when you agreed to participate as a co-collaborator on this research with the exception of emphasis added to information relevant specifically to focal student participants. All other information regarding the research purpose, procedures, use of information, and rights and risks of participation are consistent with your participation as a general co-collaborator. Please review the information below carefully before determining whether you would like to participate in this study as a focal student.

2. Research Purpose

This research is the basis of my dissertation in the Department of English at the University of Washington, Seattle, USA. The purpose of this research is to better understand the value of including mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and research frameworks in the composition course. I want to examine the impact such rhetorics and frameworks have on students' writing, research, and critical understanding of mental health and illness. Further, I am curious about how frameworks for thinking critically about mental health, disability, and illness transfer outside of the composition classroom as a result of writing about and with such frameworks. I am also hoping to develop a greater understanding of how writing about and with such frameworks might contribute to student agency and self-advocacy outside of the composition classroom and in everyday discussions about mental health and illness. Ultimately, I aim to understand why and how rhetorics of mental health, disability, and illness should be a concern for composition studies and what makes composition classrooms the best place for this work.

You are invited to participate in this study because you are enrolled in English 281: Intermediate Expository Writing at the University of Washington. Students who choose to participate in this qualitative study will agree to have the work we do together in English 281—in the form of class discussions, in-class and out-of-class writing, and surveys and questionnaires—collected and analyzed. **You may be invited to participate as a focal student in which case we will also produce additional data through interviews and other written correspondence**. Analysis of all the data collected in this study will be shared with my dissertation committee as well as other professionals interested in rhetorics of mental health and illness, disability studies, and knowledge transfer in the composition classroom.

3. Procedures

If you choose to participate in this study, **you will be giving me your permission to include what you say during class discussions, interviews (if applicable), in your in- and out-of-class writing, and during our other interactions related to the study in my writing, including in any resulting scholarly publications or conference proceedings.**

Please do not give permission if you do not feel completely comfortable with this decision. Please also do not give your consent if you are under 18.

Once you have agreed to participate in the study, you will be sent an email asking if you would like to be recognized by name in my research, or if you would prefer to remain anonymous. If you would like to remain anonymous, I will ask you to choose a pseudonym that I can use to refer to you in my analysis. I will ask again at the end of the study if you would like to remain anonymous or be recognized by name,

and you may change your original decision. You may choose to not answer a question or to withdraw your consent to participate in the study at any time.

I will be both teaching our English 281 class sessions and observing our discussions, writing, and interactions as data. As a result, I will be observing our interactions online, in person, during conferences, before or after class, and any other events that constitute our working together during English 281. Observations and reflections will be recorded in personal journals and word processing programs. In addition, class sessions will be recorded to ensure true transcription of the conversations being had about writing and mental disability frameworks. I will be intentional about asking you to review details about your discussion contributions and writing.

Because the majority of the data collected for this study will be fulfilled as a requirement of the English 281 course (e.g., writing assignments and essays, free writing exercises, class discussions, student conferences, and so forth) little extra time will be required of you during the 10-week quarter for which you have agreed to participate. However, as previously mentioned, **those of you who are invited to participate as focal students in the study will require an estimated 1–4 hours of your time per quarter. This time will be dedicated to interviews, one-on-one or group meetings with other focal students, and other work such as emailing, reviewing documents, and so forth. Interviews can take place either in person or online depending on what is more accessible and comfortable for you.**

For focal students, I would like to interview you once or twice between March 2023 and June 2023 though this timeline may shift. Interviews will last approximately 30–60 minutes and will take place in the medium of your choosing. Interview questions will focus on your perceptions of and understanding of mental health, disability, and illness and your experience engaging and writing with our course concepts. The interviews are semi-structured, and you are invited to ask questions of me as well. I imagine the interviews as an open conversation. The interviews will be recorded, and these recordings will be transcribed for further analysis. All audio recordings and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after transcription. If you choose to participate anonymously, all of the information that you provide will remain confidential, and I will remove all names from transcripts. This includes all names of individuals, the names of places, and any other additional information closely associated with you. Throughout the study, I may consult you about my interpretations of your words or actions. I will do this in an effort to reach common understanding and represent you as responsibly as I can.

4. Uses of the Information

The information you provide during this study will be used for research purposes. I will use it for analysis in order to write my doctoral dissertation and possibly other pieces of writing such as academic articles or a book, and I may use this information in presentations at professional conferences. Resulting publications may be publicly available and may contain quotations from your interviews or interactions that we have.

I will make every effort to use your words responsibly. To me, that means interpreting their meaning as accurately as I can and consulting you to reach a common understanding. I want to represent your words and opinions respectfully.

You may choose to be named or remain anonymous at any point in this research process, and you may change your decision later in the research process. If you choose to participate in this study anonymously, I will make every effort to ensure that you cannot be identified from your words. At the time of written informed consent, I will assign a pseudonym and will link it to transcripts and notes associated with your participation. Your pseudonym will be kept in a separate digital file that contains your name and pseudonym. Recordings, transcripts, and any information you provide will be stored digitally, in a

password-protected format to which only I have access. Please note that information sent by email is not completely secure.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, the records of your participation may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk of harm. I will keep records of this research for the length of time required by my institution.

You may ask me at any time to refrain from using a particular quote or other piece of data; please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu to let me know.

5. Rights and Risks of participation

If you choose to participate in this research, I will ask questions on topics that you may find sensitive or personal, such as but not limited to where you have heard discussions of mental health and illness take place, what your relationship is to research and how you feel about it in general, and how you see discussions on mental health and illness fitting into our writing. These topics have the potential to cause emotional discomfort. I will approach these topics with respectful curiosity, and my goal is to understand your views and experiences. I do not intend to cause you personal or professional harm.

As a participant in this study, you have the right to refuse to answer any question, at any time. You may also request that I do not include certain words of yours or certain information about you in my study. You also have the right to withdraw your participation in this research at any time.

In closing…

I invite you to participate in this research as a co-collaborator. As a result, I will always welcome your feedback and opinions on research procedures, including this process of informed consent. Please consider this research an open and ongoing conversation. I truly appreciate your willingness to join me. Thank you.

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu).

Once you have read through the details and asked any questions necessary, please respond below.

If you would like to participate in this research study as a focal participant, please complete the following:

____ Yes. I consent to participate in this research project as a focal student.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix IX

Permission to Audio Record Class Sessions for a Study on the Uses of Mental Health, Disability, and Illness Rhetorics in the Composition Classroom

Please direct any questions to Hunter Little (at hclittle@uw.edu)

As stated earlier, I need full-class permission to audio record some of our class sessions for my study on the uses of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics and literacy in the first-year composition classroom.

The purpose of recording our class sessions is to ensure true transcription of research participants' comments and to get a general sense of the class conversation. Other students' comments will not be transcribed and will not be stored.

The information research participants (i.e., those who signed the consent form to participate in the study as co-collaborators) share during class sessions will be used for research purposes. I will use it for analysis in order to write my doctoral dissertation and possibly other pieces of writing such as academic articles or a book, and I may use this information in presentations at professional conferences. Resulting publications may be publicly available and may contain quotations from your interviews or interactions that we have.

Participants should see their signed consent form for more information on the use of their recorded and transcribed information.

Below please indicate whether or not you grant me, Hunter Little, permission to audio record our class sessions:

- Yes. I grant Hunter Little permission to audio record our English 281 class sessions for her study on mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in the first-year composition classroom.
- No. I do not grant Hunter Little permission to audio record our English 281 class sessions for her study on mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in the first-year composition classroom.

Appendix X

English 110 Interview Questions

1. Please include your name and a short explanation of how you would identify yourself.
2. What interested you about being a focal student in this study?
3. What were your initial thoughts when you heard we would be discussing mental disability in our English 110 course?
4. What was your experience like engaging with the content of the course readings? What feelings or thoughts did you experience when reading or during our discussions?
5. Have you learned anything new about mental health, illness, and disability since entering our course? If so, what did you learn that felt most influential to you?
6. Of the things you have learned, how likely do you think you are to carry that information into other contexts such as conversations with friends or family members? In what situations might you feel compelled to carry that information?
7. Did you learn anything valuable about research from our course readings on disability? If so, what did you learn?

Appendix XI

English 281 Interview Questions

1. How would you describe your relationship with or to disability broadly and mental disability specifically?
2. How do you think your perception of mental disability has changed or stayed the same since the beginning of the term?
3. Where and when has knowledge from our course and course readings been useful for you throughout the term? What information has been useful to you? (i.e., from which readings, discussions, interactions, etc.) When and where did you find opportunities to expand your engagement with the course content? (certain genres, modalities, etc.). What made that possible?
4. Did any particular class session feel most or least impactful for you in terms of discussion of readings or concepts?
5. Which pieces of knowledge from our course and course readings do you think you are most likely to carry forward?
6. What new terminology have you adopted?
7. Where might you use that terminology in the future?
8. Within which assignments did this information and terminology feel most useful to you?
9. Have you talked about any of the readings or ideas/concepts outside of class? If so, what prompted those conversations.
10. Thinking ahead, when do you think what you have learned about mental disability will be useful for you?
11. What generic occasions might you imagine for communicating this information? What new generic possibilities do you see for sharing information about mental disability?
12. How has the way you have learned to think about disability affected your writing?

Please include a non-UW-affiliated email address at which I can reach you with study updates in the case that you are no longer a UW student.

Please indicate whether or not you would be willing to complete a second interview later in the term.

Appendix XII

English 110 Initial Survey

Initial Survey: Prior Understandings and Interactions with Mental Health, Illness, and Disability

The purpose of this survey is to compile information about your prior understandings of and interactions with discussions related to mental health, illness, and disability. It is important to remember that you are not required to respond to questions that are distressing, triggering, or that otherwise make you uncomfortable.

If you run out of space, feel free to use a separate piece of paper.

Name: _____

1. How would you define *mental health*?
2. How would you define *mental illness* or *mental disability*?
3. What situations, conversations, media (e.g., shows, music, books), experiences, and so forth have informed your stated definitions / understandings of mental health, illness, or disability? And in what way?
4. In your opinion, in what ways is mental health, illness, and disability related to writing and research?
5. In what locations or contexts have you participated in discussions of or heard others having discussions related to mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.
    a. Home
    b. School / university
    c. In the classroom
    d. Work / place of employment
    e. Social media
    f. Email correspondence
    g. Between friends
    h. Between family members
    i. With primary care providers
    j. Other
        i. Indicate “Other”: _____
6. In what locations of contexts do you think it is <u>appropriate</u> to discuss mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.
    a. Home

   b. School / university
   c. In the classroom
   d. Work / place of employment
   e. Social media
   f. Email correspondence
   g. Between friends
   h. Between family members
   i. With primary care providers
   j. Other
      i. Indicate “Other”: _____

7. In what locations or contexts do you think it is <u>inappropriate</u> to discuss mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.
   a. Home
   b. School / university
   c. In the classroom
   d. Work / place of employment
   e. Social media
   f. Email correspondence
   g. Between friends
   h. Between family members
   i. With primary care providers
   j. Other
      i. Indicate “Other”: _____

8. What is your general attitude toward or perception of discussions of mental health, illness, and disability within classrooms or within the University as a whole? Explain.

9. What is your general attitude toward or perception of discussion of mental health and illness in your own writing or the writing of your peers within a college writing assignment? Explain.

10. On a scale of 1–5, to what degree do you think mental illness is stigmatized within the University?
    a. 1 = not stigmatized at all
    b. 2 = slightly stigmatized
    c. 3 = moderately stigmatized
    d. 4 = widely stigmatized

    e. 5 = universally stigmatized

11. To what degree do you feel equipped to respond to other's stigmatizing comments or views about mental health and illness?

    a. 1 = not at all equipped

    b. 2 = somewhat equipped

    c. 3 = moderately equipped

    d. 4 = very equipped

    e. 5 = totally or fully equipped

12. In the event that you or a friend needed to seek out services related to mental illness or disability, where would you go or who would you seek information from? Explain why.

13. What questions do you have about mental health, illness, or disability?

Appendix XIII

English 110 Closing Survey (Google Forms)

Closing Survey: Current Understandings

The purpose of this survey is to compile information about your understanding of and interactions with discussions related to mental health and illness as you leave our course, English 110, after engaging with readings related to mental disability. It is important to remember that you are not required to respond to questions that are distressing, triggering, or that otherwise make you uncomfortable.

* Indicates required question

1. How would you define *mental health*?

2. Please include your name *

3. How would you define *mental illness* or *mental disability*?

4. Which reading(s) from our course informed your current understanding of (mental) disability the most? In what way?

5. Which reading(s) from our course informed any one decision you made in your own research? What was the decision?

6. What situations, conversations, media (e.g., shows, music, books), experiences, and so forth have informed your stated definitions / understandings of mental health and illness? This can include but is not limited to conversations and media related to our class.

7. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations or contexts have you participated in discussions of or heard others having discussions related to mental health and illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] In the classroom
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

8. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations of contexts do you think it is appropriate to discuss mental health and/or illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

9. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations of contexts do you think it is inappropriate to discuss mental health and/or illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

10. Leaving this course, what is your general attitude toward or perception of discussions of mental health and illness within classrooms or within the University as a whole?

11. Leaving this course, what is your general attitude toward or perception of discussion of mental health and illness in your own writing or the writing of your peers within a college writing assignment?

12. To what degree do you think mental illness is stigmatized within the University? For something to be stigmatized is for it to have unfairly negative beliefs or attitudes placed upon it.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Highly stigmatized

13. Leaving this course, to what degree do you feel equipped to respond to other's stigmatizing comments or views about mental health and illness?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Totally or fully equipped

14. In the event that you or a friend needed to seek out services related to mental illness or disability, where would you go or who would you seek information from?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Option 1

15. What would you still like to learn about mental health, illness, or disability?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix XIV

English 281 Initial Survey (Google Forms)

Initial Survey: Prior Understandings and Interactions with Mental Health, Illness, and Disability

The purpose of this survey is to compile information about your prior understandings of and interactions with discussions related to mental health, illness, and disability. It is important to remember that you are not required to respond to questions that are distressing, triggering, or that otherwise make you uncomfortable.

1. How would you define *mental health*?

2. How would you define *mental illness* or *mental disability*?

3. What situations, conversations, media (e.g., shows, music, books), experiences, and so forth have informed your stated definitions / understandings of mental health, illness, or disability? And in what way?

4. In your opinion, in what ways is mental health, illness, and disability related to writing and research?

5. In what locations or contexts have you participated in discussions of or heard others having discussions related to mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] In the classroom
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

6. In what locations of contexts do you think it is appropriate to discuss mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

7. In what locations or contexts do you think it is inappropriate to discuss mental health, illness, or disability? Circle all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

8. What is your general attitude toward or perception of discussions of mental health, illness, and disability within classrooms or within the University as a whole? Explain.

9. What is your general attitude toward or perception of discussion of mental health and illness in your own writing or the writing of your peers within a college writing assignment? Explain.

10. To what degree do you think mental illness is stigmatized within the University? For something to be stigmatized is for it to have unfairly negative beliefs or attitudes placed upon it.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Highly stigmatized

11. To what degree do you feel equipped to respond to other's stigmatizing comments or views about mental health and illness?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Totally or fully equipped

12. In the event that you or a friend needed to seek out services related to mental illness or disability, where would you go or who would you seek information from?

13. What would you still like to learn about mental health, illness, or disability?

14. What questions do you have about mental health, illness, or disability?

Appendix XV

English 281 Closing Survey (Google Forms)

Closing Survey: Current Understandings

The purpose of this survey is to compile information about your understanding of and interactions with discussions related to mental disability as you leave our course, English 281, after engaging with readings related to mental disability. It is important to remember that you are not required to respond to questions that are distressing, triggering, or that otherwise make you uncomfortable.

* Indicates required question

1. Please include your name *

2. How would you define *mental health*?

3. How would you define *mental illness* or *mental disability*?

4. Which reading(s) from our course informed your current understanding of (mental) disability the most? In what way?

5. Which reading(s) from our course informed any one decision you made in your own research? What was the decision?

6. What situations, conversations, media (e.g., shows, music, books), experiences, and so forth have informed your stated definitions / understandings of mental health and illness? This can include but is not limited to conversations and media related to our class.

7. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations or contexts have you participated in discussions of or heard others having discussions related to mental health and illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] In the classroom
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

8. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations of contexts do you think it is appropriate to discuss mental health and/or illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

9. Now that you have engaged with frameworks of mental health, disability, and illness rhetorics in our classroom, in what locations of contexts do you think it is inappropriate to discuss mental health and/or illness? Check all that apply.

Check all that apply.

- [ ] Home
- [ ] School/university
- [ ] Work/place of employment
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Email correspondence
- [ ] With friends
- [ ] With family members
- [ ] With primary care providers
- [ ] Other: _____

10. Leaving this course, what is your general attitude toward or perception of discussions of mental health and illness within classrooms or within the University as a whole?

11. Leaving this course, what is your general attitude toward or perception of discussion of mental health and illness in your own writing or the writing of your peers within a college writing assignment?

12. To what degree do you think mental illness is stigmatized within the University? For something to be stigmatized is for it to have unfairly negative beliefs or attitudes placed upon it.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Highly stigmatized

13. Leaving this course, to what degree do you feel equipped to respond to other's stigmatizing comments or views about mental health and illness?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Totally or fully equipped

14. In the event that you or a friend needed to seek out services related to mental illness or disability, where would you go or who would you seek information from?

15. What would you still like to learn about mental health, illness, or disability?

Appendix XVI

English 110 Syllabus

English 110 B: Critical Composition II

Research Methods, Methodologies, and Process

Winter 2023

General Course Information

Course Title
Critical Composition II: Research

Credits
5

GE Requirements
Composition (C)

Course Location
Savery Hall, Room 140

Meeting Days & Times
MTWTH 10:30–11:20 AM

Required Texts & Materials

- your UW email account
- a notebook (physical or digital) designated for English 110
- something to write with
- a laptop to access course materials
- all course texts will be provided on your Canvas site

Instructor Name & Email
Hunter C. Little
Pronouns: she/her
hclittle@uw.edu

Instructor Office
Padelford B-5-A
B-Wing, Plaza Level (PL)

Instructor Office Hours
Monday 1:00–2:00 PM
Tuesday 1:00–2:00 PM

Office hours can take place via Zoom or in person.

Course Calendar
To view our English 110 course calendar, click here

Course Reading & Listening List

This list of readings for Winter term is tentative which means it is subject to change. Keep your eyes on the course modules and calendar for more information on when and what to read.

- Wong, A. (Host). (2019, March 10). Disability studies (No. 46) [Audio podcast episode]. In *Disability Visibility Project*. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2019/03/10/ep-46-disability-studies/ (with Drs. Sami Schalk and Subini Annamma; 6 pg or 31 min)
- Wong, A. (Host). (2018, September 24). Intersectionality (No. 34). [Audio podcast episode]. In *Disability Visibility Project*. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2018/09/24/ep-34-intersectionality/ (with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite; 6.5 pg or 34 min)
- Bailey, M., and Mobley, I. A. (2019). Work in the intersections: A Black feminist disability framework. *Gender & Society*, *33*(1), 19–40. DOI: 10.1177/0891243218801523 (17 pg)
- Price, M. (2015). The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain. *Hypatia, 30*(1). (13 pg)
- Wong, A. (Host). (2019, December 1). Black mental health. (No. 65). [Audio podcast episode]. In *Disability Visibility Project*. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2019/12/01/ep-65-black-mental-health/ (with Imade Nibokun; 8–9 pages or 31 min)
- Pryal, K. R. G. (2021). *Life of the mind interrupted: Essays on mental health and disability in higher education*. Blue Crow Books. (excerpts)
- Yergeau, M. R. (2013). Clinically significant disturbance: On theorists who theorize theory of mind. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *33*(4). (approx. 10 pg)
- Ahmed, S. (2013, Sept. 11). Making feminist points. *feministkilljoys.* (4 pg)
- Walters, S. (2018). A different kind of wholeness: Disability dis-closure and ruptured rhetorics of multimodal collaboration and revision in *The Ride Together*. *Composition Forum*, 39. (5 pg)
- Other readings include but are not limited to models and samples for your writing assignments, your peers' work during peer review and on discussion posts, and my comments on your papers.

Course Description

Catalog Description

Approaches writing as social action and language as tied to identity, culture, and power. Centers students' diverse language resources and discourse traditions. Builds rhetorical capacities for composing ethically, critically, and impactfully across different contexts, audiences, genres, and goals within the university and beyond. **Emphasizes research.** English composition awarded if credit received for both ENGL 109 and ENGL 110. Prerequisite: ENGL 109. Offered: AWSp.

