In Dialogue

Collaborative Reading and Writing

Maha Bali
The American University in Cairo

Ashley S. Boyd
Washington State University

Remi Kalir
University of Colorado Denver

This issue's In Dialogue presents reflections by Maha Bali, Ashley S. Boyd, and Remi Kalir on the histories and futures of collaborative reading and writing in education research, teaching, and service. Together, the participants examine the tensions between individual and collaborative conceptions of literacy, the transformative potential of writing collaboratively across cultural difference, and the role that collaborative writing can play as a means of inspiring students to critique power and strive toward more equitable futures.

In its multivocality, this dialogue weaves a "living dialogic thread" (Bakhtin, 1982), an intricate tapestry of ideas. In a mirroring of format and content, the authors composed individual reflections and commented on one another's reflections in a shared Google document. By displaying the original reflections alongside the collaborative digital annotations, we strive to illustrate the ways annotation can facilitate collaborative reading and writing. In rendering visible the often invisible processes of shared inquiry, we elucidate the shape of collaborative meaning-making as ideas emerge, and as voices merge, coalesce into, enrich, extend, and complicate one another in conversational communion. Through this experimentation with form, we seek to *trans*form our shared conceptions of knowledge construction as inherently collaborative, continually evolving, and ultimately transformative practices. Our aim, then, is to illuminate our ways of knowing; in tracing these threads of thought in their emergence and dispersal, we might expose the finer mechanisms by which we come to know what we know.

As Remi Kalir writes, collaboration is "improvisational; it invites reflective inquiry both in the moment and of the moment." In its melodic expressions, in its syncopated harmonizations, this conversation illuminates an interplay of voices interweaving into a synergistic symphony. As we, the RTE editorial team, sound the opening notes, we express our gratitude to our participants for their thoughtful engagement in this dialogue.

We also invite readers to contribute annotations to the ongoing conversation with a free Hypothesis account (https://web.hypothes.is/start/). Create an account, add Hypothesis to your web browser, then access this article at https://ncte.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/RTE-Nov22-InDialogue.pdf where you can read annotations and add your comments.

—Ruth Li, Naitnaphit Limlamai, and Michelle Sprouse

RTE: What histories of collaborative reading and writing are most important for the field of English to understand?

Maha: I'm not in the field of English myself, but I've taught English, and I teach in English, and I think one of the key things I've noticed about students who grew up in Egypt, especially those who have had an Egyptian education, is that they don't have a good foundation in writing altogether, let alone collaborative writing. They also have very little experience with reading. When you write in your nonnative language, when you've been taught to write for grammatical correctness and accuracy rather than for expression, writing itself is not enjoyable. Bringing collaboration into a space such as this may not be welcome.[1] So, for me, as a teacher in my context, I find it important to spend time helping students learn to write to express themselves freely before I ask them to work together on writing. Reading is also something a lot of Egyptians grew up with as an academic and not a leisurely pursuit. When students read my syllabus and collaboratively annotate it (something I learned from Remi!), they are surprised by how much they enjoy it. When we do collaborative annotations of readings, students enjoy reading each other's thoughts. Before the technology of collaborative annotation, it was rare that people would read together that closely; it might be possible for one or two to do it together, but not an entire class.

1

Remi: As you suggest, Maha, it may not be an expected or routine practice. This is a useful reminder to not presume that schooling, or literacy education specifically, is by default a collaborative experience for many students. Personal histories with formal learning may contradict an invitation to read and write with peers. I agree with you that it's very important to honor cultural and personal ways of knowing, and then—as educators—help craft low-stakes opportunities (like syllabus annotation!) for students to first participate in new ways of writing in community.

Maha: I also remembered something I may not have mentioned before: there are schooling cultures where collaboration is considered a violation of academic integrity. It makes me sad and angry that rather than encouraging and nurturing collaboration, some educational systems instead discourage and criminalize it. What's more, in a higher ed context, people worry about sharing their work lest others plagiarize it. And they worry for good reason. Sometimes graduate students' supervisors take their work and publish it under their own names, removing the students' name from their research.