Our Course Description

In English 110 you will delve deeply into a sustained research process and learn to grapple with the knowledge you gain throughout that process. English 109 was your opportunity to obtain the skills and resources you needed to lay the groundwork of the research process you will conduct in English 110. This research process will include revisiting a lot of the ideas and concepts we covered in English 109 such as citational politics, positionality, genre awareness, and much more.

Because “Rhetoric and composition are social and political” (Cedillo 2018, “What does it mean to move?) this course requires thinking critically about research and the academy and takes as its theme *mental disability rhetorics and literacy*. By “literacy” I mean gaining knowledge or competence in a particular topic or area of study. This means you will not only learn research skills but also learn what it means to be disabled (physically, mentally, and psychiatrically) within the community you have signed up to be a part of for four years.

As you begin the course, you will learn more about this rhetorical choice: the course theme. For now, you only need to be aware that it will be a theme that both improves your relationship with others and makes you grossly aware of how the academy reinforces injustices toward those who are “Othered.” It also allows you to engage more deeply with the concepts of genre, audience, and research which includes developing research questions, identifying a need and audience, making rhetorical choices related to genre, proposing your research to other audiences, working collaboratively, developing citation criticality and gaining citation skills, analyzing and synthesizing sources, and presenting your research to publics as part of the circulation of information.

In this course, we will engage questions such as “whose experiences are the basis for deciding what is good or effective? Do they belong to someone with a learning disability or whose first language is not English, or do we still target the whitestream and make inclusivity a retrofit? What very real people do we imagine as we compose lest our

audience remain always and ever a fiction?" (Cedillo 2018) and more in order to develop research that is engaged ethically and thoughtfully.

My hope for this course is three-fold:

1. I hope that you *do* develop the aforementioned research skills in order to produce both a research paper and poster that you are proud of as well as skills that you will carry into the future be it in other courses or in your daily life,
2. that you become literate in mental disability rhetorics and come to recognize how literacy is developed generally so that you can apply these skills to other topics as you move through the academy,
3. and that you gain confidence in your writing, hope for your academic and non-academic futures, and an awareness of how you are situated within your formal and informal writing because, as Cedillo reminds us, "The 'I' matters because *I* matter, because every person's engagement with the world occurs through bodily means, as does communication of our experiences."

I commit myself to continually supporting you by being available in and outside of class for questions and concerns and being open-minded as we talk about challenging topics and share different perspectives.

Welcome to English 110. I'm looking forward to co-learning with you.

The Syllabus

It is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with the full contents of the syllabus below as well as the assessment agreement. Though some aspects of the syllabus and assessment agreement will be reviewed collaboratively during the first week of the course, others will be left for you to view on your own. Please be sure to do this early in the quarter.

Course Assignments

- **Peer Reviews**: You will participate in four (4) peer review sessions this term. The tentative dates for those sessions are 1/30, 2/7, 2/21, and 2/27. Mark your calendars for these dates. For peer review, you only need to submit a paper draft. Once work is reviewed, you have the option to revise and resubmit.
- **Weekly assignments**: These assignments will target one or more of the course outcomes at a time, help you practice these outcomes, and allow you to build

toward the research paper and poster at the end of the quarter. The length of writings for these assignments are normally 1 to 4 pages.

- **Daily assignments**: These include readings, reading responses, discussion posts, group work, classroom activities, note taking, and other minor homework assignments. Keep your eyes on the course modules for more on daily assignments.
- **Conferences**: You will attend two face-to-face conferences during which you will have the opportunity to discuss your progress in the class individually with me.
- **Final Poster, Revision, and Reflection**: For your final assignment, you will produce and present a research poster on the topic you have researched throughout the quarter. Then, you will revise your research project according to feedback from peers and me. Finally, you will submit a 500+ words reflection of your experience in English 110, what you learned, your research process, etc

Again, the list of daily assignments is not exhaustive. Make sure you are keeping up with the course modules and attending class for daily assignment information.

Final Project (60% of Final Grade)

This class will end with a small research conference/symposium for you to display and share your work with your peers and UW community. The poster will be conceptualized and designed by you to present the research work you did during the quarter. Following our Research Project Peer Review and the Poster Symposium Presentation, you will make necessary revisions to your Research Project and develop a Critical Reflection in which you reflect on your experiences in the course, writing and reading about research, and presenting a poster. Further details are provided in the prompts on Canvas.

Participation (40% of Final Grade)

This is not a class that will depend on lecture for learning. Please be prepared to be awake and involved in class. Your participation grade is dependent on attendance, completion and submission of weekly and daily assignments, participation in class discussions—including note taking, in-class writing and group activities, submission of the research journal, peer review sessions, and conferences. Participation scores can be enhanced by attending optional class sessions (if they occur), attending office hours or additional conferences, and completing additional peer reviews outside of class time. Multiple and continuous class disruptions can interfere with your participation score as well.

Attendance Policy

Your regular attendance in English 110 is required to fulfill the participation portion of the course, as participating in class discussions matters for your own and your peers' learning. Thus, this involves both physical and intellectual presence in the classroom.

Please come to class regularly and try your best to be present in class while you are there. Try your best not to be late to our class sessions. Being late (10+ minutes) more than 3 times (or equivalent) will count toward an absence. Please communicate with me about your absences so that we can work together to ensure you have the information and resources you need to be successful in this course. Communication about absences does not require disclosure of the purpose for your absence.

It is your responsibility to contact me or your classmates with questions about missed work or classes. If you miss class on a day that written work is due, you are still expected to turn your work in on time according to the late work policy. Some in-class work cannot be made up. Please try your best not to schedule any appointments during class time unless absolutely necessary.

Each of you is granted four (4) excused absences before your participation grade becomes affected.

If attendance or participation becomes a concern at any point throughout the quarter, you may contact me via email to address the issue.

Late Work Policy

All deadlines in this course are "rolling."

This means you are given a three-day window to submit your assignment if you would like to receive feedback. For example, if the deadline is Friday and you submit on Tuesday, you will not receive feedback unless you communicate with me. If you submit your work after the third day and would still like feedback, it is your responsibility to contact me to schedule a time to discuss or provide feedback on your assignment.

If you need more time to complete an assignment, please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu or via your Canvas Inbox feature before the deadline. Please reach out if you are struggling to keep up with the fast pace of the class. I'm always happy to accommodate the students in my class!

All late daily and weekly assignments can be submitted any time before March 3, 2023.

Email Policy

I am unable to accept or respond to emails from email addresses that are not UW affiliated. Thus, make sure you email me directly from your UW email address or the Canvas Inbox feature. I will respond to emails as quickly as I possibly can. Please make sure you fill out the subject line of your email.

*All emails about grades should be sent using the Canvas Inbox feature.

Technology Policy

There is no strict cell phone or technology policy for this section of English 110. Much of our work in and outside of class will be completed on laptops or mobile devices and submitted online. Though we will use technology often in class, out of respect for yourself, your education, your classmates, and me, I expect you will refrain from using your electronic devices for anything other than our coursework. This mutual respect is imperative for our class as a whole to operate successfully. If your use of technology for purposes other than our class work becomes disruptive, your participation grade can be affected.

If you do not have access to a laptop on which you can complete said work, please contact me ASAP at hclittle@uw.edu so that we can make accommodations for you.

Language and Cultural Difference

Christina V. Cedillo states that “Academia tends to show little appreciation for the personal and homegrown communication skills that allow marginalized people to adapt to the material conditions affecting our everyday lives, focusing only on notions of deficit and asking that we leave our identities at the door.”

The ability to communicate in multiple languages, including different varieties of English, is a valuable skill, and you are encouraged to use these linguistic and cultural resources. In any case, the same rhetorical principles apply; consider audience, purpose, and appeals. Consider who you are writing for, why, and in what genre.

COVID-19 and Illness

To protect their fellow classmates, faculty, and staff, students who feel ill or exhibit possible COVID-19 symptoms should not come to class. Email me if you anticipate you will miss class so that we can ensure you are provided the materials you need to be successful.

Although the University has lifted the indoor mask mandate as of March 2022 and the choice to wear or not wear a mask is left to the individual, in the event that you feel ill, I

strongly advise staying home or wearing your mask in order to protect your fellow classmates.

Absences related to COVID-19 will be treated as all other absences.

Intellectual Property

Intellectual property is a central concern of writing, and we will spend a lot of time working on appropriate methods for integrating others' ideas within your own writing. At no point should you present others' words or ideas as your own—that's plagiarism, and it's poor form ethically and academically. If you have questions (and you should!), please ask. On a first plagiarism offense, you will be required to attend a mandatory conference with me, then revise and resubmit the work in question, along with a brief report on the changes and their effects, by an agreed-upon deadline. On a second offense, I will have to report it to the College of Arts and Sciences for review.

English Department Statement of Commitment

We at the English department are committed to valuing the lived experiences, embodied knowledges, and scholarship produced by people of color and Indigenous peoples; queer, trans, and disabled people; immigrants and refugees, and other targeted identities who have historically been excluded from sites of knowledge production; denied access to wealth, resources and power; and forced to negotiate multiple interlocking forms of structural and institutional oppression and violence. This commitment emerges from and reflects our shared vision for a just and equitable world that actively affirms and values the humanity of every individual and group. It is this vision that informs our pedagogical practices.

Code of Conduct

We at the English department have a zero-tolerance rule for hate speech. According to the American Bar Association, hate speech is "any speech that offends, threatens, or insults groups, based on race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or other traits." While this could and does apply to many groups, one of the tenants of this course is that hate speech is a violence, and that these violences do not impact everyone equally. Rather, the force of their impacts is dependent on systems of power. Marginalized communities and people are vulnerable to and impacted by such speech in ways that groups or individuals in power are not. With this in mind, I will specify that I interpret "hate speech" to be any forms of speech that targets already vulnerable people/communities. Racism and xenophobia will not be tolerated in this course, nor will transphobia, homophobia, ableism, classism, or other statements or practices that uphold white supremacy.

Resources for Academic Stress, Counseling, Sexual Trauma, Suicide Prevention, Mental Health Info, Substance Abuse, etc.

*Note: This is not an exhaustive list. In other words, there are many more resources online and within our community that you are able to access. It is my goal to provide my students with some options for seeking help that I am familiar with so you may feel more comfortable doing so.

UW Resources

UW Counseling Center
UW Mental Health Resources
Student Coaching & Care | LiveWell
UW Provided Off-Campus Resources
UW Sexual Assault Resources
UW Student Resources | Community Standards and Student Conduct
Other Resources for Students
UW Resilience Lab
Any Hungry Husky (UW Food Bank)
Husky Health & Well-Being
UW Recreation

Non-University Resources

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute
A Positive Alternative Alcohol and Substance Abuse treatment center
Integrative Counseling Services
Lodestar Therapy
Cardona Counseling
Suicide Prevention Lifeline
National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI)
TalkSpace Mental Health Resource List (PDF)
MentalHealth.Gov
National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
Mental Health Treatment Plans: Templates, Goals, and Objectives
Mental Health America
Mental Health Resources (Mental Health First Aid)
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
Teen Mental Health
Youth.Gov resources list
World Health Organization | Mental Health

Resources for Time Management

UW Academic Support Programs
Time Management Tips
Creating a Weekly Schedule

Q Center

The University of Washington Q Center builds and facilitates queer (gay, lesbian, bisexual, two-spirit, trans, intersex, questioning, same-gender-loving, allies) academic and social community through education, advocacy, and support services to achieve a socially-just campus in which all people are valued. For more information, visit http://depts.washington.edu/qcenter/

Other Important and Useful Resources

Campus Safety

Preventing violence is everyone's responsibility. If you're concerned, tell someone.

- Always call 911 if you or others may be in danger.
- Call 206-685-SAFE (7233) to report non-urgent threats of violence and for referrals to UW counseling and/or safety resources. TTY or VP callers, please call through your preferred relay service.
- Don't walk alone. Campus safety guards can walk with you on campus after dark. Call Husky NightWalk 206-685-WALK (9255).
- Stay connected in an emergency with UW Alert. Register your mobile number to receive instant notification of campus emergencies via text and voice messaging. Sign up online at www.washington.edu/alert.
- For more information visit the SafeCampus website at www.washington.edu/safecampus.

Writing Resources

UW Writing Resources

The Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC) offers 45-minute appointments on any writing assignment ranging from an academic essay to personal statements. You can also schedule an appointment with the above link.

The Center for Learning and Undergraduate Enrichment's Writing Center (CLUE) has writing tutors available from 7 p.m. to 11 p.m. on school nights! They can help with every stage of the writing process to brainstorming to polishing the final draft!

Instructional Center

Staffed by 17 professional instructors and over 100 peer tutors, the Instructional Center provides tutoring and study groups for students in almost every discipline or major.

English 109/110 instructors can require visits to the IC for all students; additional visits may be recommended for individual students who need extra help. Student visits are tracked via computer at the IC, but TAs may also have students fill out and return more specific tutoring forms. In addition to tutoring, special services offered at the IC include: a computer lab, Study Skills Sessions and Assessments, Critical Reading Courses, and various types of Learning Assessments. IC Hours are generally M - F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm. They are working to increase evening and add weekend hours. Check with the IC for up-to-date information: http://depts.washington.edu/ic/

UW Policies

Title IX

The University of Washington carries out the objectives of Title IX through a coordinated system of initiatives, programs, and services that collectively protect educational access, advance gender equity, and prevent and respond to sexual harassment, sexual violence, and gender discrimination. Title IX applies to and protects students, staff, faculty, other academic personnel and visitors at the Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses as well as other sites and programs affiliated with the University.

Title IX, Washington State law, and University of Washington policy prohibit discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, pregnant or parenting status, and LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) identity.

Relevant and Related UW Policies here

Many University policies prohibit and/or outline processes to address sexual misconduct, including sex discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, intimate partner violence, and other sexual misconduct.

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism, or academic dishonesty, is presenting someone else's ideas or writing as your own. In your writing for this class, you are encouraged to refer to other people's thoughts and writing--as long as you cite them. As a matter of policy, any student found to have plagiarized any piece of writing in this class will be immediately reported to the College of Arts and Sciences for review.

Religious Accommodations

Washington state law requires that UW develop a policy for accommodation of student absences or significant hardship due to reasons of faith or conscience, or for organized religious activities. The UW's policy, including more information about how to request an accommodation, is available at Faculty Syllabus Guidelines and Resources. Accommodations must be requested within the first two weeks of this course using the

Religious Accommodations Request form available at https://registrar.washington.edu/students/religious-accommodations-request/

Complaints

If you have any concerns about the course or your instructor, please see the instructor about these concerns as soon as possible. If you are not comfortable talking with the instructor or not satisfied with the response that you receive, you may contact the following Expository Writing Program staff in Padelford A-11: Director Stephanie Kerschbaum, kersch@uw.edu or Assistant Directors Anselma Prihandita, anselmap@uw.edu; Francesca Colonnese, fcolonne@uw.edu; Missy González-Garduño, mimgonz@uw.edu; and Joseph Wilson, jwils@uw.edu. If, after speaking with the Director or Assistant Directors of the EWP, you are still not satisfied with the response you receive, you may contact English Department Chair Anis Bawarshi at bawarshi@uw.edu, (206) 543-2690.

Accommodations

If you need accommodation of any sort, please let me know so that I can work with the UW Disability Resources for Students Office (DRS) to provide what you require. More information about accommodation may be found at http://www.washington.edu/students/drs/.

UW Grading Policy

A 4.0–3.9	B- 2.8–2.5	D+ 1.4–1.2
A- 3.8–3.5	C+ 2.4–2.2	D 1.1–0.9
B+ 3.4–3.2	C 2.1–1.9	D- 0.8–0.7
B 3.1–2.9	C- 1.8–1.5	E 0.0

Appendix XVII

English 110 Course Calendar

Week	Date	In Class	Weekly Assignments Due
Week 1	January 3	Individual introductions and introductory surveys; group teach/recap groups determined	(1) introductory survey, (2) initial survey, (3) audio recording consent form, and (4) discussion post in response to Wong's *Disability Visibility* podcast Ep. 46 with Sami Schalk & Subini Annamma and Ep. 34 with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite by 11:59 PM on 01/04
	January 4	Course introduction and syllabus review quiz	
	January 5	Read or Listen to Alice Wong's *Disability Visibility* podcast Ep. 46 **and** Ep. 34 and submit your discussion post (GDP). In class: Research study introduction, discussion, consent forms, and initial survey	
Week 2	January 9	Group (re)teach 109 concepts	(1) discussion post in response to Bailey & Mobley's "Work in the intersections" by 11:59 PM on 01/11 and (2) **Burrowing Exercise by 11:59 PM on 01/15**
	January 10	Group (re)teach 109 concepts	
	January 11	Burrowing Exercise: Choosing your Research Topic; Reviewing Witte's "Research Starts with Answers"	
	January 12	Read Moya Bailey & Izetta Autumn Mobley's "Work in the intersections: A Black feminist disability framework" and submit your discussion post (GDP)	
Week 3	January 16	**No Class: MLK Day**	(1) discussion post in response to Margaret Price's "The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain" by 11:59 PM on 01/16 and (2) discussion post in response to Wong's *Disability Visibility* podcast Ep. 65 with Imade Nibokun and the Black LGBTQ+ mental health
	January 17	Read Margaret Price's "The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain" and submit your discussion post (AGDP)	
	January 18	Read or Listen to Alice Wong's Disability Visibility podcast Ep. 65, read this infographic on Black LGBTQ+ mental health, and submit your discussion post (AGDP)	

	January 19	Genre: Identifying a Need, Audience, Genre, and Location for Translation	infographic by 11:59 PM on 01/17
Week 4	January 23	**Read the excerpts from Katie Rose Guest Pryal's *Life of the Mind Interrupted* along with this tweet thread by @bennessb, and submit your discussion post (GTDP)**	(1) **Genre Translation by 11:59 PM on 01/24**, (2) discussion post in response to Pryal's *Life of the Mind Interrupted* by 11:59 PM on 01/22, (3) discussion post in response to Yergeau's "Clinically significant disturbance" by 11:59 PM on 01/23, and (4) your genre and audience proposal (in class)
	January 24	Read M. Remi Yergeau's "Clinically significant disturbance: On theorists who theorize theory of mind" and submit your discussion post (AGDP)	
	January 25	Talking about genre possibilities in your research; the research project prompt	
	January 26	Proposing a genre and audience for your papers	
Week 5	January 30	Read Sara Ahmed's "Making feminist points" and submit your discussion post (GDP)	(1) **Audience and Genre Reflection by 10:20 AM on 02/01** and (2) discussion post in response to Ahmed's "Making feminist points" by 11:59 PM on 01/29
	January 31	Developing keywords and searching for sources	
	February 1	**Peer Review for the Audience and Genre Reflection**	
	February 2	APA and MLA citations; proposal of conversation discussion	
Week 6	February 6	Synthesizing sources	(1) discussion post providing a sample scholarly, academic, or professional source that incorporates research of some kind and (2) **Proposal of Conversation by 10:20 AM on 02/13**
	February 7	Working on your synthesis and proposal of conversation (asynchronous)	
	February 8	Post your example paper / source on the discussion post before class on 02/08	
	February 9	Reading research paper samples; focus on structure	
Week 7	February 13	**Peer Review for Proposal of Conversation**	
	February	Continuing discussion on research paper	

	14	samples	
	February 15	In-class workshops and conferences	
	February 16	In-class workshops and conferences	
Week 8	February 20	**No Class:** University Holiday	(1) **Draft of Research Paper by 10:20 AM on 02/21**
	February 21	**Peer Review for Project Draft**	
	February 22	Circulating Knowledge and Sharing Literacy: The Poster Presentation and Positionality	
	February 23	Poster samples and workshop	
Week 9	February 27	**Peer Review for Research Poster**	(1) **Draft of Research Poster by 10:20 AM on 02/27** and (2) **Revised Symposium Posters Due by 12 PM on 03/03**
	February 28	Poster workshop	
	March 1	The Final Reflection	
	March 2	Sample Final Reflections	
Week 10	March 6	Discussing Alice Wong podcast episode 12; FWs and Surveys	
	March 7	Housekeeping (course evaluations and read aloud)	
	March 8	POSTER SYMPOSIUM DAY 2: 10 AM to 11 AM	
	March 9	**Last Day of Class**: Wrap up, read aloud, goodbyes	
Finals Week	Your final reflection (i.e., your course final) is due by 5:00 PM on Wednesday, March 15. Please also complete the course evaluations by following this link (TBA).		

Note: These dates are tentative. This means they are subject to change. The assignments above are your "Weekly Assignments" and include some "Daily Assignments." To see more of your daily assignments, go to the Modules tab in the left side bar on Canvas.

Appendix XVIII

Assessment Agreement

English 110 B, Winter 2023

Assigning Grades

As per the EWP program policies and my own values as an instructor, no *official* grades will be assigned to your work until the end of the quarter after you've completed the final portfolio (60%; see the syllabus for more information on your final portfolio). Each weekly and daily assignment, class discussion, note taking submission, group activity, free write, and other small assignments you complete count toward your participation (40%) and will be marked complete/incomplete (see the Syllabus for more information on what is included in your participation grade). Thus, although grades will not be assigned, I will be tracking the progress of your writing, the effort you put into the class, and the overall completion of coursework.

Rationale

The reason grades are not assigned until the end of the quarter is to ensure that you are not judged by the skills you possess upon entering the class, but rather the skills you possess at the end of the quarter and how much you have grown from day one. Assigning grades on day one and comparing you to an unspoken standard can be discouraging, though I acknowledge and celebrate the skills, experiences, and tools you bring with you from your past writing and life experience.

Additionally, if at any point you would like to know how you are doing in the class, please do reach out via email or the Canvas in. I'm more than happy to chat about your progress or discuss assignment feedback one-on-one!

Submitting Work

As stated in the syllabus (see Late Policy), all deadlines (unless otherwise specified, such as peer review papers) in this course are "rolling." This means you are given a three-day window to submit your assignment if you would like to receive feedback. For example, if the deadline is Friday and you submit on Tuesday, you will not receive feedback unless you communicate with me. If you submit your work after the third day and would still like feedback, it is your responsibility to contact me to schedule a time to discuss your paper.

For daily assignments, such as discussion posts, that contribute to class discussion, you should try your best to submit them before we have the discussion. If they are consistently submitted after the in-class discussion your participation grade will be affected.

Return Time

All feedback on assignments will be returned to you no later than two weeks after your work is submitted. I am often able to return work within a week of submission and will try my best to do so. As stated above, if you submit an assignment three or more days after the posted deadline, you will not receive feedback on your work unless you schedule a time to meet and discuss the work with me. All comments on your work are meant to build your writerly confidence and guide you toward a discussion in your final portfolio; they are not punitive or corrective.

Types of Comments

Daily Assignments (discussions and discussion posts, note taking, free writes, worksheets, activities, etc.): Comments on daily assignments will be occasional and minimal. That said, if comments are not provided, it does not mean that I have not read and appreciated the work you have done and the effort you have put into the assignment.

Weekly Assignments: Written feedback will be provided to you for each weekly assignment, typically in the form of marginal and terminal comments unless otherwise requested (e.g., audio comments). The comments will focus on "higher order concerns," such as development of thoughts, organization, depth of analysis, backing up claims, etc. rather than "lower order concerns," such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc. unless you specifically request otherwise.

The reason I do not provide feedback on such lower order concerns is to combat the idea that one must "master" writing in English and challenge the belief in a standard way of writing that is both Eurocentric and oppressive. However, if another instructor is deducting points from your assignments for grammatical errors, I'd be happy to sit down with you and discuss the "errors" they've marked.

Course Final: Minimal feedback will be given on the final portfolio, but I welcome any questions that arise based on the grade assigned to you at the end of the quarter.

Remember, all written comments left on your work are meant to build writerly confidence and push you toward the discussion in your final portfolio; they are meant to encourage you to improve the piece of writing and, thus, your writing skills overall.

Focus of Assessment

Overview

Assessment is mostly based on general completion of the course assignments, observed application of the concepts we discuss and practice, and your active engagement with our course readings during discussions and in your writing assignments. You will also be assessed on overall progress, a thorough final portfolio, and observable effort.

With the completion of your first writing assignment, you demonstrate the skills you possess as an experienced writer and, thus, set a goal for yourself to learn and grow as you acknowledge writing as a process rather than a product. When you enter this classroom there is no standard to which I am comparing your work and the only person you are competing with in your writing is yourself. The only person you need to try to do "better" than is your past self.

Grade Breakdown

The starting grade in this course is a 70% which requires completion of all assignments, meeting the minimum requirements. For each assignment that demonstrates exceptional awareness of concepts and skills beyond the minimum requirements and expectations, this percentage will increase. Moreover, if you attend optional conferences or office hours, this will also be taken into consideration as observable effort. For any assignment that fails to meet the minimum requirements and expectations, this percentage will decrease. If the expectations for assignments are unclear, please email me or bring this up in class so we can work together to ensure your success.

My Expectations for You

To demonstrate that you have put an average amount of effort into this course, (i.e., to receive an average grade [C range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all but three discussion board posts
- Completion of all but three daily assignments
- Completion/submission of all but two weekly assignments*
- Completion of all but three free writing exercises
- Occasional, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)
- Attendance and participation in 3 out of 4 peer review sessions
- Missing no more than 6 class sessions (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and thoughtful reflections of your work
- Attendance of one one-on-one conference with me during our two scheduled conference weeks
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

*Consistently submitting work beyond the rolling deadline date can result in deduction of participation points.

To demonstrate that you have put slightly above-average amount of effort into this course (i.e., to receive a slightly above-average grade [B range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all but two discussion board posts
- Completion of all but two daily assignments
- Completion/submission of all but one weekly assignment
- Completion of all but two free writing exercises
- Regular, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)
- Attendance and participation in 3 out of 4 peer review sessions
- Missing no more than 4 class sessions (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and offering thoughtful reflections of your work
- Attendance of one one-on-one conference with me during our two scheduled conference weeks
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

*Consistently submitting work beyond the rolling deadline date can result in deduction of participation points.

To demonstrate that you have put a great or exceptional amount of effort into this course (i.e., to receive an above-average grade [A range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all discussion board posts and all daily assignments with the addition of occasional responses to your peers' discussion board posts
- Completion/submission of all weekly assignments within the three-day "rolling" deadline window
- Completion of all free writing exercises demonstrating thoughtful engagement with the prompts/questions
- Frequent, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)

- Attendance and participation in all peer review sessions
- Missing no more than 2 class sessions (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and offering thoughtful reflections of your work, the research project, and research poster with the addition of a clear reflection of your overall progress since English 109, what aspects of the course you will carry with you, and how the course changed your views of research in general
- Making an apparent effort to communicate with me if/when necessary (e.g., asking questions or expressing concerns via email or during office hours)
- Attendance of two one-on-one conferences with me during our two scheduled conference weeks
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

Participation Expectations

This course will be rigorous, involving a lot of reading and writing, and I expect you to be *active* participants. I am not the sole contributor to the energy of the room. As in any relationship, our interactions cannot be both one-sided *and* productive. To be successful, I strongly advise that you come to each class with discussions to be had. It's important to remember that you are active agents in your education and contribute a significant amount of energy and effort to your learning. I truly believe you each have something valuable to contribute to our class discussions, and I want you to keep in mind that your peers do as well. Give them your attention when they are speaking, trust that they are listening to you, do the reading, share your thoughts, and write your words.

For more information on participation expectations, see the discussion expectations on Canvas.

Your Expectations for Me

In return for the effort you put into this course, I will hold myself to the following:

- As stated above, all written work will be returned with feedback within two weeks of submission if submitted within the three-day rolling deadline window.
- I will meet with you one-on-one to discuss your writing, any other aspects of the course, or general topics upon request. Just shoot me an email or ask after class
- I will not require an “excuse” for absences, requested extensions, or missed work. It’s not my business unless you *choose* to share it with me. In which case, I will listen and discuss the situation with care.
- I will not deduct points from participation for missing one week or less of our class sessions.
- I will excuse *one* discussion post and *one* free write at the end of the quarter.
- I will respond to all emails as soon as possible. You will receive email responses within twenty-four hours on days when class is in session.
- If asked a question or called on in class, you will not be penalized for passing or not knowing an answer.
- I will not deduct points if your *initial* drafts of your daily and weekly assignments do not meet the page count or fulfill the prompt. However, **they must fulfill the prompt when submitted with the final portfolio as the end of term.**
- I will not expect you to code switch in order to be successful in my course.
- I will not penalize you for “improper” grammar, syntax, etc. in your written work.
- I will deeply consider changes to course design, assignments, guidelines, etc. if concerns, issues, or suggestions are raised. In other words, I will approach discussions of work overload with grace and consider revising course design if issues arise.

Student Agreement

To demonstrate that you have read and understand the above information regarding grades for our course (English 109), please sign this document below and return it to me in person before or after class by 11:59 PM on October 7th.

Sign Here: _____

Print Name Here: _____

Instructor Use

*Students, you do not need to fill out the following line.

Date Received by Instructor: _____

Appendix XIX

English 110 Course Reading Rationales

Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility* (Ep. 46) with Sami Schalk and Subini Annamma on “Disability Studies”

The purpose of reading or listening to Wong’s podcast episode no. 46 is to introduce you to the field of disability studies in a more popular genre so that the ideas therein are more accessible and lead us into the peer-reviewed article by Bailey and Mobley. The idea of intersectionality is briefly mentioned in this text which directly connects to the following episode on intersectionality specifically. Schalk and Annamma not only introduce disability studies but emphasize some issues or areas of progress within the field and also present solutions as well as hopes for the future of disability studies. Pay attention to those definitions, issues, and solution proposals. This episode will introduce you to the ways in which academic topics or topics that we write about and engage within the University can be translated into more popular texts for the general public to access. This will be important to consider when you are writing your own research project.

Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility* (Ep. 34) with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite on “Intersectionality”

Reading or listening to Wong’s podcast episode no. 34 more deeply introduces you to the framework and concept of intersectionality while providing examples of what it means to think intersectionally about our own subject positions and other’s. Further, Jean-Luc emphasizes how an intersectional approach can be useful in looking at mental disability in Indigenous communities.This concept is important for approaching the questions you ask in your research, engaging with research participants, and for reading the work of your classmates. It is one more demonstration of what it means to use and apply a research framework as well as show you the ways in which academic topics can be translated into more popular texts for the general public to access. This will be important to consider when you are writing your own research project.

Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley, Work in the intersections: A Black feminist disability framework

The purpose of reading Bailey and Mobley’s article is for you to gain background knowledge into the field of disability studies from which studies of mental disability as both social and individual and mental disability *rhetorics* emerged. Bailey and Mobley’s article expands on the concept of intersectionality that is introduced in Alice Wong’s podcast. Not only does this article provide background into disability studies broadly, it also demonstrates the importance of an intersectional approach to studying disability and its complexity.

Bailey and Mobley provide examples of how to apply a Black feminist disability framework, demonstrating what it means to use and be informed by a framework in your research. By providing these examples, they introduce you to the idea that something like *disability* can be used as a way to critique broader oppressive structures that are, in the simplest terms, *disabling*, oppressive, and exclusionary. This article provides one genre in which information about mental disability can be communicated which we will compare to other genres we engage.

Bailey and Mobley explain what disability studies is, what its issues are, what people within the field try to do, and what changes can be made to merge disability studies with other fields. As you read, pay attention to what the goals of disability scholars are, what issues we[25] tend to address, how they are addressed, and what the justification for the presented framework is. Think about what it might look like to use this understanding of disability to "look at" the university.

Margaret Price (she/her), The bodymind problem and the possibilities of pain

The purpose of reading Price's article is to show you how a disability scholar applies critical disability studies as a research framework. Price's work also expands critical disability studies to look more specifically at mental disability through a feminist materialist perspective. I do not expect you to understand this full text. What I want you to pay attention to is Price's discussion of mental disability and illness and how she is applying disability frameworks to mental disability. Think about what issues she is bringing to the forefront of disability studies' focus on breaking down the body/mind binary and acknowledging the bodymind or how the mind and body are always operating together. Then, think about how she approaches those issues using some of the ideas from Schalk's and Linton's articles. Finally, I want you to consider the issue of disability desire and undesirability that Price discusses.

Broadly, this text gives you an understanding of what it means to use a research framework or a lens to observe phenomena and make critiques. It's a structuring mechanism. Remember that frameworks can be those used in particular areas of study or they can be constructed through your own experience and identity.

Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility* (Ep. 65) with Imade Nibokun on Black Mental Health

Reading or listening to Wong's podcast is important for a number of reasons. First, the discussion of Black mental health and disability parallels the discussions we have had related to the first two podcast episodes and the important points made by Bailey and Mobley. Not only that, but Nibokun's disclosure about her experiences as a Black, mentally disabled woman might fit into the limit cases Price pushes disability scholars to include in their research. It shows us, again, how information from one genre can be translated into another and be equally as effective for making arguments about social justice. This demonstrates that frameworks and methodologies we use in our research can also be applied to the conversations we have with others. Nibokun also proposes solutions to the issues presented in this reading that are valuable for reflecting on the future of mental disability in the academy and our lives outside of the classroom. Pay attention to these issues and solutions and your feelings toward them.

"Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health" from the LGBTQ+ Behavioral Health Equity and African American Behavioral Health Centers of Excellence

[25] In these rationales, I use the first-person plural pronoun "we" to refer to disability scholars because I identify as a disability scholar.

Paired with Bailey and Mobley's article and Wong's podcast (Ep. 65), the Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health infographic offers one more example of what it means to translate information from one genre into another. It provides us with more evidence of the constraints and affordances of various genres and gives us the opportunity to further examine the genre, audience, purpose, and situations that inspire a text and the rhetorical choices therein. Seeing the ways in which articles can be translated into podcasts into infographics will be important for you to build your own genre translation and for choosing your own genre in which to compose your research project. Composing in a variety of genre, as mentioned in the assignment prompts, promotes literacy in whatever topic you are writing about.

Katie Rose Guest Pryal (she/her), *Life of the mind interrupted: Essays on mental health and disability in higher education*

First, Pryal's book provides us with a list of disability-studies terminology and their accessible definitions. Beyond that, reading excerpts of Pryal's memoir allows you to see how disability studies frameworks can be applied to writing that may not be perceived as "academic" or "scholarly" in the traditional sense. Pryal demonstrates that you can make strong, effective arguments about injustice when writing from your personal experience and looking at that experience with a critical lens. We see in her work yet another way in which someone can apply a research framework, particularly a way in which it can be applied to non "standard academic" texts. Pryal's work opens up possibilities for approaching your writing in this class by showing you that good argumentative, impactful, valid, and change-inspiring writing does not have to fit the mold of the standard academic research paper.

M. Remi Yergeau (they/them), Clinically significant disturbance: On theorists who theorize theory of mind

Similar to reading Pryal's work, Yergeau's article shows us that valid intellectual work and arguments can be completed in non standard ways. Like Price's article, some of Yergeau's writing may be difficult for you to understand. That's okay. What I want you paying attention to is Yergeau's style and their explanation of that style. Does this writing (content and style) challenge ideas you have about professional and academic writing? I want you to think about arguments related to humanness, mental disability, and rhetoricity. Think about what Yergeau means when they say "This is my scholarship, and my scholarship is experience, and my experience is the experience of impairment and of relationships with skin and bones and mindless orbs." What does this mean to you? My hope is that this article helps you think critically about academic definitions of "sense making," coherence, organization, professionalism, and so forth.

Sara Ahmed (she/her), Making feminist points

I always assign Ahmed's blog post as a reading for first-year students. There is a lot of value in reading "Making Feminist Points." First, like Yergeau's and Pryal's articles, Ahmed shows us what it looks like to write about scholarly topics in a way that is typically considered "non academic." Ahmed writes very conversationally and from her own experience about topics that matter for anyone whether they are involved in the academy or not, but that particularly concern those who cite and synthesize academic sources (like you all do and will continue to do). Second, Ahmed gives us the language we need for critiquing standard citational practices that are cyclical and that reinforce the white heteropatriarchy as the center of academic discourse, as the center of scholarly knowledge and knowledge validity. Ahmed helps us, finally, think

more generally about what it means to think about who “fits” within academic conversations, who fits within our classrooms, who is included in university policies and policy making, and how *we* fit within the walls of the ivory tower.

Shannon Walters (she/her), A different kind of wholeness: Disability dis-closure and ruptured rhetorics of multimodal collaboration and revision

Walters shares the idea of “dis-closure” meaning the moment “when disability frustrates the normative expectations of multimodal, compositional, and narrative closure in productive and generative ways.”

This concept is one I want you to take with you into your peer review session(s). Because we all think differently, I want you to challenge ideas you have about coherence. I want you to consider that there are ways in which your peers will disrupt normative ways of providing closure in their work. This means they may build coherent narratives and arguments in ways that might not feel cohesive or coherent to you.

There are things you do not know about your classmates and their ways of writing may connect with dis-closure. This is why, when we run into what we perceive to be issues of coherence, we should ask questions rather than make assumptions about our classmates’ rhetorical choices.

Though I want you to see dis-closure as potentiating in that it helps us question the very idea of closure and coherence and leads to adaptation and acceptance, it is important to not see dis-closure as something all of us can do, but as something that *happens* when disabled individuals do not conform and, therefore, frustrate normate expectations in ways that expand and open up normate understandings of disabled experience.

In your peer reviews, pay attention to moments of frustration and consider if they can be self-reflective moments for you to challenge your expectations of dis-closure.

Appendix XX

Burrowing Exercise

Deadline: 01/15 at 11:59 PM
Rolling Deadline: 01/18 at 11:59 PM

For this assignment, you will explore possible topics for your research project by burrowing into your interests and deciding which topics interest you most, what you'd like to learn more about, what change you would like to push for, etc.

For essays, burrowing can help you dig deeper into the topic in which you are interested. The deeper you dig, the more likely it will be that you are comfortable in how you are developing your research.

Free Write

- What communities do you consider yourself a part of?
    - "Community" can be understood broadly as in "low income students" or more specifically such as "low-income students on my co-ed basketball team."
- What is your role in those communities?
- How do you "fit" in those communities? Are you comfortable with how you "fit" in those communities?
- What are some of the issues or questions concerning you and the other community members?
- Why are these issues and questions concerns for you?
- What other topics interest you? Why do they interest you?

List 1: Communities

Make a list of seven (7) communities you would say you are a part of.

List 2: Issues and Questions

Choose three to five (3–5) of those communities and put a list under each one. These lists should include two or three (2–3) issues or questions concerning individuals within those three communities.

List 3: Inquiry or Starting Research with Questions

Choose one (1) of those three to five communities initially chosen to expand upon and continue posing questions about one or more of the issues or questions you raised. Think about the following:

- How familiar are you with the topic or question?
- What broad questions can you ask?
- What more narrow questions can you ask?
- What questions might people in that community want answered?

These questions will serve as the starting point for your line of inquiry though you will develop more questions as you continue researching and obtaining more information.

Select: Choose a Potential Topic

Once you have developed questions, choose one (1) topic related to the questions you have raised that you think could serve as a strong research topic.

Reflect on your Chosen Topic

In 400+ words, say more about the topic you chose that you think could serve as a strong research topic.

Remember, this is the start of your research. You want to be thinking about this choice as something projected into the future ten weeks and beyond. It would be best to think deeply about the topic now rather than five weeks from now.

Consider these questions as you reflect on your decision:

- Why is this topic important to you? Why did you choose it?
- Within what discipline would you situate this topic or these research questions?
- How is this topic connected to who you are, your identity, your experiences, and so forth?
- What obstacles do you anticipate you will encounter in exploring this topic?
- What resources do you plan to consult in your research? Will you use only research articles or do you think you might use surveys and interviews? Are there other resources you want to draw on? Why or why not?
- Who might be an ideal audience for your topic at this point in time? Why?
- Do you anticipate that you might change the topic? Why or why not?
- Is the topic timely and relevant? How?

As with all assignments, the word count is set to meet a program requirement. What I want to see more is that you are developing your ideas and responding to your choice and the above questions thoughtfully.

Rationale

The purpose of the burrowing exercise is to help you begin and develop your line of inquiry or the set of questions you want to answer through your source exploration and engagement, collaboration, and writing. It also allows you a space to think about the daily work you do in your communities, where you “fit” more or less (un)comfortably, what you are curious about or enjoy thinking about, and then to construct research questions based on what more you need to know about those communities, what it means to “fit,” or the topics that interest you.

What’s important is that you choose a line of inquiry that is interesting and important to you. Thinking about where we move and how we *feel* in particular spaces or what concerns us in those spaces connects with the writing concept of “Rhetoric and [writing] are social and political” (Cedillo 2018). It also reinforces the idea that research (no matter how objective you try to make it) is always concerned with *you*, with the “I.”

You must begin the inquiry process from a place of the familiar; start with what you know to determine the questions you need to ask to guide you through your research. Additionally, becoming “literate” in any topic requires question asking, self-reflection, and a novice perspective that leaves you open to learning.

Appendix XXI

Genre Translation

Deadline: 01/24 at 11:59 PM
Rolling Deadline: 01/27 at 11:59 PM

Background

After reading Margaret Price's (2015) "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain," we discussed more deeply the concepts of genre and audience while also taking time to identify who else needs to know or hear more about psychiatric or mental disability, where information about psychiatric or mental disability should be shared, and in what genre that information should or could be presented in that location and to those individuals. Now, you are going to translate (or transform) the content of Price's article for a different audience and in a different genre.