Ashley: I also really appreciate the focus here on students' cultures and the traditions of writing in which they were socialized. I would love to hear more about annotating a syllabus! This sounds like a great way "in" to this sort of work.

Maha: Here is a video Remi and I recorded about Annotate the Syllabus, and it has links to other stuff he has written about it. My students absolutely love doing this, and it gives me so much insight into their first impres-

I'm thinking about how collaborative writing was before Google documents[2] existed, and I remember cowriting papers with my colleagues as an undergrad, each having to do our part and email it, or else sit next to each other and write together. There was no elegant way to give comments or suggestions on each other's work, no protocol for politely editing one another's work. And before email, I guess people had to fax or snail-mail things to each other and wait. Or they just worked with someone while they were physically close to each other. But I think sitting and writing in the same space influences how our thinking goes, and that having a lag between writing our part and having someone else read it and respond in itself can alter our thinking.

Ashley: I think it's important to think about socialization and schooling in the histories of reading and writing. In the United States, I believe reading is often taught as a very technical skill, and here I'm thinking of Street's (1984) "autonomous" versus "ideological" models of literacy. In the former, literacy is treated as one set of skills that can be transferred to any discipline area or context. In the latter, literacy is treated according to the context in which it occurs and is seen as a social practice. Despite the great work of scholars in the

sions of the course, what they care about, what confuses them, what they might be able to offer to help other people with their learning: https://onehe.org/eu-activity/annotate-the-syllabus/

Remi: I should mention that the idea of annotating a syllabus has been around for a long time. I've become a very vocal advocate of the practice by curating resources and educator responses via #AnnotatedSyllabus. And, Maha, your invitation to share my practice with new audiences was humbling and helped me think about this strategy in new ways—including, now, its relevance to collaborative reading and writing practices.

2

Ashley: This is really making me think about the affordances of technology and maybe even the results of the pandemic. We've been forced into online collaborative spaces that I think can be really beneficial (which speaks to the next question). It seems like we're finding more creative and equitable ways, especially with online tools, to write, give feedback, meet, and revise.

Maha: Yes! I was so frustrated during my PhD dissertation-writing (I did my PhD remotely, so I was mostly communicating with my supervisor via email) with having to send documents back and forth . . . and that annoying feeling a few days after you've hit *send* and you want to add a couple of new things to the document, but it's a Word attachment and you can't anymore. Now with Google Docs, you can keep editing anytime, and the person reading can give you feedback as they read (not after they've finished).

I also remember when Google Docs did not have "suggest" mode (like "track changes" in Word) and how frustrating it was to coauthor with large groups, with people editing over each other and finding your words erased and such.

Even with current tech, there is often unspoken "etiquette." For example, when we

field, I still think the majority see literacy as an individual practice and reading/writing in these isolated ways.[3] This history is crucial to keep in mind as we think about collaborative reading and writing, because such approaches challenge us to see literacy as something that occurs also outside of (and between) individuals. The push to discern literacies as collaborative has opened valuable doors.

Remi: Inside classrooms, practices of collaborative reading and writing easily encompass a range of formal disciplinary routines. Our students mark up their mentor texts, whether poetry or policy. They provide feedback to peers. Sticky notes—one of the most accessible and malleable tools for thought—tether easily to books, walls, and digital spaces. It is likely that our personal histories of reading with friends and writing alongside classmates have been subsequently iterated, in some form, within today's literacy classrooms. In my assessment, however, histories of collaborative reading and writing are most notable outside[4] of school. We know, as literacy educators and researchers, that texts have social lives and legacies.

do open peer review in the journal *Hybrid Pedagogy*, we ask authors never to resolve a comment until we as reviewers have seen the edit the author has made—so we can keep track of changes they've made and resolve the comments ourselves. I got used to that, then noticed some people I coauthor with resolving comments without checking back with me (the person who wrote the comment), and it annoyed me a lot . . . until I realized we had not explicitly discussed that as a process or norm.

I still think, though, that some people are not able to "write" feedback with warmth and empathy even when they are able to do so orally, and it's maybe a skill set or literacy we can nurture.