Examples

Within our class and readings, we have seen a few genre translations:

- The content of Bailey and Mobley's article could be said to be a translation into Wong's podcasts or vice versa
- Podcast episodes 45 and 65 could be translations of the information in the Black LGBTQ+ mental health infographic and vice versa
- Our syllabus review PowerPoint was a genre translation of the syllabus, Canvas site, and assessment agreement

When thinking about these examples, closely consider how the genre, audience, purpose, and situation (context) shift between translations despite the information being similar.

Instructions

Using the information you selected related to identifying

(1) who needs to hear or know more about psychiatric or mental disability
(2) where information about psychiatric or mental disability should be shared, and
(3) in what genre that information should or could be presented in that location and to those individuals

develop a more "popular" or "public" translation of Price's article. The degree to which you use Price's exact language or style is dependent on your **G**enre, **A**udience, **Purpose** (or goals), and the **S**ituation (or context) in which you are presenting your information. You can choose any genre as long as it suits your goals and purpose and as long as you can explain how that genre is ideal for presenting information to the intended audience. What I want to see is that you are intentionally extracting information from Price's article and transforming it to fit your needs and goals as a communicator. Your translation should not look like Price's article.

Technical Requirements

Elements of style, organization, and length will vary depending on the genre into which you choose to present information.

Writer's Memo

In 200+ words, respond to the following:

1) What audience, genre, and context (location or situation) did you choose to translate the information for, into, and within?
2) Why did you select the audience, genre, and context you did?
3) What were some specific rhetorical choices you made related to diction (word choice), tone, organization, length, etc. as a result of the audience's knowledge, access needs, geographical location, economic background, gender, sexuality, and other elements of their identities and experiences?
    a) What were some specific rhetorical choices you made related to diction (word choice), tone, organization, length, etc. as a result of the genre's conventions (i.e., rules, expectations, traditional format and design)?
4) Did this assignment have any influence over how you view your own rhetorical awareness and intentionality in everyday communication? Why or why not?
5) Would you truly consider presenting this genre to the intended audience of your translation? Why or why not?
6) What would you most like feedback on?

Rationale

To become literate or fluent in any topic or field of study, you must learn to communicate information using a variety of means and for a variety of audiences. This allows you to exercise that knowledge and recognize its possibilities for public engagement. In other words, seeing the ways in which information *moves* from place to place enables us to better implement that into our daily lives.

"Translating" texts helps us hone our genre and audience awareness skills which broadly means we are exercising our rhetorical awareness skills. Genre and audience awareness are necessary for you to select a genre in which to present your research at the end of the term. It is also necessary because, for your course final, you will be translating your paper into a poster for public display and engagement.

Further, rhetorical awareness is needed for any and all communication because we are always selecting what information to share and how to share it when we interact with different groups and individuals. Paying close attention to your composition choices and their consequences (positive and negative) helps you become a more thoughtful and ethical writer and researcher. This assignment gives you the opportunity to think about audience access needs, ability, geographical location, economic background, gender, sexuality, and other elements of audience identity and experience (i.e., their positionality) to determine the best way to present information to them.

Appendix XXII

Audience and Genre Reflection

Deadline
01/30 at 10:20 AM before Peer Review

No rolling deadline.

Background

This term, you have examined the genres and audiences of Yergeau's and Price's articles, two podcast episodes, and an infographic while also analyzing a situation and need in order to strategically make rhetorical choices related to genre, audience, purpose, and context in your Genre Translation assignment. Not only did you complete this larger translation assignment, but translated your response to Pryal's text into your choice of a tweet or tweet thread, text message or text conversation, or an email to another instructor, professor, or teacher for your discussion post.

Instructions

Now that you have seen examples of your possibilities for writing your research project and have the skills you need to make critical decisions about genre, audience, and purpose within a particular context, I want you to turn back to the same steps you used to identify a need for sharing information and selecting a genre and audience for your Genre Translation assignment to **identify a need, select an audience, examine context, and propose a genre** for your research project.

You may choose to use one of the genres we looked at in class or you can propose something different.

For this assignment, please complete the following:

1) State your topic choice at the top of your document.
2) Explain your relationship to this topic. Why have you chosen it? Why does it matter to you?
3) Tell me where there is a need for talking about your chosen topic.
    a) Explain why there is a need for sharing information in that location given the current economic, social, and political context.
4) Talk about the audiences that interact in that location or in spaces related to that location.
    a) Select an intended audience to write with, to, for, or alongside. Tell me about who they are and various elements of their identity and experience that might influence the choices you make as you write.
    b) Tell me why you have chosen this group or person as your intended audience.
    c) Reflect on your relationship to this audience.

    d) For this portion, it is okay to talk about 2–3 potential audiences if you are uncertain at the moment.
5) Reflect on what genres are most likely to reach this audience.
    a) Explain why these are the most likely genres for this audience.
    b) Tell me what the audience's relationship to the genre is. How do they usually interact with it or what expectations do they have of it?
6) Tell me what genre you are most likely to choose to construct your project and why
    a) If you plan to work with an even more nontraditional genre than what we have talked about, what proposals do you have for meeting the other technical requirements (such as word count). This can include, for example, additional metacommentary on your process, choices, and learning as you were writing or additional details in the notes of a PowerPoint presentation.
    b) Explain why this would be the best alternative.
7) Make a statement about what you hope your project with *do* (for now) and how the genre and audience selections help you do this.
    a) What impact do you want it to have?
    b) What change do you want to inspire?
    c) What knowledge bases do you want to contribute to?

Apart from placing your topic at the beginning of the document, these do not need to be written about in any particular order and will likely be overlapping.

Technical Requirements

- 750+ words
- Written in paragraph format (i.e., do not write your responses as bullet points under each question)
- Use 11–12 pt font in any of the following: Arial, Times New Roman, Calibri, Cambria, or EB Garamond
- Use single or double spacing
- Include page numbers
- Save your document file with your last name included such as LastName_AudienceGenreReflection

Rationale

Similar to your genre translation of Margaret Price's "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain," this assignment involves honing your audience and genre awareness skills. However, this assignment demonstrates the importance of considering genre and audience as it applies to your own research topic and research goals.

It is also important to be able to identify a need and explain how that need will be addressed by providing information in a particular way for a particular audience. In this way, you are thinking about how your research fits into a public space and its consequences. This assignment is meant to help you think critically about *who belongs* (who is included or excluded from certain spaces), who you want to include or benefit, who authority you want to operate under, and how you can engage and respond to research questions your audience may have.

Remember, this work is political because it is rhetorical and has consequences for you and others. All research and writing (no matter how explicit) make arguments to help people move, change, and make decisions—no matter how small.

Finally, you will participate in a peer review to reinforce the understanding that writing and research are collaborative, social, reciprocal, and reflexive (actively reflective). This helps you gain literacy skills because being in conversation expands your knowledge and reveals the consequences of your learning on and for others as well as expands the possibilities for where your knowledge can go.

Appendix XXIII

Proposal of Conversation

Deadline: 02/08 by 11:59 PM
No rolling deadline.

Instructions

Now that you have selected a topic, reflected on your audience and genre choice, and utilized the tools and resources required to search for sources to support your argumentative claims, you will produce a "proposal of conversation."

Your proposal of conversation comes in three (3) parts:

1) Your initial source list
2) A synthesis of the conversations within the sources and an explanation of how you hope to join or employ those conversations
3) A genre translation

To complete this assignment, please do the following:

1) Use the source searching resources and tools we covered and practiced in class to find a minimum of five (5) sources to include in your paper. At least seven (7) sources are required for the final project.
2) Read the sources, annotate them, and take notes about how their main argument responds to your research question(s).
    a) Don't worry too much about full comprehension. You just need to be able to identify how the source will be of use to you and in response to your questions or goals.
3) Create bibliography (e.g., works cited, references, bibliography) entries for each source using APA, MLA, CMOS, IEEE, or AMA. Indicate which citation style you have used when you submit.
4) Synthesize the ideas in the sources you have read to explain what conversations are being had and how you will use them to reach your research goals.
    a) Again, think about what questions they help you answer?
    b) Consider what information they offer your audience as well.
5) Turn your proposal into a more public genre. Here are some examples:
    a) Email, Facebook post, PowerPoint, tweet thread, Instagram slides, text message chain
    b) Use the skills you used for your Genre Translation and Audience and Genre Reflection to make decisions about which genre to translate your information into.
    c) I want to see that you are able to take the same information and share it with an outside audience while paying attention to how our audience and context change the generic and stylistic choices of our work.
    d) Who might be interested in your discoveries or goals going forward? Who might want to know information from at least one of the sources? What aspects of the sources you've read or the research you are doing might they find interesting?
        i) What information will you keep, expand, or omit?

Writer's Memo

In 100+ words, respond to the following:

1) What did you do really well in this assignment?
2) What was most difficult for you in this assignment?
3) Would you most like feedback on?
4) What audience, genre, and context (location or situation) did you choose to translate the information for, into, and within? and why?
5) How did your previous genre translations and reflections influence the choices you made or steps you took?
6) What were some specific rhetorical choices you made as a result of the genre's conventions (i.e., rules, expectations, traditional format and design)?

Rationale

Your proposal of conversation is meant to help you practice both joining scholarly and public conversations (i.e., synthesizing sources) as well as offer you a low-stakes space to practice your citation skills. As we know, all writing is social in that we draw on what we know from others to create knowledge that we then share with others. It also means we engage in already existing conversations to attempt to answer our research questions. To do so, we respond to and build on other's arguments to "converse" with them as we would in a chat with a friend.

This assignment is also your first step toward your research paper draft because you will build on the conversation you develop in this assignment when you synthesize your sources in your paper draft. Building a conversation rather than writing an annotated bibliography allows you to trace connections between sources rather than separating them into discreet arguments that exist in a vacuum.

The translation portion of the assignment gives you the opportunity to once again practice your genre and audience awareness skills. This is also meant to demonstrate the ways in which the work you do in this class is never isolated or restricted to this classroom. It gives you a chance to share with others a topic that means something to you in a non-academic context and genre.

As with the Audience and Genre Reflection, you will participate in a peer review to reinforce the understanding that writing and research are collaborative, social, reciprocal, and reflexive (actively reflective). This helps you gain literacy skills because being in conversation expands your knowledge and reveals the consequences of your learning on and for others as well as expands the possibilities for where your knowledge can go.

Appendix XXIV

Research Project

Deadline
02/21 by 10:20 AM

Background and Direction

Each of us exists in a large number of communities because our identities are so intersectional as we have learned in our discussions of how multiple aspects of our identities (such as ability, race, gender, sexuality, economic status, and geographical location) intersect and inform our relationship to power.

Your goal in completing the burrowing exercise was to choose one community in which you participate and identify an issue or topic relevant to that community to continue exploring and researching. You then developed a set of questions (a line of inquiry) to learn more about the topic, identify keywords, find sources, and join in a conversation with those sources all while gaining and honing your genre and audience awareness skills to enhance both your fluency and rhetorical capacities for communicating information.

Now, you will write a research project on your chosen topic, in your chosen genre(s), and toward your chosen audience to achieve your research goals. Even if you have chosen to conduct “informative or exploratory research” rather than “argumentative research,” you must keep in mind that *all texts are arguments*; this means, even a research paper that is solely informative will have (1) an intended audience, (2) a goal or purpose that will be guided by your line of inquiry, (3) a chosen genre that helps reach your goal and audience, and (4) outside support for its claims.

Format & Genre

- 1500+ words which can be reach through proposed alternatives if your genre is nontraditional
- The format and genre is dependent on what you gauge to be the genre best suited for 1) achieving your goal/purpose and 2) reaching your target audience. This would have been decided during the completion of your Audience and Genre Reflection assignment. Although we reviewed a number of past assignments and discussed potential genres for you to use to reach your audience, you were welcome to propose alternative genres. The biggest requirement for your choice is that you have a rationale for choosing that genre.
- To demonstrate that you are joining ongoing conversations about a topic, you should use at least five (7) secondary sources in this project. At least two (3) of them should be "scholarly sources" from the UW Libraries, databases, or Google Scholar.
- Name your document file using the format LastName_ResearchProjectDraft

Writer's Memo

In 150+ words, please respond to the following:

1) What would you like the most feedback on?
2) What part of writing your project was most challenging for you?
3) What did you do well in this project?

4) How are your rhetorical choices informed by discussions we have had in English 110 and 109 related to genre and audience, rhetoric as mediation, citational politics, intersectionality, accessibility, difference, ethical research practices, countering Western narratives and ideas of “academic” writing, and so forth?

Assessment Criteria for Your Final, Revised Draft)

Assessment for the peer review draft is based on submission of some semblance of a draft before peer review.

- Meets or is near word count but, most importantly, fully **develops ideas** despite word count
- Has a **structure** that is consistent with the chosen **genre** (i.e., follows genre conventions)
- Demonstrates **rhetorical** and **audience** awareness; makes rhetorical choices that are consistent with the intended audience's knowledge of the subject and values
- Shows **awareness** of the current social, political, and cultural **context** or relevance / **timeliness** as well as connection to one's **own** values, identity, interests, passions, etc. (i.e., your **connection** to the topic and the connection of the topic to the outside world)
- Makes an **argument** and provides **support** for said argument
- Includes 7 outside **sources** (3 of which should be "scholarly")
- Thoroughly **connects** your own ideas to the ideas of the sources and evidence therein (i.e., demonstrates synthesis skills) and cites source material
- Demonstrates some form of **revision** from the project draft (i.e., should take into account feedback from your peers and me to some degree)

Assessment is largely based on completion and following the general prompt, revision from the draft, and the development of ideas alongside supporting evidence.

Rationale

Literacy means developing knowledge, competence, or fluency in a particular topic or area of study. Not only have you learned the critical vocabulary necessary to be literate in mental disability rhetorics, you have also developed literacy in whatever topic you have chosen to write about.

This research paper allows you to demonstrate your literacy of a topic by offering you the opportunity to use all of your available linguistic resources, to employ all of our course’s key concepts, to make thoughtful and ethical rhetorical choices, to have a conversation with your peers and other researchers, to participate in a space that views failure as necessary and generative, to articulate your research methods and methodology, to demonstrate your conscious citational choices, and more.

I want you to see how your work fits into the world, who it accounts for, and what possibilities you envision for *moving* or transferring information. As with the Audience and Genre Reflection and Proposal of Conversation, you will participate in a peer review to reinforce the understanding that writing and research are collaborative, social, reciprocal, and reflexive (actively reflective). This helps you gain literacy skills because being in conversation expands your knowledge and reveals the consequences of your learning on and for others as well as expands the possibilities for where your knowledge can go.

Appendix XXV

Research Poster

Deadline
02/27 by 10:20 AM

No rolling deadline.

The Poster Presentation & Submitting Your Poster

Your posters will be workshopped in class and, in order to hold the symposium in person and have your posters printed for it, you will need to submit them *before* the date of the presentation. Though the dates are still tentative, as I work with the EOP Assistant Director and EWP Director and Program Coordinator, this is important to keep in mind.

Although we will workshop posters in class, it is your responsibility to make sure you fulfill the requirements and submit the poster well before the poster presentation date/time.

The Poster Task

Your research posters will be workshopped in class amongst your peers but presented to other English 110 students and UW community members. Thus, when creating a research poster, it is important to consider the various contexts related to the presentation of your information. Below are some questions to ask yourself as you draft your research poster:

- Who is your audience? What are their experiences and identities that might inform how you structure information?
- What information are you trying to communicate to them?
- What is the importance of this information?
- Why is your research topic relevant to your audience or field of study?
- How is it applicable beyond these contexts?
- What is the main idea or most important message that you want to convey with your research poster?
- What information from your project are you going to include, omit, or expand upon? What will be central?
- Where are you presenting this information?
- Will your content be presented in-person or virtually or both?
- Do you want to offer supplemental materials in the form of a handout or a QR code with a link?
- How do you want to present yourself and your positionality on the poster?

Options for Creating the Poster

You have two choices when creating a research poster

1. You can create your poster from scratch by using PowerPoint, Google Slides, Canva, or a similar design program. Most students use Canva, but you do not have to.
2. You can use one of the University of Washington Research Poster Templates Links to an external site..

Examples

Research poster samples will be added shortly.

Sizing Your Poster

Resize your slide to width 24 inches by height 18 inches.

To resize in PowerPoint go to "File" --> "Page Setup" --> Change the Width to 18in and the Height to 24in (you are able to use the UW templates and then resize them in PowerPoint)

On Canva.com, make sure you double check the default poster sizes for different templates.

IMPORTANT: You must change the size of your slide **before you start working on your poster**. This will ensure that your images and text do not become pixelated when the poster is printed.

Using Images

Including visualizations can help your poster stand out and help others understand your research and ideas. There are lots of ways to include visualizations on your poster—graphs, charts, photographs, as well as many others.

First, be sure to check out this concise guide on legally using images and/or this guide from UW library on finding images.

Rationale

Literacy, again, involves being in conversation with others to share and demonstrate your knowledge. Talking about our knowledge gained helps us engage in continual learning and reflection related to a topic or area of study which ensures we maintain our literacy. This poster also helps you hone your audience and genre awareness in a way similar to the Genre Translation assignment. Translating information from one genre into another helps us see the potential for us to carry that information into other situations and contexts with other people.

This symposium further demonstrates the social, collaborative, political, and reflexive nature of research and writing. By sharing your research in a public space among other scholars, you are practicing rhetoric by contributing to the circulation of information, collaborating with others to develop ideas and influence decision making, and reflecting on those conversations to determine your best course of action carrying this information forward into your research revisions and (non)academic life.

For more information on the research poster and symposium see "Research Poster Symposium" under the "Assignments" tab on Canvas.

Appendix XXVI

Final Critical Class Reflection

Due Date

Wednesday, March 15 by 5:00 PM

*Note: This deadline is **not** negotiable. That means, it **must** be submitted on this date.

***Remember**: The poster presentation, revised research project draft, and final reflection are worth **60% of your final grade** for this course. In Canvas, the course final is listed as 100 points which is further broken down by Revised (Final Draft) Research Paper (25 points), Symposium Poster & Presentation (25 points), and the Critical Reflection itself (50 points).

Submission

Submit your reflection as a Word Doc, Google Doc link, or PDF file. Label your file as follows: LastName_FinalReflection

---

Your Critical Reflection (50 points)

Following our Research Project Peer Review and the Poster Symposium Presentation, you will make necessary revisions to your Research Project and develop a Critical Reflection in which you reflect on your experiences in the course, writing and reading about research, and presenting a poster.

*Your final reflection should be **500+ words**. Many of you will write more than this and that is okay. Think of your reflection as a demonstration of your understanding of the class discussions and readings on research and writing, both in general, and as they apply to the specific work you completed.

Ask yourself questions such as:

- How did I engage with the research process in my work on the poster and conference as well as in other assignments and tasks throughout the quarter?
- When/where/how did I demonstrate engagement with research and composition?
    - What rhetorical awareness skills did I demonstrate? (e.g., genre and audience awareness, elements of tone and style, etc.). Where were they demonstrated?
- How does my work demonstrate strong reading/research/writing practice?
- How did my understandings of writing, research, or other class concepts change/shift/grow?
- What course readings helped me make decisions about my work?

Here you should **present your main claims about how your writing as a whole is showing progress toward your goals**. You should offer **evidence** from your work to show how you approached these questions in a specific context and why this contributed to your thinking and writing in this piece. You should also mention how concepts demonstrated in the readings present themselves in your work or how they will be carried into your future research (consider our readings from the first 4-5 weeks of class).

In your reflection you should also address the "stakes" of the work you accomplished in class:

- Why does it matter that you have learned to apply certain research and writing outcomes in your writing?
- How will this help you in your future classes? Your major? Your career?
- How do you see the work you've done this quarter translating to other situations, either in or out of school?
- What still needs improvement?
- How will you continue to improve?

Keep in mind that these reflections are pieces of **argumentative writing**. **Your argument should center on what you believe are the most important aspects of your work in this class and how that work shows your progress.** Your evidence for these claims will be your own work from the quarter. Thus, you should be applying the same writing strategies to your reflection that we have discussed in class and put into practice throughout the quarter, including:

- Presenting and defending your claims about a topic
- Providing context to situate the reader and help make sense of sources and evidence
- Summarizing, synthesizing, and using quotations to support claims
- Providing stakes: Why does it matter that you have learned what you have?

A compelling critical reflection will include quotes, paraphrases, or summarizes directly from your work in class and/or the course readings. Other evidence can come from peer feedback, teacher feedback, and tutor feedback. This is your opportunity to describe and reflect on how the work you did in your conference poster and other assignments throughout the quarter relate to your own goals as a writer/researcher/student.

What's important to me is that you are putting in the effort to make a strong argument about your progress *this* term. This means, you should not be copying and pasting writing from your reflection in 109. Refer to specific moments and steps in the writing and reading process from this quarter. If you want to add some information about 109 and connect the two, that's fine, but it should largely talk about this quarter.

Samples

Below are 5 sample critical reflections.

Each varies in length and will demonstrate how different students used the space to establish an argument about their learning and progress. Each sample also contains the comments I made on their reflections when assessing their course finals.

You can also access these samples by going to Files --> Samples --> Course Final(s).

Appendix XXVII

English 281 D: Intermediate Expository Writing

Spring 2023

General Course Information

Course Title	Intermediate Expository Writing
Credits	5
GE Requirements	“C” or “W”
Course Location	Smith Hall, Room 313
Meeting Days & Times	MW 10:30 AM – 12:20 PM

Instructor Name	Hunter C. Little, she/her
Instructor Email	hclittle@uw.edu
Instructor Office	Padelford B-5-A, B-Wing, PL level
Instructor Office Hours	MW 12:30–1:30 PM on Zoom or in person

Tentative Course Reading List

All course readings can be found in this Google Drive folder and are linked on our Canvas modules. This list of readings is tentative which means it is subject to change. Keep your eyes on the course modules and calendar for more information on when and what to read.

- James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric*, Chapter 1
- Margaret Price, *Mad at School*, Chapter 1 excerpts and Chapter 4
- Jay Dolmage, *Disability Rhetoric*, Chapter 1
- M. Remi Yergeau, “Clinically Significant Disturbance”
- Dana Cloud, *Reality Bites,* excerpts
- Jack Selzer, “Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers”
- Brent Henze, “Teaching Genre in Technical and Professional Communication”

- Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi, *Genre and the Performance of Publics*, Introduction
- Margaret Price, “The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain”
- Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility*, Episode #34 on “Intersectionality” with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite
- Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters, *Introduction to Intersectional Qualitative Research*, Chapter 1
- Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley, “Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework”
- Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, Chapter 2
- Max Liboiron, “A Wee Primer on Colonialism”
- Video: “Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done”
- Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research”
- Carrie Mott and Daniel Cockayne, “Citation Matters: Mobilizing the Politics of Citation Toward a Practice of ‘Conscientious Engagement’”
- Sara Ahmed, “Making Feminist Points”
- Janice C. Redish, “What is Information Design?”
- Jared S. Colton and Steven Holmes, “A Social Justice Theory of Active Equality for Technical Communication”

Catalog Description

Writing papers communicating information and opinion to develop accurate, competent, and effective expression.

Course Description

This course has two primary and equally important goals: to hone your skills in rhetorical and analytical awareness and to cultivate your understanding of writing and research. This particular course will achieve this from the perspective of understanding and thinking critically about disability as it is socially and rhetorically constructed though equally embodied.

Because “Rhetoric and composition are social and political” (Cedillo, 2018) this course requires thinking critically about writing, research, and the academy and takes as its theme *mental disability rhetorics and literacy*. By “literacy” I mean gaining knowledge or competence in a particular topic or area of study as well as practicing continual critical thinking about said topic. As we read, we will consider rhetoric’s role in constructing our understanding and perceptions of disability broadly and mental disability specifically, a skill which can be applied to examining the

ways in which other aspects of our worlds are constructed and how we construct worlds through our communication.

Together, we will practice asking questions including but not limited to the following:

- What is rhetoric and what does it mean to be rhetorical?
- Who decides what and who is rhetorically effective?
- What does it mean for something to be “real” or “true” and who decides?
- How does rhetoric contribute to the construction and maintenance of power and oppression?
- What rhetorical influence or presence do you want to have in your own writing?
- Whose truth and reality do you want to remain faithful to in your writing?
- What is ethical research and how can we practice it?
- What is the relationship between rhetoric and ethical research practices?

Alongside engaging with these questions, we will also be entering into a dialogue with each other; this course is necessarily interactive and self-reflective, meaning that we will approach our own writing and that of our peers with the same analytical frame of mind. As such, drafting, revising and reflecting on your rhetorical choices will comprise a significant part of the class. Further, while no course can build in absolutely everything you need to know to write successfully, developing the analytical and compositional skills required to articulate your thinking will benefit you in many of the writing and reading situations you encounter in the future, both inside and outside of school.

While 281 has no formal prerequisite, this is an intermediate writing course, and instructors expect entering students to know how to formulate claims, integrate evidence, demonstrate awareness of audience, and structure coherent sentences, paragraphs and essays. In other words, this course assumes that students have previous experiences in college-level writing (such as ENGL 109/110, 111, 121, or 131 or equivalent), as we will be building on those skills and techniques begun in those introductory courses. With that in mind, this class also takes as a basic assumption that writing is a skill and that, like any skill, it can always be furthered and improved through guided practice and experimentation. We will work to develop, challenge, and enhance the writing skills students already possess into the skills and intuitions necessary for successful writing.

I commit myself to continually supporting you by being available in and outside of class for questions and concerns and being open-minded as we talk about challenging topics and share different perspectives.

Welcome to English 281. I’m looking forward to co-learning with you.

The Syllabus

It is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with the full contents of the syllabus below as well as the assessment agreement. Though some aspects of the syllabus and assessment

agreement will be reviewed collaboratively during the first week of the course, others will be left for you to view on your own. Please be sure to do this early in the quarter.

Course Assignments

Grade Breakdown	
Participation	30%
Weekly Assignments	30%
Final Project and Reflection	40%

- **Peer Reviews**: You will participate in multiple peer review sessions throughout the term to practice writing as a collaborative process. For peer review, you only need to submit a paper draft. Once work is reviewed, you will revise and resubmit. Peer reviews count toward your participation.
- **Weekly assignments**: These assignments will connect the course content (readings) to the various writing skills I aim for you to practice and acquire. They will also allow you to build toward the research project at the end of the quarter.
- **Daily assignments**: These include readings, reading responses, discussion posts, group work, classroom activities, and other minor homework assignments. Keep your eyes on the course modules for more on daily assignments. Daily assignments count toward your participation.
- **Conferences**: You will attend at least one writing conference with me throughout the term during which you will have the opportunity to discuss your progress in the class individually with me. Conferences count toward your participation.
- **Final Revisions and Reflection**: For your final assignment, you will revise your research project according to feedback from peers and me. Finally, you will submit a class reflection of your experience in English 281, what you learned, your research process, etc.

Participation (30% of Final Grade)

This is not a class that will depend on lecture for learning. Please be prepared to be awake and involved in class. Your participation grade is dependent on in-class presence, participation in class discussions, completion of daily assignments, in-class writing and group activities, peer review sessions, and conferences. Participation scores can be enhanced by attending optional class sessions (if they occur), attending office hours or additional conferences, and completing additional peer reviews outside of class time. Multiple and continuous class disruptions can interfere with your participation score as well.

Attendance Policy

Each of you is granted four (4) excused absences before your participation grade becomes affected. Please come to class regularly and try your best to be present in class while you are there. Please communicate with me about your absences and tardiness so that we can work together to ensure you have the information and resources you need to be successful in this course. Communication about absences does not require disclosure of the purpose for your absence. It is your responsibility to contact me or your classmates with questions about missed work or classes. If attendance or participation becomes a concern at any point throughout the quarter, you may contact me via email to address the issue.

Late Work Policy

All deadlines in this course are “rolling.” This means you are given a three-day window to submit your assignment if you would like to receive feedback. For example, if the deadline is Friday and you submit on Tuesday, you will not receive feedback unless you communicate with me. If you submit your work after the third day and would still like feedback, it is your responsibility to contact me about doing so.

If you need more time to complete an assignment, please contact me at hclittle@uw.edu or via your Canvas Inbox feature before the deadline. Please reach out if you are struggling to keep up with the pace of the class. I’m always happy to accommodate students and make revisions to our schedule as needed. All late daily and weekly assignments can be submitted any time before May 26, 2023.

Email Policy

I am unable to accept or respond to emails from email addresses that are not UW affiliated. Thus, make sure you email me directly from your UW email address or the Canvas Inbox feature. I will respond to emails as quickly as I possibly can.

*All emails about grades should be sent using the Canvas Inbox feature.

Technology Policy

There is no strict cell phone or technology policy for this section of English 281. Much of our work in and outside of class will be completed on laptops or mobile devices and submitted online. Though we will use technology often in class, out of respect for yourself, your education, your classmates, and me, I expect you will refrain from using your electronic devices for anything other than our coursework. This mutual respect is imperative for our class as a whole to operate successfully. If your use of technology for purposes other than our class work becomes disruptive, your participation grade can be affected. If you do not have access to a laptop on which you can complete said work, please contact me ASAP at hclittle@uw.edu so that we can make accommodations for you.

Language and Cultural Difference

Christina V. Cedillo states that “Academia tends to show little appreciation for the personal and homegrown communication skills that allow marginalized people to adapt to the material conditions affecting our everyday lives, focusing only on notions of deficit and asking that we leave our identities at the door.”

The ability to communicate in multiple languages, including different varieties of English, is a valuable skill, and you are encouraged to use these linguistic and cultural resources. In any case, the same rhetorical principles apply; consider audience, purpose, and appeals. Consider who you are writing for, why, and in what genre.

Intellectual Property

Intellectual property is a central concern of writing, and we will spend a bit of time working on appropriate methods for integrating others’ ideas within your own writing. At no point should you present others’ words or ideas as your own—that’s plagiarism, and it’s poor form ethically and academically. If you have questions (and you should!), please ask. On a first plagiarism offense, you will be required to attend a mandatory conference with me, then revise and resubmit the work in question, along with a brief report on the changes and their effects, by an agreed-upon deadline. On a second offense, I will have to report it to the College of Arts and Sciences for review.

English Department Statement of Commitment

We at the English department are committed to valuing the lived experiences, embodied knowledges, and scholarship produced by people of color and Indigenous peoples; queer, trans, and disabled people; immigrants and refugees, and other targeted identities who have historically been excluded from sites of knowledge production; denied access to wealth, resources and power; and forced to negotiate multiple interlocking forms of structural and institutional oppression and violence. This commitment emerges from and reflects our shared vision for a just and equitable world that actively affirms and values the humanity of every individual and group. It is this vision that informs our pedagogical practices.

Code of Conduct

We at the English department have a zero-tolerance rule for hate speech. According to the American Bar Association, hate speech is “any speech that offends, threatens, or insults groups, based on race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or other traits.” While this could and does apply to many groups, one of the tenets of this course is that hate speech is a violence, and that these violences do not impact everyone equally. Rather, the force of their impacts is dependent on systems of power. Marginalized communities and people are vulnerable to and impacted by such speech in ways that groups or individuals in power are not. With this in mind, I will specify that I interpret “hate speech” to be any form of speech that targets already vulnerable people/communities. Racism and xenophobia will not be tolerated in

this course, nor will transphobia, homophobia, ableism, classism, or other statements or practices that uphold white supremacy.

Resources for Academic Stress, Counseling, Sexual Trauma, Suicide Prevention, Mental Health Info, Substance Abuse, etc.

*Note: This is not an exhaustive list. In other words, there are many more resources online and within our community that you are able to access. It is my goal to provide my students with some options for seeking help that I am familiar with so you may feel more comfortable doing so.

UW Resources

UW Counseling Center
UW Mental Health Resources
Student Coaching & Care | LiveWell
UW Provided Off-Campus Resources
UW Sexual Assault Resources
UW Student Resources | Community Standards and Student Conduct
Other Resources for Students
UW Resilience Lab
Any Hungry Husky (UW Food Bank)
Husky Health & Well-Being
UW Recreation

Non-University Resources

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute
A Positive Alternative Alcohol and Substance Abuse treatment center
Integrative Counseling Services
Lodestar Therapy
Cardona Counseling
Suicide Prevention Lifeline
National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI)
TalkSpace Mental Health Resource List (PDF)
MentalHealth.Gov
National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
Mental Health Treatment Plans: Templates, Goals, and Objectives
Mental Health America
Mental Health Resources (Mental Health First Aid)
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
Teen Mental Health
Youth.Gov resources list
World Health Organization | Mental Health

Resources for Time Management

UW Academic Support Programs
Time Management Tips
Creating a Weekly Schedule

Q Center

The University of Washington Q Center builds and facilitates queer (gay, lesbian, bisexual, two-spirit, trans, intersex, questioning, same-gender-loving, allies) academic and social community through education, advocacy, and support services to achieve a socially-just campus in which all people are valued. For more information, visit http://depts.washington.edu/qcenter/

Other Important and Useful Resources

Campus Safety

Preventing violence is everyone's responsibility. If you're concerned, tell someone.

- Always call 911 if you or others may be in danger.
- Call 206-685-SAFE (7233) to report non-urgent threats of violence and for referrals to UW counseling and/or safety resources. TTY or VP callers, please call through your preferred relay service.
- Don't walk alone. Campus safety guards can walk with you on campus after dark. Call Husky NightWalk 206-685-WALK (9255).
- Stay connected in an emergency with UW Alert. Register your mobile number to receive instant notification of campus emergencies via text and voice messaging. Sign up online at www.washington.edu/alert.
- For more information visit the SafeCampus website at www.washington.edu/safecampus.

Writing Resources

UW Writing Resources

The Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC) offers 45-minute appointments on any writing assignment ranging from an academic essay to personal statements. You can also schedule an appointment with the above link.

The Center for Learning and Undergraduate Enrichment's Writing Center (CLUE) has writing tutors available from 7 p.m. to 11 p.m. on school nights! They can help with every stage of the writing process to brainstorming to polishing the final draft!

Instructional Center

Staffed by 17 professional instructors and over 100 peer tutors, the Instructional Center provides tutoring and study groups for students in almost every discipline or major. English 109/110 instructors can require visits to the IC for all students; additional visits may be recommended for individual students who need extra help. Student visits are tracked via

computer at the IC, but TAs may also have students fill out and return more specific tutoring forms. In addition to tutoring, special services offered at the IC include: a computer lab, Study Skills Sessions and Assessments, Critical Reading Courses, and various types of Learning Assessments. IC Hours are generally M - F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm. They are working to increase evening and add weekend hours. Check with the IC for up-to-date information: http://depts.washington.edu/ic/

UW Policies

Title IX

The University of Washington carries out the objectives of Title IX through a coordinated system of initiatives, programs, and services that collectively protect educational access, advance gender equity, and prevent and respond to sexual harassment, sexual violence, and gender discrimination. Title IX applies to and protects students, staff, faculty, other academic personnel and visitors at the Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses as well as other sites and programs affiliated with the University.

Title IX, Washington State law, and University of Washington policy prohibit discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, pregnant or parenting status, and LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) identity.

Relevant and Related UW Policies here

Many University policies prohibit and/or outline processes to address sexual misconduct, including sex discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, intimate partner violence, and other sexual misconduct.

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism, or academic dishonesty, is presenting someone else's ideas or writing as your own. In your writing for this class, you are encouraged to refer to other people's thoughts and writing—as long as you cite them. As a matter of policy, any student found to have plagiarized any piece of writing in this class will be reported to the College of Arts and Sciences for review.

Religious Accommodations

Washington state law requires that UW develop a policy for accommodation of student absences or significant hardship due to reasons of faith or conscience, or for organized religious activities. The UW's policy, including more information about how to request an accommodation, is available at Faculty Syllabus Guidelines and Resources. Accommodations must be requested within the first two weeks of this course using the Religious Accommodations Request form available at https://registrar.washington.edu/students/religious-accommodations-request/

Complaints

If you have any concerns about the course or your instructor, please see the instructor about these concerns as soon as possible. If you are not comfortable talking with the instructor or not satisfied with the response that you receive, you may contact the following Expository Writing

Program staff in Padelford A-11: Director Stephanie Kerschbaum, kersch@uw.edu or Assistant Directors Anselma Prihandita, anselmap@uw.edu; Francesca Colonnese, fcolonne@uw.edu; Missy González-Garduño, mimgonz@uw.edu; and Joseph Wilson, jwils@uw.edu. If, after speaking with the Director or Assistant Directors of the EWP, you are still not satisfied with the response you receive, you may contact English Department Chair Anis Bawarshi at bawarshi@uw.edu, (206) 543-2690.

Accommodations

If you need accommodation of any sort, please let me know so that I can work with the UW Disability Resources for Students Office (DRS) to provide what you need. More information about accommodation may be found at http://www.washington.edu/students/drs/.

UW Grading Policy

A 4.0–3.9	96–100%	B- 2.8–2.5	80–83%	D+ 1.4–1.2	67–69%
A- 3.8–3.5	90–95%	C+ 2.4–2.2	77–79%	D 1.1–0.9	64–66%
B+ 3.4–3.2	87–89%	C 2.1–1.9	74–76%	D- 0.8–0.7	60–63%
B 3.1–2.9	84–86%	C- 1.8–1.5	70–73%	E 0.0	< 60%

Appendix XXVIII

English 281 Course Calendar

	In Class	Readings	Assignments Due
Week One			
03/27	Introducing ourselves, the course, and reading strategies	N/A	**(1) Course Introductory Email** due on Friday, March 31 by 11:59 PM **(2) Initial Survey** due on Friday, March 31 by 11:59 PM
03/29	Defining rhetoric Introduction to research study and writing emails	James A. Herrick, *The Theory and History of Rhetoric*, Chapter 1 (25 pages)	
Week Two			
04/03	Discussing disability rhetoric(s) and writing letters	Margaret Price, *Mad at School*, pp. 25–46 (21 pages) Jay Dolmage, *Disability Rhetoric*, Chapter 1 (11 pages)	**Definitions of Rhetoric Email** due on Wednesday, April 5 at 11:59 PM
04/05	Discussing disability rhetoric(s) and truth, reality, and facts	M. Remi Yergeau, “Clinically Significant Disturbance” (15 pages) Dana Cloud, *Reality Bites*, pp. 1–5, 13–16, 24–29, 54–58 (20 pages)	
Week Three			
04/10	Rhetorical analysis and memo writing	Jack Selzer, “Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers” (24 pages)	**Rhetorical Awareness Letter to your Partner** due on Sunday, April 16 by 11:59 PM to both me

		** included Wong and Nibokun and infographic	and your partner (partners will automatically receive the letter under peer reviews)
04/12	Rhetorical analysis	Margaret Price, *Mad at School*, Chapter 4 (35 pages)	
Week Four			
04/17	Genre awareness and analysis	Brent Henze, "Teaching Genre in Technical and Professional Communication," pp. 72–82 (10 pages) Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi, *Genre and the Performance of Publics*, "Introduction," pp. 3–14 (12 pages)	
04/19	Genre analysis and writing proposals	Margaret Price, "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain" (17 pages)	
Week Five			
04/24	Intersectionality, intersectional research methods and methodologies, positionality, and positionality statements Peer Review	Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility* podcast, Episode #34 on "Intersectionality" with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters, *Introduction to Intersectional Qualitative Research*, Chapter 1 (25 pages)	**Draft of Rhetorical Analysis Memo** due on Monday, 04/24 by 10:30 AM (i.e., before class for peer review) **Rhetorical Analysis Memo** due on Wednesday, April 26 by 11:59 PM
04/26	Discussing research frameworks and structure	Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley, "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability	

	Positionality statements	Framework" (17 pages) Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, Chapter 2 (11 pages)	
Week 6			
05/01	Ethical research practices UW library resources	Max Liboiron "A Wee Primer on Colonialism" (4 pages) Video: "Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done" (6 minutes) Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "R-Words: Refusing Research" (22 pages)	**Proposal Draft** due on Friday, May 5 by 11:59 PM Peer review will be asynchronous and will be due on Sunday, May 7 by 11:59 PM **Final Draft of Proposal** due Wednesday, May 10 by 11:59 PM
05/03	Citational politics and proposal peer review	Sara Ahmed, "Making Feminist Points" (blog) Carrie Mott and Daniel Cockayne, "Citation Matters" (18 pages)	
Week Seven			
05/08	Information design, active equality, and designing websites	Janice C. Redish, "What is Information Design?" (4 pages) Jared S. Colton and Steve Holmes, "A Social Justice Theory of Active Equality for Technical Communication" (23 pages)	**Website Sketch** due on Sunday, May 14 by 11:59 PM
05/10	Individual workshopping	Bring a device on which you can work on your website, search for sources, or complete other work for the	

		course.	
Week Eight			
05/15	[No Class: Sign up for Individual Conferences]		**Source Synthesis** due on Friday, May 19 by 11:59 PM
05/17	[No Class: Sign up for Individual Conferences]		
Week Nine			
05/22	Peer workshopping		**Website Draft** due on Monday, May 22 by 10:30 AM
05/24	Final presentations		
Week Ten			
05/29	No Class: Memorial Day		
05/31	Final presentations		
Finals Week			
06/05–06/09	Final Projects are due by 5:00 PM on Wednesday, June 7, 2023 via Canvas		

Appendix XXIX

Assessment Agreement

English 281 D, Spring 2023

Assigning Grades

As per the PWR program policies and my own values as an instructor, no *official* grades will be assigned to your work until the end of the quarter after you've completed the final project and reflection (40%). Each daily assignment, class discussion, group activity, free write, and other small assignments you complete count toward your participation (30%) and will be marked complete/incomplete (see the Syllabus for more information on what is included in your participation grade). All weekly assignments (30%) will be marked complete/incomplete. Thus, although grades will not be assigned, I will be tracking the progress of your writing, the effort you put into the class, and the overall completion of coursework.