3

Remi: Yes, I agree, Ashley. There's resonance here with dominant perceptions of literacy (and learning, more broadly) as quantifiable, confined within a student's mind, and valued as an individual cognitive achievement that is largely disembodied and disconnected from sociocultural realities. The so-called grammar of schooling hasn't helped to expand the study and pedagogy of literacy as reflecting the messiness of everyday life. How have you helped other educators to shift their dispositions toward embracing the social life of literacy practices?

4

Ashley: This is really pushing me to think of "in school" and "out of school" literacies and arguments that we need to do a better job of bringing those outside literacies to the classroom. Are we encouraged to be more collaborative outside but more competitive within?

Maha: Great point. Also, so much of what we encourage in school goes against what would be useful for people in life . . . things like discouraging collaboration on homework, when you want people in real life to work together!

As with the Talmud, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, The Combahee River Collective Statement, and the AIDS Memorial Quilt,[5] to name but a few. These texts were—and remain—social media, circulating alternative narratives and documenting dignity. These texts were—and continue to function as—civic media, recording resistance and encouraging collective action. Communities of conscience have, for many years, composed texts of wisdom in response to the sociopolitical needs of their time. It is, therefore, our responsibility to help learners access and curate a lineage of collaboratively authored texts that resonate across eras[6] and prompt critical readings of the world.

5

Maha: This is all so interesting to me and I did not know of these histories—would love to know more about them beyond the fact that they were communally written or annotated. . . . I see that both you, Remi, and Ashley connected collaborative reading/writing to noneducational settings, and that seems so important: literacy is not for the classroom, it's for being able to do something in authentic settings—and now I reflect on what I've written and it's so focused on educational settings!

6

Maha: And the writing itself occurs across eras, and I wonder what that means, as the ways we write and the ways we look at the world change over time. You mentioned the Talmud. I don't know enough about it, but I do know that in Islamic thought, interpretation changes over time, to reflect the realities of the time, and I wonder what such a conversion over decades and centuries would look like, how comprehensible it would be (to a lay person) without historical and social context. It also makes me reflect on smaller acts of collaborative annotation within the classroom and how we can build students' consciousness/awareness of how the histories and cultures within us influence how we approach a text and how we socially construct knowledge together from our different identities.

Remi: Yes indeed, Maha, interpretation does—and it must!—change over time. In reference to the Talmud, as well as other Jewish texts, digital resources like Sefaria (https://www.sefaria.org/) help make those ongoing conversations and commentaries much more accessible to a wide range of people today. And that's also, as you note, a great connection to our classrooms. We can help our students appreciate the ways in which their notes join others and accumulate over time, how annotation can speak to the proximal and also timeless concerns of certain groups, and how these growing conversations are useful references and resources for learning.

RTE: What does collaborative reading and writing mean for the future of literacy learning?

Maha: I feel like collaborative writing is its own literacy, something beyond learning to write, because it involves a process of negotiation, of melding voices together, and sometimes the technology that facilitates the technical processes of writing together hides the underlying human relationships and thoughts and feelings that occur behind the scenes[7] in collaborative writing. With every collaborative writing relationship, we need to establish our ways of working together and how we behave if we disagree on something, how we integrate our separate selves into one coherent piece that a separate party can read and benefit from.

I was a computer science undergraduate, and I'm remembering the process of coauthoring computer programs and that no one taught us the literacy of coauthoring—how different it is to write a program with someone else (where they can continue our work where we left off), the kinds of things we need to make explicit when working with one another, and the benefit of learning how another person thinks along the way.

7

Remi: I am heartened, Maha, to imagine a future of literacy learning that privileges disciplinary practices—and sincere relationships—over technical processes. Yes, the tools that make collaborative writing possible, alongside the practices that consequently emerge, are mutually supportive and generative of new learning arrangements. Perhaps a first step toward learning "for, through, and with" peers (to paraphrase the lovely quote from Bakhtin, 1982) is to make explicit the many possibilities and complexities of this unfamiliar, yet rewarding, literacy.

Maha: Yes. I see how well-designed and well-facilitated collaborative reading and writing can bring students such joy. I also see how when it is poorly prepared, it can be awkward at best, painful at worst. I read recently in adrienne maree brown's *Emergent Strategy* (2017) the phrase "less prep, more presence," and although I think preparation is important, learning to be present in the moment of collaboration is essential—both for us as teachers as we watch our students collaborate and also for collaborators themselves as they focus on being present with one another in the moment of collaboration. I'm here with you, and I turned my attention away for a moment to be present with my child who just lost her first molar—at 1:16 in the morning! When we collaborate asynchronously, what does it mean to be "present" with each other?

Remi: I'm smiling behind this comment, Maha ;)

My initial contributions to our writing, and my subsequent commentary, have been inconsistent and scattered. Potty-training a toddler and COVID quarantine are (surprise!) circumstances that disrupt long stretches of undisturbed writing, amid all the many

When done well, collaborative writing can be a transformative experience, and we should brace ourselves for how we can be changed by it. I love this quote from Bakhtin: "I am conscious of myself and become myself only while revealing myself for another, through another, and with the help of another. . . . I cannot manage without another,[8] I cannot become myself without another" (1984, p. 287). I guess when we write alone, we can still be transformed by the effect of the writing on whoever reads it, but when we write together, especially with someone culturally different from ourselves, who has a style different from ours, it is more than just two or three or more people writing. If we build trust and make ourselves vulnerable, we can do so much more together than we can each do alone, but no one tells us that. It's not a literacy we are taught or that we reflect upon. When we have to read or write with another person, there are power dynamics that we cannot ignore, and which I discuss later.

I remember years ago borrowing a book from my PhD supervisor and being distracted by his annotations. I automatically assumed that this person, who was more knowledgeable than I, knew what was most important in this piece I was reading, and his annotations influenced mine. I think the same can happen when we annotate collaboratively. Another person who is more powerful by position or personality may have annotated ahead of us, and their annotations can

other challenges of the moment. And yet, despite distraction, I've carried the questions guiding this dialogue, as well as snippets of our various responses, in my mind while exercising and running errands. Then—when a moment of calm emerges—here I am, reconnecting with you through our marginalia, adding another trace of presence.

Maha: I laughed out loud reading this, remembering my child's potty-training days. I, too, learned to carry thoughts around in my head and let them percolate while caring for my young child. (It's physical work until a certain age, and your mind can wander productively while doing stuff! When children get older, they require more mental and emotional "presence" than physical effort, and you can't do that as often.)

8
Ashley: I just love this quote. Thank you for sharing it! I find the conversations I have when writing collaboratively push my thinking and challenge me in the best ways. As you said, this type of writing is its own sort of literacy practice and one that, I think, we learn and adapt as we interact in different configurations with others. Is my collaborative writing with a graduate student different from writing with a senior colleague? How do I learn from each of those?

Maha: Oh wow, yes, that is a great question. I think when Bakhtin wrote this (and I don't have the full context of the quote) he must have been aware of power differences and dynamics, but the quote doesn't address that. While the quote points to interdependence and openness to growth with others, when we are collaborating with more or less powerful/dominant others, how does that influence how we are changed and how they are changed? How do we influence positive change, where the person who changes has agency (can we really control how we change?), rather than forced/forcible change (often unconscious for both the

influence the way we approach a piece and read it. When we encourage students to annotate, how do we encourage them to bring their own lens and also benefit from seeing other people's perspectives?[9]

more dominant and the less dominant person)? Of course, when writing involves more than one person, there is more complexity, and there is intersectionality (e.g., female cisgender/heterosexual professor of color with white male LGBTQ student).

9

Remi: Annotation makes thinking visible. Our students can benefit from reading other readers' rough-draft thinking as it appears on the page. And yet, as educators, we must also encourage reader response that includes uncertainty, contextualization, and critique—whether of other readers or the author.

Maha: Oh yes, definitely that. There's so much value in creating spaces where learners feel safe to express unfinished thoughts and uncertainty. And again, how do we first lay the groundwork for this before they jump in, and how do we respond in the moment when someone makes themselves extremely vulnerable? A student of mine admitted in one of his recent annotations to being an orphan. In an Egyptian private university such as mine, most students are upper-middle-class and privileged. This student somehow felt safe enough to express this in a public annotation. (Actually, I created a group for the class annotation but he posted his publicly. Some of them do.) I don't think I created that environment; it must have been previous experiences that gave him courage to express this, something which is really difficult to share in an Egyptian context.