Rationale

The reason grades are not assigned until the end of the quarter is to ensure that you are not judged by the skills you possess upon entering the class, but rather the skills you possess at the end of the quarter and how much you have grown from day one. Assigning grades on day one and comparing you to an unspoken standard can be discouraging, though I acknowledge and celebrate the skills, experiences, and tools you bring with you from your past writing and life experience.

Additionally, if at any point you would like to know how you are doing in the class, please do reach out via email or the Canvas in. I'm more than happy to chat about your progress or discuss assignment feedback one-on-one!

Submitting Work

As stated in the syllabus (see Late Policy), all deadlines (unless otherwise specified, such as peer review sessions) in this course are "rolling." This means you are given a three-day window to submit your assignment if you would like to receive feedback. For example, if the deadline is Friday and you submit on Tuesday, you will not receive feedback unless you communicate with me. If you submit your work after the third day and would still like feedback, it is your responsibility to contact me requesting that I do so.

Return Time

All feedback on assignments will be returned to you no later than two weeks after your work is submitted. I am often able to return work within a week of submission and will try my best to do so. As stated above, if you submit an assignment three or more days after the posted deadline, you will not receive feedback on your work unless you reach out to me. All comments on your work are meant to build your writerly confidence and guide you toward a discussion in your final reflection; they are not punitive or corrective.

Types of Comments

Daily Assignments (discussions and discussion posts, note taking, free writes, worksheets, activities, etc.): Comments on daily assignments will be occasional and minimal. That said, if

comments are not provided, it does not mean that I have not read and appreciated the work you have done and the effort you have put into the assignment.

Weekly Assignments: Written feedback will be provided to you for each weekly assignment, typically in the form of marginal and terminal comments unless otherwise requested (e.g., audio comments). The comments will focus on "higher order concerns," such as development of thoughts, organization, depth of analysis, backing up claims, etc. rather than "lower order concerns," such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc. unless you specifically request otherwise.

The reason I do not provide feedback on such lower order concerns is to combat the idea that one must "master" writing in English and challenge the belief in a standard way of writing that is both Eurocentric and oppressive. However, if another instructor is deducting points from your assignments for grammatical errors, I'd be happy to sit down with you and discuss the "errors" they've marked.

Course Final: Minimal feedback will be given on the final project and reflection, but I welcome any questions that arise based on the grade assigned to you at the end of the quarter.

Remember, all written comments left on your work are meant to build writerly confidence and push you toward the discussion in your final reflection; they are meant to encourage you to improve the piece of writing and, thus, your writing skills overall.

Focus of Assessment

Overview

Assessment is mostly based on general completion of the course assignments, observed application of the concepts we discuss and practice, and your active engagement with our course readings during discussions and in your writing assignments. You will also be assessed on overall progress, a thorough final reflection, and observable effort.

With the completion of your first writing assignment, you demonstrate the skills you possess as an experienced writer and, thus, set a goal for yourself to learn and grow as you acknowledge writing as a process rather than a product. When you enter this classroom there is no standard to which I am comparing your work and the only person you are competing with in your writing is yourself.

Grade Breakdown

The starting grade in this course is a 70% which requires completion of all assignments, meeting the minimum requirements. For each assignment that demonstrates exceptional awareness of concepts and skills beyond the minimum requirements and expectations, this percentage will increase. Moreover, if you attend optional conferences or office hours, this will also be taken into consideration as observable effort. For any assignment that fails to meet the minimum requirements and expectations, this percentage will decrease. If the expectations for assignments are unclear, please email me or bring this up in class so we can work together to ensure your success.

My Expectations for You

To demonstrate that you have put an average amount of effort into this course, (i.e., to receive an average grade [C range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all but three daily assignments
- Completion/submission of all but two weekly assignments*
- Completion of all but three free writing exercises
- Occasional, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)
- Attendance and participation in all but one peer review session
- Missing no more than three class sessions (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and thoughtful reflections of your work
- Attendance of one one-on-one conference with me
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

*Consistently submitting work beyond the rolling deadline date can result in deduction of participation points.

To demonstrate that you have put slightly above-average amount of effort into this course (i.e., to receive a slightly above-average grade [B range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all but two daily assignments
- Completion/submission of all but one weekly assignment
- Completion of all but two free writing exercises
- Regular, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)
- Attendance and participation in all but one peer review session
- Missing no more than two class sessions (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and offering thoughtful reflections of your work
- Attendance of one one-on-one conference with me
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

*Consistently submitting work beyond the rolling deadline date can result in deduction of participation points.

To demonstrate that you have put a great or exceptional amount of effort into this course (i.e., to receive an above-average grade [A range]), I expect the following:

- Completion of all daily assignments
- Completion/submission of all weekly assignments within the three-day “rolling” deadline window
- Completion of all free writing exercises demonstrating thoughtful engagement with the prompts/questions
- Frequent, thoughtful contributions to in-class discussion (responding to lectures, readings, activities, discussions, etc.)
- Attendance and participation in all peer review sessions
- Missing no more than one class session (beyond the 4 initial excused absences)
- Completion of your final critical reflection demonstrating an understanding of the course concepts and offering thoughtful reflections of your work and the research project with the addition of a clear reflection of your overall, what aspects of the course you will carry with you, and how the course impacted your views of research in general

- Making an apparent effort to communicate with me if/when necessary (e.g., asking questions or expressing concerns via email or during office hours)
- Attendance of one one-on-one conference with me
- Upholding community guidelines throughout the quarter

Participation Expectations

This course will be rigorous, involving a lot of reading and writing, and I expect you to be *active* participants. I am not the sole contributor to the energy of the room. As in any relationship, our interactions cannot be both one-sided *and* productive. To be successful, I strongly advise that you come to each class with discussions to be had. It's important to remember that you are active agents in your education and contribute a significant amount of energy and effort to your learning. I truly believe you each have something valuable to contribute to our class discussions, and I want you to keep in mind that your peers do as well. Give them your attention when they are speaking, trust that they are listening to you, do the reading, share your thoughts, and write your words.

For more information on participation expectations, see the discussion expectations on Canvas.

Your Expectations for Me

In return for the effort you put into this course, I will hold myself to the following:

- As stated above, all written work will be returned with feedback within two weeks of submission if submitted within the three-day rolling deadline window.
- I will meet with you one-on-one to discuss your writing, any other aspects of the course, or general topics upon request. Just shoot me an email or ask after class
- I will not require an “excuse” for absences, requested extensions, or missed work. It’s not my business unless you *choose* to share it with me. In which case, I will listen and discuss the situation with care.
- I will not deduct points from participation for missing two weeks or fewer of our class sessions.
- I will excuse *one* discussion post and *one* free write at the end of the quarter.
- I will respond to all emails as soon as possible. You will receive email responses within twenty-four hours on days when class is in session.
- If asked a question or called on in class, you will not be penalized for passing or not knowing an answer.
- I will not deduct points if your *initial* drafts of your daily and weekly assignments do not meet the page count or fulfill the prompt. However, they must fulfill the prompt when submitted by the end of the as the end of term (May 26).
- I will not expect you to code switch in order to be successful in my course.
- I will not penalize you for “improper” grammar, syntax, etc. in your written work.
- I will deeply consider changes to course design, assignments, guidelines, etc. if concerns, issues, or suggestions are raised. In other words, I will approach discussions of work overload with grace and consider revising course design if issues arise.

Student Agreement

To demonstrate that you have read and understand the above information regarding grades for our course (English 281), please sign this document (physically or digitally) below and return it to me by 11:59 PM on Monday, April 3, 2023.

Sign Here: _____

Print Name Here: _____

Instructor Use

*Students, you do not need to fill out the following line.

Date Received by Instructor: _____

Appendix XXX

English 281 Reading Rationales

- James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric*, Chapter 1
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical awareness
    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Herrick's text is to provide a brief introduction to the history, field, and definition of rhetoric so as to provide you a starting point from which to explore other definitions of rhetoric and develop your own. Your own understanding and definition of rhetoric is what you will then apply to both your rhetorical awareness letter and rhetorical analysis memo.
- Margaret Price, *Mad at School*, Chapter 1 excerpts and Chapter 4
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical awareness and analysis; critical awareness; attention to power and privilege
    - **Rationale Chapter 1:** The purpose of reading Price's text is to provide another definition of rhetoric so as to provide you a starting point from which to explore other definitions of rhetoric and develop your own. Your own understanding and definition of rhetoric is what you will then apply to both your rhetorical awareness letter and rhetorical analysis memo. Price's text expands your rhetorical literacy alongside your mental disability literacy by defining rhetoric from a disability studies perspective; pairing rhetoric with issues of power; putting into question beliefs about objectivity, reason, and rationality; and asking us to think critically about how discourse and rhetoric contribute to negative perceptions of those who are mentally disabled.
    - **Rationale Chapter 4:** The purpose of reading the fourth chapter of Price's book is to provide you one other example of a rhetorical (discourse) analysis as well as demonstrate the ways in which the language we use about mental disability has very real consequences. Price's analysis offers a structure which you can follow to conduct your own analysis and targets the underlying assumptions and beliefs attached to discourse about mental disability and violence.
- Jay Dolmage, *Disability Rhetoric*, Chapter 1
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical awareness and analysis; critical awareness; attention to power and privilege
    - **Rationale:** In this chapter, Dolmage claims that he "want[s] to make two initial moves to align disability studies and rhetoric. First, [he] want[s] to explore the rhetorical history of the disability studies concept of normativity. Then, [he] want[s] to chart some popular and persistent disability myths." What Dolmage offers us in this course is an examination of disability rhetoric or rhetoric that

informs our definitions, understandings, and relationships to disability and the norm. Within this examination Dolmage poses questions, similar to Yergeau and Price, about the relationship between the body and rhetoricity which leads us to question our own assumptions about disability and capacities to reason. Beyond this, Dolmage offers us an introduction to the workings of disability studies and its goals and emphasizes the social model of disability. As you read, I want you to consider what it means for there to be multiple rhetorics, what it means to speak and write credibly, and what norms you want to construct through your own rhetoric in your writing and research.

- M. Remi Yergeau, “Clinically Significant Disturbance”
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical awareness and analysis; critical awareness; attention to power and privilege
    - **Rationale:** Yergeau’s (they/them) article shows us that valid intellectual work and arguments can be completed in non standard ways. What I want you paying attention to is Yergeau’s style and their explanation of that style. Does this writing (content and style) challenge ideas you have about professional and academic writing? I want you to think about arguments related to humanness, mental disability, and rhetoricity. Think about what Yergeau means when they say “This is my scholarship, and my scholarship is experience, and my experience is the experience of impairment and of relationships with skin and bones and mindless orbs.” What does this mean to you? My hope is that this article helps you think critically about academic definitions of “sense making,” coherence, organization, professionalism, and so forth while also making you question what definitions of those terms you want to put forth in your work and whose realities you want to remain faithful to in your own writing.
- Dana Cloud, *Reality Bites,* excerpts
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical awareness and analysis; critical awareness; attention to power and privilege
    - **Rationale:** In *Reality Bites,* "Cloud critiques the Left's use of uncritical 'fact-checking' as a rhetorically neutral approach. Further, Cloud argues for a new method of judgment for truth claims which she calls rhetorical realism. Rhetorical realism assesses a truth claim's fidelity to epistemic knowledge, which she argues includes both scientific resources and the lived experience of the oppressed and exploited" (Dana L. Cloud). In other words, Cloud is concerned with the ways in which beliefs, experiences, and values shape our understanding of what is true and factual and how those beliefs, experiences, and values contribute to our ability to be influenced by "hard facts." As you read Cloud's text, I want you to continue questioning what it means for something to be real or true and whose reality is represented in those pieces of information we consider to be

true or real. Consider how this understanding of truth and facts may change your relationship to establishing logic or reason within your own arguments.

- Jack Selzer, “Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers”
    - **Skills:** Rhetorical analysis
    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Selzer’s text is to provide you with the background you need to conduct your own rhetorical analysis. Seltzer provides examples of both textual and contextual analyses that will help you in developing your analysis of an artifact related to mental disability. Selzer also provides more information about rhetoric’s history and another definition of rhetoric.
- Brent Henze, “Teaching Genre in Technical and Professional Communication”
    - **Skills:** Genre awareness and analysis
    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading both Henze and Reiff & Bawarshi's text is to expand your rhetorical awareness by introducing you to the complexity of genre and genre theory. Henze focuses specifically on teaching genre as a concept to individuals enrolled in professional and technical communication while applying a rhetorical genre studies lens. Reiff & Bawarshi dive deeper into rhetorical genre studies and theory, asking us to pay closer attention not only to how genres facilitate social actions, but how social action takes place between genres in what they call *uptakes*. Both texts pay close attention to the context-dependency and situatedness of genre performances. An attentiveness to genre theory will allow you to make more conscious and effective decisions about genre and the elements therein. It will also make you more aware that genres are not stable categories but arise out of different social situations thus making you more aware of the relationships that genres respond to and inspire, emphasizing the social nature of writing broadly.
- Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi, *Genre and the Performance of Publics*, Introduction
    - **Skills:** Genre awareness and analysis
    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading both Henze and Reiff & Bawarshi's text is to expand your rhetorical awareness by introducing you to the complexity of genre and genre theory. Henze focuses specifically on teaching genre as a concept to individuals enrolled in professional and technical communication while applying a rhetorical genre studies lens. Reiff & Bawarshi dive deeper into rhetorical genre studies and theory, asking us to pay closer attention not only to how genre facilitate social actions, but how social action takes place between genres in what they call *uptakes*. Both texts pay close attention to the context-dependency and situatedness of genre performances. An attentiveness to genre theory will allow you to make more conscious and effective decisions about genre and the elements therein. It will also make you more aware that genres are not stable

categories but arise out of different social situations thus making you more aware of the relationships that genres respond to and inspire, emphasizing the social nature of writing broadly.

- Margaret Price, “The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain”
    - **Skills:** Genre analysis; research structures
    - **Rationale**: Price’s work expands critical disability studies to look more specifically at mental disability through a feminist materialist perspective. Not only does this text provide deeper insight into disability studies and the importance of including mental disability in conversations about disability, but it also gives you a starting point for analyzing genres (here the academic research article genre). Moreover, this text gives you an understanding of what it looks like to use a research framework or a lens to observe phenomena and make critiques. It’s a structuring mechanism. Frameworks can be those used in particular areas of study or they can be constructed through your own experience and identity. I do not expect you to understand this full text. What I want you to pay attention to is Price’s discussion of mental disability and illness and how she is applying disability frameworks to mental disability. Think about what issues she is bringing to the forefront of disability studies’ focus on breaking down the body/mind binary and acknowledging the bodymind or how the mind and body are always operating together. I want you to consider the issue of disability desire and undesirability that Price discusses. Finally, pay close attention to the structure of the article.
- Alice Wong, *Disability Visibility*, Episode #34 on “Intersectionality” with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite
    - **Skills:** Genre analysis
    - **Rationale:** Reading or listening to Wong’s podcast episode no. 34 introduces you to the framework and concept of intersectionality while providing examples of what it means to think intersectionally about our own subject positions and other’s. Further, Jean-Luc emphasizes how an intersectional approach can be useful in looking at mental disability in Indigenous communities. This concept is important for approaching the questions you ask in your research, engaging with research participants, and for reading the work of your classmates. It is one more demonstration of what it means to use and apply a research framework as well as show you the ways in which academic topics can be translated into more popular texts for the general public to access. This will be important to consider when you are writing your own research project.
- Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters, *Introduction to Intersectional Qualitative Research*, Chapter 1
    - **Skills:** Critical awareness; ethical research

    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Esposito and Evans-Winters text is to expand your understanding of intersectionality which you were introduced to in Alice Wong's podcast. The authors present the history and theory of intersectionality in a way that is accessible and provide tools for examining your own positionality in relation to your research. This will help you develop a positionality statement for your own research projects.

- Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley, "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework"

    - **Skills:** Critical awareness; research frameworks; ethical research; research structures

    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Bailey and Mobley's article is for you to gain background knowledge into the field of disability studies from which studies of mental disability as both social and individual and mental disability *rhetorics* emerged. Bailey and Mobley's article expands on the concept of intersectionality that is introduced in Alice Wong's podcast and Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters chapter. Not only does this article provide background into disability studies broadly, it also demonstrates the importance of an intersectional approach to studying disability and its complexity. Bailey and Mobley provide examples of how to apply a Black feminist disability framework, demonstrating what it means to use and be informed by a framework in your research. By providing these examples, they introduce you to the idea that something like *disability* can be used as a way to critique broader oppressive structures that are, in the simplest terms, *disabling*, oppressive, and exclusionary. This article provides one genre in which information about mental disability can be communicated which we will compare to other genres we engage. Bailey and Mobley explain what disability studies is, what its issues are, what people within the field try to do, and what changes can be made to merge disability studies with other fields. As you read, pay attention to what the goals of disability scholars are, what issues we tend to address, how they are addressed, and what the justification for the presented framework is. Think about what it might look like to use this understanding of disability to "look at" the university or your field of study.

- Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, Chapter 2

    - **Skills**:

    - **Rationale**: Simpson's chapter provides you another example of what a research framework is and looks like as well as provides an example of how our positionality influences how we conduct research and how we determine what "counts" as research. This chapter will center the importance of decolonizing research by bringing to the fore Simpson's own Indigenous theories and epistemologies. Simpson articulates that Indigenous theories do not need

validation from Western institutions to be considered theories in their own right. With this text, I want you to be inspired to challenge solely Western ways of knowing and doing and to expand your view of what counts as and what we value as research. Further, I want you to recognize the harm often caused by research, particularly research conducted with historically marginalized and oppressed communities. In your writing, it's important to be able to demonstrate critical awareness of your own position and values as a researcher within the academic institution. I want you to critically examine the choices you make as a researcher as well as what you deem valid knowledge and research in order to find the tools, methods, and methodologies that are most true to your values.

- Max Liboiron, "A Wee Primer on Colonialism"
    - **Skills:** Ethical research
    - **Rationale:** As with Simpson's text, when you read Liboiron's primer, I want you to recognize the harm often caused by research, particularly research conducted with historically marginalized and oppressed communities. Liboiron emphasizes the colonial roots of research and helps us more deeply understand research's complexity and loaded history. From this place, I want you to be inspired to challenge solely Western ways of knowing and doing and to expand your view of what counts as and what we value as research. In your writing, it's important to be able to demonstrate critical awareness of your own position and values as a researcher within the academic institution. You should consider the ethics of your own research as well as whose interest you want to represent and remain faithful to.
- Video: "Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done"
    - **Skills:** Ethical research
    - **Rationale:** This short video emphasizes the importance of working *with* research participants rather than operating from a position of power, authority, and objectivity that separates the researcher from the participants as an all-knowing source of information. Liboiron makes it clear that working with communities helps science be better because more people are able to participate and create knowledge beyond those who have access to university and government resources. With this information, I want you to approach research with an eye for how you can position yourself to benefit and remain faithful to those whose interests you are invested in. I want you to continue critically examining the choices you make as a researcher as well as what you deem valid knowledge and research in order to find the tools, methods, and methodologies that are most true to your values.
- Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "R-Words: Refusing Research"
    - **Skills:** Ethical research

    - **Rationale:** Similar to Simpson and Liboiron's texts, Tuck and Yang highlight the ways in which the white, Western researcher has *othered* those populations they conduct research with by observing and analyzing those populations through Western lenses and values. As with our previous texts, I want you to consider your own fraught relationship with research as you work through your research project. What does research mean to you? Why does it mean what it means to you? Who does your form of research benefit or disadvantage? What are your values as a researcher? With this text, I want you to continue critically examining the choices you make as a researcher as well as what you deem valid knowledge and research in order to find the tools, methods, and methodologies that are most true to your values.

- Carrie Mott and Daniel Cockayne, "Citation Matters: Mobilizing the Politics of Citation Toward a Practice of 'Conscientious Engagement'"

    - **Skills:** Ethical research

    - **Rationale:** Mott and Cockayne's reading helps us understand that the practice of citation is not neutral and is, rather, a practice that reinforces hierarchies of power. As you search for and synthesize sources, I want you to question who you are citing and why. This text is meant to help you be more self-reflexive and critical about your own choices as a researcher and continues begging the question of who you want to remain faithful to in your research. You will become better at making decisions about who to cite/center and articulating why.