   The element of critiquing authors is also important, but I think it's important when critiquing openly to try to imagine ourselves facing the author, making eye contact, as we critique them.

Ashley: I like this idea of thinking of the "person" when annotating. It seems so easy to critique, and I think our students are quick to do that. How do we teach and practice

the skills of response with an eye toward the humanity of the writer and the intention of growth and learning?

Maha: I wonder if framing it as peer review, feedback, or critique gives students an impression of negativity, rather than framing it as a response to the author, in which case we're humanizing the author and opening up for any kind of response, not necessarily one that criticizes. I do think some North American notions of "critical thinking," though not intentionally, promote a kind of antagonism—what Richard Paul calls "weak sense critical thinking," where you focus on the technicalities of building a convincing argument and using logic, etc. Whereas more feminist and non-Western notions of criticality can have an element of openness to other people's points of view, trying to see the other person's view empathetically before we analyze and unpack it (Belenky et al. 1986 in *Women's Ways of Knowing*; Edward Said's philological hermeneutics (see Nixon, 2006), Martha Nussbaum's (1997) "narrative imagination"), and also connecting our critique to the wider social world, being willing to have not only our opinion but also our worldview changed ("Strong Sense critical thinking," according to Richard Paul, 1994). In all of this, the point you made about the "person" is a reminder also of the intersectional identity and positionality of the person. When a person responds to another's writing, we don't always know who that person is, where they've been, where they're going. In a double-blind peer review, when a reviewer suggests a modification, we usually don't know who they are or why they said so. As a peer reviewer, I often will insert elements of myself, such as "I am a critical-interpretive researcher, and so my take on this is . . ." or "As a postcolonial person, I believe that . . ." or "I have a computer science background, and so . . ."

What I love about a space like a Google document is how we can have a back and forth over time. It's not one person writing a big thing and the other person writing a big response and that's the end of the relationship. This conversational nature in itself draws out parts of our humanity. It allows us to make ourselves vulnerable if we feel safe doing so. :)

Does it matter who got to the annotation first?[10] What is the power inherent in annotating earlier, and what are the benefits of annotating later?[11] How much more deeply can we go with collaborative reading when it becomes an iterative process and we keep coming back to engage with the annotations of others?

10

Remi: Maybe? Maybe not? Who knows! I wrestle with this question as, in all likelihood, the author and their friends and the text's editor probably annotated drafts well before a public readership marked up the manuscript. The presumed authority and "final word" of a text is, in my opinion, really just an invitation to keep the conversation going ;)

Maha: Of course, yes! Sometimes I wish parts of those processes were kept transparent for us. I wonder if some journals do that? Oh wait, we're doing it now! I wonder how it will look when published.

11

Remi: Annotation is not a neutral practice. The addition of notes to texts is always fraught with presence, authority, relevance, and—yes—time. If a reader is annotating a text with others, however they manage their engagement over time, it's my hope there's a shared commitment to enhancing the social life of the text and its meaning. Doing so, I hope, can help diminish potentially harmful collaborative writing outcomes.

Maha: I used to borrow texts from my PhD supervisor and found myself automatically prioritizing the sections he had highlighted. He was my authority, so I assumed what he had highlighted must be important. At some stage in my educational experience, we didn't buy our own books and borrowed them from school. We were asked not to annotate them and to return them "clean," except for some English literature books we could annotate and take with us into an open-book exam. I don't really understand why my school did this textbook-borrowing thing, because it wasn't for economic reasons. But the problem is, I didn't get experience annotating at all while in high school (apart from the literature books), so I think I never got into the habit of annotating my science or math books, for example!

Ashley: I think collaborative reading and writing in the future will be expanded and more widely accepted, especially due to the technology afforded us today. And, as the pandemic has shown, we can collaborate in virtual platforms in ever-changing ways. Multiple minds working at once (or on the same piece) means we can reach, perhaps, new understandings and ideas.[12] I can think of numerous examples where working with colleagues has allowed us to build on one another and come up with a concept, conclusion, or model that perhaps none of us individually would have reached. To me, that's the beauty of collaboration and what I love about it!