- Sara Ahmed, "Making Feminist Points"

    - **Skills:** Ethical research and citational practices

    - **Rationale:** As with Mott and Cockayne's reading, Ahmed's text helps us understand that the practice of citation is not neutral and is, rather, a practice that reinforces hierarchies of power. As you search for and synthesize sources, I want you to question who you are citing and why. This text is meant to help you be more self-reflexive and critical about your own choices as a researcher and continues begging the question of who you want to remain faithful to in your research. You will become better at making decisions about who to cite/center and articulating why.

- Jared S. Colton and Steven Holmes, "A Social Justice Theory of Active Equality for Technical Communication"

    - **Skills:** Design skills and accessibility in web design

    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Colton and Holmes's article is to demonstrate the need for active forms of equality in your own writing and research. This will not only help you construct more thorough and high-quality work, but will help

you do so with good intentions over time. This text is meant to give you a critical awareness with which to approach design choices.

- Janice C. Redish, “What is Information Design?”
    - **Skills:** Design skills
    - **Rationale:** The purpose of reading Redish’s article is to provide a primer for understanding information design for your websites and to help you make decisions about what steps to take and what to pay attention to in the design process.

Appendix XXXI

Definitions of Rhetoric Email

Deadline

Wednesday, April 5 at 11:59 PM

Format

Like your Introductory Email, your definition of rhetoric email should take the same format and include the same elements which are as follows:

- A short and simple subject
- A positive or neutral greeting
- A statement of purpose (i.e., why you are emailing)
- Further details related to the purpose of the email
- A statement of next steps to be taken (if applicable)
- Closing remarks
- A professional signature

Unlike a traditional email, this email will be quite long because you have to share information not only about the definitions you found but their similarities and differences alongside one another and those we have already discussed.

Your email should be 500+ words.

For a more detailed overview of what it means to write an email, follow this link.

Content

Your email should include the following details as if I have asked you to respond to an initial email with said details:

- At least 2 definitions of rhetoric which you should find from sources other than Google. Google Scholar and UW Libraries are good places to start.
- A comparison of the definitions. What are their similarities and differences?
    - This will require elaboration on and dissection of the definitions. In other words. you'll have to do more than copy/paste the definitions into the email. Compare your definitions to each other and then to those we have discussed in class. See the lesson plans, course readings, and PowerPoints for these definitions.
- An explanation of your own understanding of rhetoric. What does rhetoric mean to you?
- A bibliography entry for each definition. Where did you find the sources? Cite them using your preferred professional citational format and indicate which format you have used.

Writer's Memo

Along with the above contents, please include a brief "Writer's Memo." This memo should include the following:

- What you would like the most feedback on and why
- What you think you did well
- What obstacles you faced while composing and researching

There is no word minimum or maximum for the memo, but think of it as an additional paragraph at the end of your initial email that outlines what the process was like for you. In other words, write in paragraph format. The memo does not count toward the main email's word count.

Submission

Submit your email to me via your UW Outlook/Gmail account or Canvas Inbox

Rationale

The Definitions of Rhetoric email is meant to engage your critical awareness of rhetoric's complexity following our discussions from Herrick, Price, and Cloud. This assignment aims to lead you toward your own understanding and definition of rhetoric by exercising your research skills and supporting claims with reason. This assignment also marks the beginning of our journey discussing complex topics and questioning what may be presented as objective fact (i.e., we typically think of definitions as objective and proof in and of themselves of what a thing is or is not). By looking at various definitions of rhetoric, you'll come to see that our rhetoric or the way we shape information—what we include or omit—has consequences for shaping our reality. You are, in short, examining and reporting on the rhetoric of definitions of rhetoric. Finally, as stated in the rationale for your Introductory Email, formal emails are genres in which you will all be required to write. These emails offer you a low stakes space to practice writing professional emails.

Appendix XXXII

Rhetorical Awareness Letter

Deadline: Sunday, April 16 at 11:59 PM

Rolling Deadline: Wednesday, April 19 at 11:59 PM

Peer Review Deadline: Friday, April 21 at 11:59 PM

Format

All letters should be single-spaced in 11-12 pt Times New Roman or a similarly serifed font.

Your letter should be 1000+ words.

For this assignment, you have the option to write in a personal letter or business letter format. A personal letter typically includes the following:

- Date
- A polite salutation including the recipient's name
- Some niceties (e.g., "I hope you are doing well.")
- An introduction/explanation of why you are writing
- Body paragraphs containing the focal content of the letter
- Closing questions or comments (e.g., "I hope to hear back from you soon"; "What are your thoughts on rhetoric?")
- A complimentary signature/closing (e.g., "Sincerely"; "Yours truly")

A business letter typically includes the following:

- The sender's address*
- Date
- The recipient's address*
- A salutation followed by the professional title and name of the recipient
- An introduction/explanation of why you are writing
- Body paragraphs containing the focal content of the letter
- Closing questions or comments (e.g., thanking someone for their consideration; see also above examples)

The business letter should be fully left aligned and written in block style (do not indent your paragraphs and put one line of space between each paragraph; see the link below for an example).

*You are NOT required or encouraged to include your personal address and information in this letter unless you wish to do so. You also will not know your peer's address, so you can make one up for them and yourself for the purposes of this assignment.

For more information on formatting business letters, follow this link.

Content

Thus far we have discussed many definitions of rhetoric, some of which emphasize its mundanity, universality, and embeddedness in our everyday lives and interactions with more-than-human things and objects.

In a traditional (Aristotelean and Western) sense, rhetorical awareness is a writer's ability to write in response to the feelings, beliefs, and experiences of an intended audience; to follow conventions of genre; and to consider the purpose and stakes of an intentional argument they are making. However important these elements are in our writing, this understanding adopts a narrow view of rhetoric as a tool we employ only when we are choosing to be intentionally persuasive.

Again, although audience, genre, context, purpose, and stakes are important and should be considered in the composition of any text, we should develop rhetorical capacities for composing ethically, critically, and impactfully. Of great importance here is the word "critically," meaning we must compose in a way that is critical of traditional and dominant views of writing and rhetoric by understanding audience, genre, context, purpose, and stakes as always in flux, never stable, and often subtle. That is, we have to abandon Western views of rhetoric as a tight and controlled set of tools.

In this letter, it is important to keep in mind our definitions and discussions of rhetoric as any*thing* that has the potential or capacity to change or influence us in some way. Therefore, rather than demonstrating your awareness of or ability to analyze another persons' intentionally persuasive piece of writing, you will demonstrate an awareness of rhetoric both as something we naturally do in sharing information and as something happening all around us. In other words, you will demonstrate your attentiveness to rhetoric in your everyday interactions with people, places, spaces, and things (the material world).

In short, I want you to pay attention to the everyday and more-than-human things induce or inspire change in action, thought, or emotion throughout your day.

For example, sidewalks are rhetorical because they communicate information about where to walk and so, they influence our behavior, persuading us that there is an appropriate place to walk. Similarly, a tree in our path persuades us to. move around it simply by being there and the rain can convince us to take shelter. It is these subtle forms of rhetoric I want you to pay attention to as you formulate your letter to your peer partner.

Once you have submitted, your letter will be sent to your peer partner to respond to. Your completion of this assignment requires you to respond to your assigned peers' letter via Canvas peer reviews.

You will also submit a Writer's Memo. Your memo should include the following:

- What would you like the most feedback on
- What did you do well in this assignment
- What obstacles did you face while composing this letter

- Name one or two rhetorical choices you made and why you made them (e.g., tone, organization, punctuation, syntax, etc.)

There is no word minimum or maximum for the Writer's Memo and it does not count toward the word count for the letter itself. You can submit it as a separate document if necessary.e

Submission

Submit your letter via Canvas. Please submit a Word Doc or Google Doc link. Title your submission using your last name. For example, Little_RALetter

Rationale

The Rhetorical Awareness Letter gives you the opportunity to demonstrate your attention to the definitions of rhetoric we have engaged in the course thus far. It allows you to practice paying attention to rhetoric in a way that develops the critical lens through which you examine the rhetoric of other individuals' work. This assignment asks you to be aware of the minuscule things and moments in which you are moved to thought, feeling, or action. By doing so, you are recognizing the power not only of the words and other symbol systems you interact with, but those that you use. In other words, this assignment enhances your rhetorical awareness by asking you to recognize the rhetoric of the things around you as well as your own rhetoric as you move through space and time and interact with other rhetorical beings. In short, through this assignment you will gain necessary analytical and rhetorical awareness skills that build knowledge and provide an opportunity to practice reporting on knowledge you have discovered. Finally, letters are not an outdated form of communication and may be necessary for you to write at some point in your professional career. They also closely resemble emails. This assignment gives you the opportunity to write in yet one more genre that will benefit you on your professional and scholarly journeys.

Resources

Sample letters for formatting (Purdue OWL)

Sample letters for formatting (Foster School of Business). These letters relate specifically to cover letters, but maintain the same general structure.

Purdue OWL Business Letters Page

Purdue OWL Personal Letters Page

Appendix XXXIII

Rhetorical Analysis Memo

Deadline: Wednesday, April 26 at 11:59 PM

Draft for Peer Review: Monday, April 24 at 10:30 AM

Format

This assignment will be formatted as a business memo. Your memo should be 1000+ words, single-spaced, and in 11-12pt Times New Roman or another easily legible serif or sans serif font (e.g., Arial, Calibri, Cambria, Garamond, Helvetica, etc.).

A memo includes all of the following:

- A header
    - TO includes the names and titles of everyone who will receive your memo (e.g., Ms. Hunter Little as this will be addressed to me)
    - FROM includes your complete name and title (e.g., Hunter Little, M.F.A.)
    - DATE includes a *complete* date (including the year)
    - SUBJECT includes a brief description of what the memo will be about (e.g., Rhetorical Analysis of NAMI Resources for Mental Health and Well-Being)
- The full message
    - The introduction explains the overall purpose of the memo
    - The body addresses the required information (i.e., your actual analysis)
    - The conclusion provides a summary of the memo and recommendations or suggestions moving forward

For more information on what to include in a memo, follow this link to the Purdue OWL "Parts of a Memo" webpage.

A memo's body is formatted using headings. Under each heading should be paragraphs that articulate single points or ideas. See the sample memo

For ideas on how to approach organization. Click here for the Purdue OWL sample memo.

What to Do

A rhetorical analysis is “The identification and evaluation of key components of a text (such as tone, context, audience, style, central argument, appeals, evidence, reliability) to demonstrate your understanding and assessment of the author’s composition choices; the text’s context, inner workings, and effects; and how successful a text is at achieving its goals” (W/T/M, pp. 121). For this assignment, you will identify and evaluate the key components of a text of your choosing as long as the text relates in some way to the discussions we have been having about mental disability, health, and illness.

Content

As stated above, your analysis should include identification and examinations/evaluations of the key rhetorical components of a text related to mental disability, health, or illness. This text can include an article, blog post, Instagram post or reel, Tweets, a news report, a YouTube video, a song, a movie, and any other text that mentions mental disability, health, or illness.

You may use the questions below to guide you through you analysis or you can focus on the elements listed in the sample memo provided above. Paying close attention to Price's and Selzer's texts will also be beneficial. Remember to (1) make a claim, (2) provide evidence, (3) explain and elaborate on the evidence (i.e., analyze it), (4) articulate (if applicable) the underlying assumptions embedded in the rhetorical choice, and (5) restate your claim in connection with the evidence and analysis you have provided.

*Note, you do not need to respond to all of the questions below. These questions are meant to guide you if you are struggling to determine what to pay attention to in your chosen text.

1. What is the purpose of this argument? What does it hope to achieve? How do you know?
2. Who is the audience for this argument? Who is ignored or excluded?
3. What appeals or techniques do the argument use—emotional, logical, ethical?
4. What type of argument is it, and how does the genre affect the argument?
5. Who is making the argument? What are their credentials? Are they a credible source for this argument? How does it make the writer or creator seem trustworthy (or untrustworthy)?
6. What authorities does the argument rely on or appeal to?
7. What facts, reasoning, and evidence are used in the argument? How are they presented?
8. What claims does the argument make? What issues are raised—or ignored or evaded?
9. What are the contexts—social, political, historical, cultural—for this argument? Whose interests does it serve? Who gains or loses by it?
10. How is the argument organized or arranged? What media does the argument use and how effectively?
11. How does the language or style of the argument persuade an audience?
12. Are you, the analyst, being thorough in providing evidence for the claims you are making about the purpose or devices being used in the piece?

When answering these questions, try to show *how* the key devices in an argument actually make it succeed or fail. Always explain "why" and provide evidence.

Cite your analyzed artifact using the citation format for your major discipline or that with which you are most comfortable.

Writer's Memo

Along with the above contents, please include a brief "Writer's Memo." This memo should include the following:

- What would you like the most feedback on and why?
- What did you do well?
- What obstacles did you face while composing and researching?
- What are one or two rhetorical choices you made and why did you make them? (e.g., tone, organization, punctuation, syntax, etc.)
- Which pieces of knowledge about mental disability will you carry forward?
- When do you think this information will be useful for you?

There is not word minimum or maximum for the memo, but think of it as an additional paragraph at the end of your initial email that outlines what the process was like for you. In other words, write in paragraph format. The memo does not count toward the main email's word count.

Submission

Submit your Memo below as a Google Doc link or Word Doc file.

Rationale

Conducting a rhetorical analysis requires that you practice the rhetorical, audience, and genre awareness skills necessary to be an effective communicator in a variety of contexts. It also enables you to think and look more critically and closely at the work of others to identify the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and motivations that inform their rhetorical choices. This memo allows you to demonstrate and deepen your understanding of rhetoric as well as demonstrate your ability to think critically about representations of mental illness and other socially constructed identity categories. Further, this assignment allows you to demonstrate your ability to identify key components of a text that influence audience engagement and interpretation. Through your analysis, you will more deeply engage conversations of mental health, disability, and illness to maintain a literacy in the topic of mental disability. Finally, you are asked to write a memo as a result of this being a genre in which you might be asked to write in the future. Transfer studies identify composing in a number of public genres to be effective in inspiring the transfer of content knowledge. Writing in a variety of genres also makes it more likely that knowledge about a particular topic will transfer from one situation to the next in that genres are typically employed in specific social situations.

Appendix XXXIV

Project Proposal

Deadline: Draft due Wednesday, May 3
Final Due: Friday, May 5

Format

Your proposal should be written in the business proposal format including a title, table of contents, executive summary, a *problem*, *objectives, solutions, methods,* and *costs*. What to include under each of these sections is outlined below. Though you can use creative agency to organize, format, and decorate your proposal, you should be sure to use headings and an easily readable font. Your heading style should be distinct from the body of the text.

Content

As stated in the website prompt, you should write about a topic inspired from *any* of our course readings and discussions. Your topic can be loosely or explicitly connected to our readings and discussions, but you must be able to identify and argue for that connection.

Executive summary: Summarize the contents of the information in your proposal. Make it clear what you will be presenting to the audience.

Problem: Think of this as the identification of your topic or research question. What are you writing about? What is it's connection to our course readings?

Objectives: Share your goals and motivations, what inspired your choice of topic, what you want to achieve, and what you hope to resolve in your research.

Solution: Though you know that your deliverable will be a website that examines a topic, I want you to include the following in your "solutions" section:

- Describe whether you are developing an explicit argument or generally trying to inform an audience. Tell me why.
- Explain what conclusions you anticipate you will come to. This may change, but it's good to think forward.
- Tell me when and where the information you are going to present will be useful to you in the future.

Methods: Tell me what steps you will take to produce your website and offer a timeline of when you will complete each necessary task. Include the following as well:

- What do you need to know to complete the research project?
- What research skills do you possess that will help you achieve your goals?
- What resources are available to you and which ones will you use?
- Who will assist you in the research process or who will you reach out to for assistance if needed?

Costs: Share what the anticipated limitations of your research are as well as what obstacles you anticipate you might face. In addition, explain the stakes of the project: what will be lost if this information is not presented to your intended audience? Who are you wanting to benefit or inform? Then, share what other possibilities you considered for your research topic?

Writer's Memo

- What would you like the most feedback on and why?
- What do you think you did well?
- What was most challenging when completing this assignment?

Rationale

The Project Proposal acts as the foundational scaffolding for your final project in the course. This assignment gives you the opportunity to "sell" your research project idea to me. It also allows me to determine you are on track to develop a successful research project at the end of the course. Writing a proposal allows you to hone your rhetorical, genre, and audience awareness skills by asking you to write to a particular audience in a professional tone and style while conforming to genre conventions. It may also, in its allowance for creative agency, enable you to challenge genre conventions in ways that other genres we have engaged do not. Further, this assignment asks you to do some preliminary research by looking back at the content we have covered this term to determine what topic you want to explore; in other words, it asks you to partake in the process of invention that is necessary for any writing task. Proposals are common genres in business and marketing; thus, this gives you one more opportunity to practice writing business genres in a low-stakes environment.

Appendix XXXV

Website Sketch

Deadline TBD

Instructions

On paper or digitally, develop a “sketch” of your website’s structure. I want to see what you will include and where. This includes tabs, images, blocks of text, sections, etc. You can use Ginny Redish’s text as a guide for making these decisions by using the following questions:

1) What do you want to achieve?
2) Who will use it?
3) How will they use it?
4) Where will they use it?
5) What information do they need?
6) What information should come first?
7) What needs to be most readily available for readers?
8) What will readers do with the information?

This sketch can be rough, but I want to see that you are imagining sections—and particularly tabs—for your website that are logical for you and your readers. This may be an assignment that takes multiple hand-written pages or that involves you screen recording a thinking process as you play around with Weebly. Regardless, you should be, to some degree, working through the Weebly interface, moving things around, and envisioning the organizational elements of your website.

Writer’s Memo

- What obstacles did you face as you constructed this sketch?
- What sections did you consider including that you did not?
- Why are you including the sections you are including?
- What are the different rhetorical choices you are making? How are they right for your audience?

Rationale

The purpose of asking you to complete this sketch is to outline your website in the same way you would use a traditional outline for structuring an academic research paper. It provides a foundation from which you can build your website.

Appendix XXXVI

Source Synthesis

Your source synthesis is exactly as it sounds: a synthesis of your sources for the website you are producing. To synthesize is to summarize “two or more texts and [forge] connections between them to support [a]...claim of your own” (Writer/Thinker/Maker, 210). This is the practice of intertextuality which is showing the relationship between texts and the ideas of others and yourself.

Instructions

To synthesize your sources, you’ll want to do the following:

1. Consider your purpose. What do you want to do or say in response to the reading(s)?
2. Summarize the work from which your argument or claim stems but be concise.
3. Ask some of the following questions:
    a. How does the claim of one text support, contribute to, challenge, and/or complicate your reading of another?
    b. How do the texts create a body of knowledge, new way of understanding an issue, or complex debate?
    c. Are there ways in which the texts contradict each other or leave significant questions unanswered?
    d. These questions will help you orient yourself toward a synthesis, toward creating a conversation between two or more texts and including your own ideas.
4. Explain why the connections you’ve made matter, to whom, etc. (here, it might be worth it to imagine an audience)
5. Establish your own position in relation to the connections you’ve made. Expand on the ideas of others and insert some of your own thoughts. Your position should be iterated.

This assignment will require summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting as well as using parenthetical citations. I want to see that you are putting your sources into conversation with one another by making their ideas clear to the imagined audience for your website. Typically, in a synthesis, you will present the author and title of the source you are talking about, summarize its contents, quote and paraphrase the most relevant information, and then connect that information to the next text you introduce. You would then end with your own claim resulting from the conversation between the texts you have presented. You can also think of this as a literature review.

Appendix XXXVII

Website Assignment

Instructions

Using Weebly, you will construct a website consisting of at least 1750 words, three separate webpages within the site, and three outside, scholarly sources. You are welcome to use our course readings as source material, but will need three *additional* scholarly sources as well. Beyond this, you are welcome to use any popular or primary sources that support your claims. You will not be assessed based on the aesthetics of your website, but on whether it conforms to website and research genre conventions. This will require rhetorical awareness and genre analysis skills to be utilized in the construction of your website.

For this assignment, you are asked to write about a topic inspired from *any* of our course readings and discussions. Your topic can be loosely or explicitly connected to our readings and discussions, but you must be able to identify and argue for that connection.

This does not mean you are restricted to writing about the most obvious choice (i.e., mental disability, illness, or health) —though you are welcome to do so—but thinking deeply about our class discussions, readings, and assignments to select a topic that matters to you.