 I'm reminded in this response of a conversation I witnessed in my department several years ago. Folks were debating if a single-authored book should "count" for more than a co-authored piece, some arguing that it's more difficult to write alone. I was appalled. I find collaborative writing to be much more time-consuming—writing, exchanging, providing comments, and revising are all part of that process. However, I find it much more rewarding and valuable as a writer.

Remi: We three are writing, together, at a moment when book banning is in vogue and state legislatures are curtailing curricula and critical inquiry. Across America, partisan efforts have delimited whose truths and narratives are welcomed—much less

12
Remi: I'm glad you included "perhaps" here. Depending on the day, my hope and skepticism fluctuate. Social media, for instance, bring many people and multiple minds together, though the terms of engagement are inequitable, the harms are very real, and new understandings can be contested (or are just wrong!). Then again, educators and designers and organizers are creating amazing opportunities for people (including many youth) and their tools and their passions to combine in wonderfully creative ways, sparking new narratives and social futures. So yes, Ashley, perhaps.

honored—in schools, with material and embodied consequences for our students, colleagues, and communities. We cannot ignore the fact that laws prohibiting the teaching of accurate history, or legislation banning transgender youth from playing on a team, are pernicious forms of coauthored[13] writing. Accordingly, I believe stakeholders in literacy education have a moral obligation to amplify the ways in which collaborative reading and writing do occur in service of more just social and educational futures (e.g., Mirra & Garcia, 2020). Collaborative reading can include the study of inequality and the celebration of imagination. Collaborative writing, especially in the context of learners' multimodal composition, can critique power and envision possibility (i.e., Watson & Beymer, 2019).[14] These forms of collaborative literacy can guide learners to fact-check misinformation or share their counternarratives on TikTok. Such collaboration should also be attuned to *literacies of dissent,* which, according to Kate Pahl and Zanib Rasool (2020), are "inherently dialogic, creative, and disruptive; indeed, they are rooted in a disruptive approach to the production of knowledge" (p. 51). How will we support learners in collaboratively reading and writing together to disrupt conventional knowledge, share their stories, and traverse more equitable literacy futures?

13

Ashley: Oh wow! So true. I appreciate you pointing out this side of collaborative writing.

Remi: Given how many states in America are legislating hate, these examples sit heavily on my heart. And my hope is that students can identify such examples of policy and law as collaborative writing so that, through their own civic imagination and collective innovation, they respond with writing that is more inclusive and just.

14

Maha: Yes. So much this. I think we often get swept away into celebrating imagination and possibility without recognizing the hard work of dealing with inequality within the collaborative reading/writing process *itself*, not only its outcomes. What would happen if we had a situation where white supremacists and Indigenous and Black people were writing something together? Even if it was not a political text but children in a school? What would happen if they read a piece together and collaboratively highlighted how they each saw it, what it meant to them? How much would people be willing to reveal? In my part, I talked about how collaboration can be transformative if we build trust and allow ourselves to become vulnerable, but when there are such huge power differences and histories of violence, how do we ask marginalized groups to take the risk of making themselves vulnerable? Is that even an ethical thing to ask? Who is "we" here?

Remi: Perceptions of an inclusive "we," the boundaries of which are often set by those in power, must necessarily be troubled in light of lived experience and social reality. The collaborative reading and writing processes which I mention often occur within affinity groups and can be social, yet need not be public. Much is gained from private group activity, with written products—like

statements or manifestos—perhaps shared openly with broader publics. Because you're right, Maha: It is both unethical and an unnecessary risk to ask people with less institutional or social power to coordinate (much less collaborate!) with those whose privilege can be harmful.

RTE: How do you envision the futures of collaboration in education research, teaching, or service? What might the futures of collaboration look or feel like?

Maha: I think we need to talk about power here and the hard work that goes into collaboration in unequal relationships, how we deal with conflict, how we preserve voice or create a cacophony of voices that doesn't erase who we are as individuals or distort some voices[15] toward the more dominant views or styles or approaches to writing.