For example, you might choose to write about or analyze rhetorical claims to objectivity in the sciences or the histories of business genres. You might write generally about the over-reliance on facts within the general population or within a specific field of study. You may also think about writing in relation to ethical research practices, inclusion and intersectionality, or colonialism in a specific discipline (e.g., what ethical practices are engaged in the marketing field or how do people in the marketing field practice inclusion and intersectionality). You might also consider writing about community engagement in research or Indigenous theories and where they present themselves in the Pacific Northwest. These are only suggestions to spark ideas.

In short, you have many options, and I encourage you to be creative in selecting your topic rather than feeling restricted to the most obvious options. As long as *you* can identify the connection for me, then you have a topic we can work with.

Rationale

Websites are a common genre in which individuals or groups present information and promote businesses or organizations. This assignment asks you to employ your rhetorical awareness skills to construct a website that both conforms to genre conventions and appeals to a particular audience. Further, you are given the opportunity to practice your research skills which includes but is not limited to presenting a topic, finding and analyzing sources, synthesizing ideas, and joining in a scholarly conversation to come to educated conclusions. Writing in public, real-world genres has also proven to be an effective way to inspire the transfer of writing and other content

knowledge. Thus, constructing a research project in a public genre increases the number of possibilities you can imagine for presenting information that may initially feel contained within the classroom.

Appendix XXXVIII

Final Critical Class Reflection

Deadline: Wednesday, June 7, 2023 by 5:00 PM (Pacific)

*Note: This deadline is not negotiable.

Submission

Submit your reflection as a Word Doc, Google Doc link, or PDF file. Label your file as follows: LastName_FinalReflection

Format

- 1000+ words
- Standard paragraph format
- 11 or 12 pt Times New Roman, Calibri, Arial, Garamond, or other readable serif or sans serif font
- Page numbers
- 1" margins
- You are welcome to be creative and creative cover pages, use colorful headings, write your reflection as a letter, etc. Check in with me if you have questions about how you want to design this work.

Content

Following your final presentations and peer review, you will make necessary revisions to your website and develop a critical reflection in which you reflect on your experiences in the course including but not limited to the course readings, your writing experience and process, the production of your website, the class environment, and your future writing goals.

To complete the critical reflection, ask yourself questions such as:

- What did I learn about writing and communication this quarter?
- How did my research process change or stay the same through the term?
- When/where/how did I demonstrate engagement with research and composition?
- What rhetorical awareness skills did I demonstrate and where?
- How does my work demonstrate strong reading, research, and writing practice?
- How did my understandings of writing, research, or other class concepts change/shift/grow?
- What course readings helped me make decisions about my work?
- What was my experience constructing a website like? What new skills did I gain?

- Where might the skills I've learned and practiced this term be useful for me in the future?
- What are my future writing goals?
- What are the three most important things I want to carry forward from this class?
- Why does it matter that you have learned to apply certain research and writing outcomes in your writing?
- How will this help you in your future classes? Your major? Your career?
- How do you see the work you've done this quarter translating to other situations, either in or out of school?
- What still needs improvement?
- How will you continue to improve?

You should offer evidence from your work to show how you approached these questions in a specific context and why this contributed to your thinking and writing in this piece. You should also mention how concepts demonstrated in the readings present themselves in your work or how they will be carried into your future research.

Keep in mind that these reflections are pieces of argumentative writing. Your argument should center on what you believe are the most important aspects of your work in this class and how that work shows your progress. Your evidence for these claims will be your own work from the quarter. Thus, you should be applying the same writing strategies to your reflection that we have discussed in class and put into practice throughout the quarter, including:

- Presenting and defending your claims about a topic
- Providing context to situate the reader and help make sense of sources and evidence
- Summarizing, synthesizing, and using quotations to support claims
- Providing stakes: Why does it matter that you have learned what you have?

A compelling critical reflection will include quotes, paraphrases, or summaries directly from your work in class and/or the course readings. Other evidence can come from peer feedback, teacher feedback, and tutor feedback. This is your opportunity to describe and reflect on how the work you did in your website and other assignments throughout the quarter relate to your own goals as a writer/researcher/student.

What's important to me is that you are putting in the effort to make a strong argument about your progress and learning this term.

Samples

Below are 5 sample critical reflections.

Each varies in length and will demonstrate how different students used the space to establish an argument about their learning and progress. Each sample also contains the comments I made on their reflections when assessing their course finals. Note that these critical reflections are from 100-level courses, so the expectations for your are higher.

You can also access these samples by going to Files --> Samples.

Appendix XXXIX

Herrick, The Theory and History of Rhetoric, Chapter 1

1. How have you understood rhetoric in the past?
2. How does Herrick define rhetoric? What are some of the different definitions he provides?
3. Is persuasion always negative or negatively manipulative? Does persuasion have to be explicit?
4. How broad is the term *persuasion*?
5. What does Herrick mean when he says “human beings are rhetorical beings”? (p. 6)
6. What is a symbol? Why does this matter for rhetoric? (p. 6)
7. Can nonhuman things perform rhetoric or be persuasive or convincing? Is so, is rhetoric always planned, adapted to an audience, and responsive?
8. Herrick notes that “Rhetorical discourse forges links between the rhetor’s views and those of an audience” (p. 11). What if an audience does not share your views at all? What if you and the intended audience hold an antagonistic relationship? How do you present information to them?
9. What is the connection between rhetoric and psychology? (p. 11)
10. What is at issue in the following definition: “[R]hetoric applies to contingent and probably matters which are subjects of actual or possible disagreement by serious people, and which permit alternative beliefs, values, and positions” (Bitzer qtd. on p. 16)?
11. Who do we or you consider or imagine as part of an audience when you are writing? Who is included or excluded? Who do you want to include or exclude? And what expectations do we have of audiences?
12. Why should we ask the questions posed by Herrick on p. 19?
13. What is the relationship between rhetoric and truth / rhetoric and knowledge? (p. 21)

All

1. What does disability studies (DS) do? (Dolmage, p. 20; Price, p. 29)

Price, Mad at School, Chapter 1

1. How does Price define rhetoric?
2. In what ways is rhetoric a “persuasive endeavor”? What does it mean to you for something to be persuasive?
3. What are the rhetorical consequences of stereotypes and stigma associated with mental disability? (p. 26)
4. What do you think Price means when she says “Rhetoric is not simply the words we speak or write or sign, nor is it simply what we look like or sound like. It is who we are, and beyond that, it is *who we are allowed to be*”? (p. 27).
5. What is *mythos*? Why does it matter in our writing? (p. 31)
6. What is the relationship between reason and emotion? (p. 32)
7. What do you think Price means when she says “Our practice [in the classroom] continues to circulate around the imperatives to diagnose, cure, contain, or expel the

mad subject"? (p. 32–33) and how are prejudices toward mentally disabled students perpetuated in the classroom? (p. 40)
8. What harm can be caused by claims to objectivity? And how are claims to objectivity rhetorical? How is the seemingly objective still rhetorical?
9. If some speakers are less likely to be listened to, how important do you think it is to speak or write with the goal of persuading an audience?

Dolmage, Disability Rhetoric

1. What stood out to you as interesting or confusing? Why?
2. What does Dolmage mean when he talks about the rhetorical *use* of disability? (p. 20, 26)
3. What are ableism and disablism? (p. 21)
4. What is the connection between bodily ideals and "proper" speech and writing? (p. 24)
5. What does Dolmage mean when he says "To norm is to employ a logic of negation"? (p. 29)
6. How do we expand the available means of persuasion by examining concepts like *norms* and *disability*?
7. Can we change norms and ideals? If so, how?
8. How can you challenge or reify norms in your own writing and research?

Yergeau, Clinically Significant Disturbance

1. Who do you believe the intended audience of this reading is? Why do you think that? What elements or content of the reading tell you this?
2. What questions does Yergeau raise about professionalism and appropriateness in both the academy, workplace, and academic writing?
3. What emotion or energies would you attach to the tone of this piece? Why?
4. What did you think of the style? What was it like reading something written in this style? What does Yergeau say about the style of the article?
5. What arguments is Yergeau making about reason and rhetoricity? How do these arguments echo Price's?

Cloud, Reality Bites

1. What is rhetorical realism? (p. 15).
2. What does it mean for knowledge to be collective and social rather than individual? (p. 26)
3. What is truthiness? Consider a few examples of what truthiness looks like or where you see it in everyday life.
4. How is rhetoric involved in conveying or creating scientific truths? Provide an example of what this might look like in science (existing or hypothetical)
5. In what ways is science not an objective field of study? Do you agree or disagree with Cloud's claims about science's subjectivity?

6. Can we perceive objects in the world directly and accurately? Why or why not?
7. What does it mean for facts to be “produced”? Does Cloud believe that there are pure facts? How does rhetoric play into this?
8. Cloud writes that "My view is that one can regard ideological discourses as truths, but then ask, whose truths are they? Are they fitting for ordinary people?" (p. 15). Who are these 'ordinary people"? What and who defines "ordinary"? And what are the lived conditions and experiences that make someone fall under the “ordinary” category?
9. Why do we need to consider the construction of truth and facts when we are composing our own work?

Selzer, "Rhetorical Analysis"

- When have you conducted an analysis before? What steps did you take?
- How does Selzer define *rhetoric*?
- How does Selzer define *rhetorical analysis*?
- What are the two types of rhetorical analysis and how are they the same or different?
- What are some symbolic actions we want to pay attention to in our analyses that are not *language-based*?

Wong and Nibokun, "Black Mental Health" and Black LGBTQ+ Mental Health Infographic

- What issues is Nibokun bringing to light?
- On page 5, Nibokun and Wong are talking about who needs to be “the experts” in the mental health system. What do you think about their proposal of who those experts should be?
- What are some of Nibokun’s proposals for change? (p. 4 & 6)
- How are the infographic and podcast speaking to one another?
- What are some of the rhetorical choices Nibokun and Wong are making throughout the podcast? What is their impact?
- What are some of the rhetorical choices made in the production of the infographic? What is the impact?

Price, Mad at School, Chapter 4

- What is Price doing? What are her goals (which she states multiple times)?
- What risk do we run when we engage the kinds of articles Price is analyzing without a critical lens? (p. 151)
- What is the structure of Price's analysis? What does she include when she is analyzing the rhetoric of headlines and news stories about mental disability and violence? (see p. 146-159)
- According to Selzer, would this be a textual or content analysis? Why?

Henze, Teaching Genre in Professional and Technical Communication, p. 72–82

- What is a *generic situation*?
- What are *genre rules* or *conventions*?

- What are *genre constraints*? What can they do? (p. 79)
- What is a *genre*?
- Tell me about the social elements of genre. What do genres do socially?
    - What does it mean for genres to be part of a system?
    - What informs rhetorical choices and genre choices?
- Henze notes that "We wants students ot see that all communications are *context specific*: arising in a specific place, at a specific moment, motivated by particular conditions" (p. 81). What does he mean by this? How does it relate to genre?
- What do we need to consider first when approaching a writing task?

Reiff and Bawarshi, Introduction: From Genre Turn to Public Turn, p. 3–14

- What are *genre performances*?
- What are *uptakes*? (p. 11) why does uptake matter when thinking about genres?
- What does Hauser mean when he says "our understanding of reality is a function of how we talk and write about it"? (p. 6) What does this tell us about our speech and writing?
- How do genres construct publics or facilitate public life?
    - What is meant when Reiff and Bawarshi say that definitions of genres need to "move to a more dynamic definition of how genres' formal features 'are connected to social purposes and to ways of being and knowing in relationship to these purposes'"? (p. 8)
- How do genres "simultaneously work to reproduce and reinforce power relations within and between individuals and social organizations"? (p. 8)
- How do material conditions or factors influence genre performances?

Price, "The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain"

- Summarize what you believe to be the main idea of the reading and why.
- Share some key terms from the reading and why they matter or how they are important within the reading. For example, what is *bodymind*? What is *misfitting*?
- Tell us what you liked or disliked about the reading and why
- Ask some questions. Rather than just listing a few questions, you will want to articulate a little bit about why you feel they are relevant or why you want them to be answered.
- How is Price breaking down her information? What sections does she use and why might that be?
- What are some of the rhetorical features of the article? What is convincing, influential, or persuasive? Which elements change your thoughts, feelings, or actions?
- What situation is this genre responding to?
- What relationships is the genre building?
- Which elements in the text are determined by the genre and genre conventions?

Alice Wong with Sandy Ho and Jean-Luc Pierite

- What stood as salient to you in this podcast?
- How would you, using your own words, describe intersectionality?

- What relationships between identify and power are fronted here?
- Why is Jean-Luc's experience a strong example of intersectionality?
- How does intersectionality matter for your own writing and research?
- Why does community matter for disabled people?
- What is accessibility to you?
- What disability myths are being countered in this podcast?

Jennifer Esposito and Venus Evans-Winters

- Based on this reading, how would you define *intersectionality*?
- How would you define *reflexivity*?
- What does it mean to conduct intersectional research?
- How do you see intersectionality being applied as a methodology or analytical framework for research in your major discipline field? Or in quantitative research broadly?
    - As Esposito and Evans-Winters ask: "How might one's lived experiences shape our research questions?...How might an intersectional perspective inform research reflexivity or how we understand the role of personal taste, biases, struggles, identities, and privilege in the research process?" (12)
- What does Audre Lorde mean when she writes "For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change"? (12)
- What do you think the authors mean when they write "we challenge the assumption that researchers only have something to give or take from participants"? (13). What is the harm in viewing the researcher as a "giver" or "savior" of sorts?
- What is the issue with the researcher being seen as an expert on a community being studied and receiving praise for said research?
- What differences do you notice between this genre and the podcast on intersectionality?

Moya Bailey and Izetta A. Mobley

- What is a research framework?
- What is a Black feminist disability studies approach/framework to research?
- How would you define disability studies based on this text?
- What disability studies or disability perception issues are Bailey and Mobley presenting?
- Share some key terms from the reading and why they matter or how they are important within the reading
- What solutions do Bailey and Mobley propose for the issues they are presenting?
- What would you say the genre conventions for this text are?
- What is the general structure of the text?
- What differences do you notice between this genre, the podcast, and the chapter on intersectionality?

Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*

- What did you think about the reading generally? Did you like it? Dislike it? Why?
- What did you learn or what do you want to carry with you from this chapter?
- What keywords would you associate with Indigenous theory and research?
- What connections can/have you made between this chapter and other texts we have read?
- What is the role of the body in Indigenous theory? How are our bodies part of our research?
- Do you consider this text to be "academic"? Why or why not?
- For what reasons do you think it is necessary and needed to combat or counter Western theories and research and to step outside of the "academic" realm to conduct research?
- What is the role of refusal in Indigenous theory? How do you feel about this?
- What do *you* value in research? How will you go about fronting those values in your research methods and practices?
- What questions remain for you? What terms would you like to define together?

Max Liboiron "A Wee Primer on Colonialism"

- What is colonialism?
- What is the relationship between Land and colonialism?
- What is the distinction between Land and land?
- What is epistemology?
- Why does understanding colonialism in relation to research matter for *your* research?

Video: "Dr. Max Liboiron is changing how science is done"

- What does Liboiron mean when they say "all research, no matter what, has values"?
- What is "open access science"?
    - How can we make research accessible for everyone?
- What does Liboiron mean when they say "everybody's a researcher" and "everyone knows more than we do"?
- What is the role of community in Liboiron's research?
    - How can you more deeply consider community and community questions in your research?
- What are some of the research methods and methodologies with which CLEAR lab operates?
- What is feminist standpoint theory?

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "R-Words: Refusing Research"

- Why is research a "dirty word" for many Native communities, particularly in social science research?
- Break down one or more of the axioms. What are their main ideas?
- What is the problem with pain narratives and damage-centered research?
- What does it mean for the researcher to be animated by or constituted through the

voices on the margins?
- What is refusal as conceptualized by Tuck and Yang?
    - What might it look like to practice refusal in your own research?
    - What might refusal look like in largely secondary research?
- What do they mean when they say “the right to conquer is intimately connected to the right to know”?
- What do you think of the note that “the academy as an apparatus of settler colonial knowledge already domesticates, denies, and dominates other forms of knowledge. It too refuses. It sets limits, but disguises itself as limitless”? (235)
- Further, what do you think it means for some “forms of knowledge [to be] better off without the scientific stamp of model citizen knowledge”? (237)

Sara Ahmed, Making Feminist Points

- What do you think it means for citation or citational practices to be a “rather successful reproductive technology”?
    - What do citational practices do or have the power to do?
    - What do you think it means for citational practices to reproduce worlds around certain bodies?
- In what ways is discomfort productive? Similarly, in what ways is complaint productive?
    - What does it mean to be so comfortable you don’t notice?
    - What does citation have to do with “being heard”?
    - What does it mean to question “who appears” or who does not appear in academic spaces?
- What is a feminist killjoy?
- What does it mean that “Sometimes we have to take the risk of fulfilling the fantasies other people have of us!”? Do you agree or disagree?
- What do you want to or think we should take away from this reading and into our citational practice, our searching for sources, or citing of scholarly work?

Mott and Cockayne, Conscientious Engagement

- For Mott & Cockayne, what do people believe citation does or represents about the scholar cited? and, consequently, what does citation *do* (speaking more to their main argument)?
- What does citing a particular text in a peer-reviewed, scholarly article *tell* the reader?
- How do we risk reproducing these logics in the way we have been taught to evaluate sources for our own writing?
- What are Mott & Cockayne advocating for in this work?
- What is at stake in their work?
- What thoughts do you have about their rationale and discussion of their own positionality on pp. 956–7?
- How does citation produce an image of the assumed researcher?
- How can we begin to think more critically about our citations? How can you, in your research projects, try to counter these cycles of citational practices that are damaging?
- How does their claim about the voices of the non-white being filtered through a white lens relate to our readings from Monday by Tuck and Yang? (959)
- How does this expand or challenge your understanding of what it means for a source to be "reliable" or "trustworthy"?

- How does citation impact other aspects of people's lives (e.g., salary)? (961)
- What is a counter logic and how can citation act as one?

Redish, "What is information design?"

- What are the broad and narrow definitions of information design? How do they work together?
- What does it mean to create a document that works for its users?
- What do users do when they interact with a text?
- What do you need to know to develop a successful document?
- What does the best presentation of information require?
- What is plain language?
- What do you need to do to develop a successful website?
- What is the first step in the information design process?
- How well do you think Redish's text conforms to her information design suggestions?

Colton and Holmes, "A social justice theory of active equality for technical communication"

- What is the stated purpose of this article?
- What is social justice in technical communication?
- What is social justice to Ranciére?
- What is *passive equality*?
    - What's at issue with passive equality for Colton and Holmes?
- What is *active equality*?
- What are partitions of the sensible? Why do they matter for technical communication?
- What political ideologies do they claim undergird most of technical communication? And what issue do they take with these approaches?
- Why is a political framework necessary for this work?
- How can we use the theory of active equality in our own writing and research? Particularly in the production of your website?

Appendix XL

Course Learning Outcomes

1. To demonstrate an awareness of the strategies that writers use in different writing contexts.
    a. The writing employs style, tone, and conventions appropriate to the demands of a particular genre and situation.
    b. The writer is able to demonstrate the ability to write for different audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university classroom.
    c. The writing has a clear understanding of its audience, and various aspects of the writing (mode of inquiry, content, structure, appeals, tone, sentences, and word choice) address and are strategically pitched to that audience.
    d. The writer articulates and assesses the effects of his or her writing choices.

2. To read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and incorporate multiple kinds of evidence purposefully in order to generate and support writing.
    a. The writing demonstrates an understanding of the course texts as necessary for the purpose at hand.
    b. Course texts are used in strategic, focused ways (for example: summarized, cited, applied, challenged, re-contextualized) to support the goals of the writing.
    c. The writing is intertextual, meaning that a “conversation” between texts and ideas is created in support of the writer’s goals.
    d. The writer is able to utilize multiple kinds of evidence gathered from various sources (primary and secondary – for example, library research, interviews, questionnaires, observations, cultural artifacts) in order to support writing goals.
    e. The writing demonstrates responsible use of the MLA (or other appropriate) system of documenting sources.

3. To produce complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts.
    a. The argument is appropriately complex, based in a claim that emerges from and explores a line of inquiry.
    b. The stakes of the argument, why what is being argued matters, are articulated and persuasive.
    c. The argument involves analysis, which is the close scrutiny and examination of evidence and assumptions in support of a larger set of ideas.
    d. The argument is persuasive, taking into consideration counterclaims and multiple points of view as it generates its own perspective and position.
    e. The argument utilizes a clear organizational strategy and effective transitions that develop its line of inquiry.

4. To develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing.
    a. The writing demonstrates substantial and successful revision.
    b. The writing responds to substantive issues raised by the instructor and peers.
    c. Errors of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics are proofread and edited so as not to interfere with reading and understanding the writing.