Writing across borders has become so much smoother now; it can mean finding a kindred spirit who lives thousands of miles away, with whom we have no shared context, with whom we do not compete for anything. But it can also mean cowriting with someone so culturally different that our norms and approaches to collaboration need to be made more explicit, and to be revised over time as our relationships grow. There are also schools of thought that believe in cultural differences in our approaches to writing, and that writing and thought are intertwined, which I realize now may

15
Remi: These tensions related to power raise questions for me too, Maha: How might consensus about a writing topic or process limit productive conflict? How might necessary dissonance lead to new writing opportunities, and can that also distort (as you note) voices and a coherent narrative?

mean that collaborative writing with someone from a very different culture can produce a new hybrid culture of writing that changes the way we each think[16] and creates some completely new modes of expression. But only if we are careful about the power dynamics here. I have written with males who dominate the writing process, and I have written with native speakers who seek to change the way I express myself. I've also been the dominant voice in many of my coauthored pieces—such as when I've written collaborative autoethnography with students, and when I've written with less experienced colleagues.

Ashley: I think the futures of collaboration in education research, teaching, and service must authentically incorporate communities,[17] and by this I mean local, national, and global, and beyond just those in traditional academics. I think first of our work (and especially research) being in the service of others. What do local communities need? What do they need to know? And, as a result, how can we help them answer those questions or get them what they need? Many literacy projects have done such work already (thinking about participatory action research with youth,[18] etc.) but I think we have a ways to go. If we aren't engaging in research that helps our communities, I worry we are continuing the navel-gazing in the ivory tower of the past that has been so well-critiqued.

16

Remi: And how does this also echo pedagogical goals that we might have as educators for—and with—our students? I'm reminded of Kris Gutiérrez's (2014) "syncretic" approaches to literacy learning, and the blending of seemingly oppositional perspectives into something new, hybrid, and of significance to learners.

17

Maha: I love this because it's a look at how the future of education and research in general could/should go, an aspirational future . . . not just of reading/writing.

18

Maha: Participatory research is so essential to me as a non-colonizing approach to constructing knowledge . . . and to being useful. I'm interested in your use of "with youth" rather than "among youth" or "by youth." I wonder if our roles as academics is to help nurture those skills of participatory reading, writing, and research while students are in our institutions, such that when they conduct their research or lives outside of our institutions, they can take those values and attitudes and apply them, without the need to call upon us to intervene or support.

Remi: In reading your questions, Maha, I'm now curious: How, as educators, should we model collaborative approaches to reading and writing as both a social and scholarly responsibility?

I imagine, for example, a group of parents who want to read books their kids encounter in school, or a collective of teachers who want to develop a social justice mission statement at their school. How might we be instruments to assist in this? How could we employ the resources from the university to help—without imposing, of course, but having been solicited.[19] How do we create structures where we can be invited for such projects, where entities reach out to the university? These are the sorts of collaborations I'd love to see. I think they combine research, teaching, and service in interesting and exciting ways.

Remi: Whether with research, teaching and learning, or service, it is customary to coordinate. When coordinating, roles are assigned. Responsibilities delegated. Shared activity is organized for convenience so as to reduce friction and maximize efficiency. Classroom management is coordination, as are many assessment routines. Collaboration, on the other hand, is messy and emergent—quite like our writing together! To collaborate with others is to accept that conflict is likely, negotiation necessary, and critique a welcome part of the process (indeed, ask any teacher who has collaboratively written and revised a class constitution with students!). Seldom is it appropriate to question the terms of coordination, rewrite the script, and change an anticipated outcome. Collaboration, alternatively,

19

Maha: This is so important—to recognize we may not be needed, to not impose. How do we create spaces where we can be available if needed, but not impose our authority as more knowledgeable?

is more improvisational; it invites reflective inquiry both in the moment and of the moment. I hope, as literacy educators and researchers, that our future collaborative labor is enacted in service of learners and their thriving, as well as in service of communities and their civic priorities. In this respect, collaborative processes in our classrooms—and across institutional and academic boundaries—must be multivocal, critical of power, and receptive to dissent. So what might the futures of collaboration feel like within our learning environments? Privileging empathy over ego. Attending to care as curricula. And, as my dear colleague Manuel Espinoza, and his coauthors, have suggested (2020), designing pedagogy and policy that affirms learners' dignity and meaningful participation in educational communities.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M. (1982). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). Toward a reworking of the Dostoevsky book (1961). In C. Emerson (Ed.), *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Trans.), 283–302. University of Minnesota Press.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind* (Vol. 15). Basic books.

brown, a. m. (2017). *Emergent strategy: Shaping change, changing worlds.* AK Press.

Espinoza, M. L., Vossoughi, S., Rose, M., & Poza, L. E. (2020). Matters of participation: Notes on the study of dignity and learning. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *27*(4), 325–347.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2014). Syncretic approaches to literacy learning: Leveraging horizontal knowledge and expertise. In P.J. Dunston, S.K. Fullerton, M.W. Cole, D. Herro, J.A. Malloy, P.M. Wilder, & K.N. Headley (Eds.), *63rd Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association* (pp. 48–60). Literacy Research Association.

Mirra, N., & Garcia, A. (2020). "I hesitate but I do have hope": Youth speculative civic literacies for troubled times. *Harvard Educational Review*, *90*(2), 295–321.

Nixon, J. (2006). Towards a hermeneutics of hope: The legacy of Edward W. Said. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27(3), 341–356. DOI: 10.1080/01596300600838793

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.

Paul, R. (1994). Teaching critical thinking in the "strong" sense: A focus on self-deception, worldviews, and a dialectical mode of analysis. In K. S. Walters (Ed.), *Re-thinking reason: New perspectives on critical thinking* (pp. 181–198). SUNY Press.

Pahl, K., & Rasool, Z. (2020). Disrupting: The literacies of activism. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Living literacies: Literacy for social change*. The MIT Press.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Watson, V. W., & Beymer, A. (2019). Praisesongs of place: Youth envisioning space and place in a literacy and songwriting initiative. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *53*(4), 297–319.

Maha Bali is professor of practice at the Center for Learning and Teaching at the American University in Cairo. She has a PhD in education from the University of Sheffield, United Kingdom. She is cofounder of virtuallyconnecting.org (a grassroots movement that challenges academic gatekeeping at conferences) and cofacilitator of Equity Unbound (an equity-focused, open, connected intercultural learning curriculum, which has also branched into academic community activities such as Continuity with Care, Socially Just Academia, Community-Building Resources (a collaboration with OneHE), and MYFest (an innovative 3-month professional learning journey). She writes and speaks frequently about social justice, critical pedagogy, and open and online education. She blogs regularly at http://blog.mahabali.me and tweets @bali_maha

Ashley S. Boyd (ashley.boyd@wsu.edu) is a former secondary English teacher and associate professor of English education at Washington State University. She teaches English methods, young adult literature, and critical theory. Her current research focuses on secondary teachers' social justice pedagogies and students' development of social action projects. She has published with Teachers College Press and Rowan & Littlefield, as well as in *English Education, The Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* and *The Journal of Teacher Education.*

Remi Kalir is an associate professor of learning, design, and technology at the University of Colorado Denver School of Education and Human Development. A former secondary literacy and civics teacher, he researches how the everyday literacy practice of annotation facilitates social, collaborative, and equity-oriented learning, and he is the lead author of *Annotation* (2021). Learn more about Kalir and his research at http://remikalir.com.

Announcements

Apply to Be the Next Editor of *College Composition and Communication*

We are seeking the next editor of *College Composition and Communication.* The term of current editor Malea Powell will end in December 2024. Interested persons should send a letter of application to be received no later than **January 15, 2023.**

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

Finalists will be interviewed in Spring 2023. The applicant appointed by the CCCC Executive Committee in spring 2023 will affect a transition in 2023–24, preparing for their first issue in February 2025. The appointment term is five years. Applications should be submitted via email in PDF form to Jim Sitar, NCTE Journals Managing Editor, at jsitar@ncte.org; please include "CCC Editor Application" in the subject line. Direct queries to Jim Sitar at the email address above.

Call for Award Committee Applications

NCTE is seeking new members for the following award committees:

Charlotte Huck Award for Outstanding Fiction for Children
https://ncte.org/get-involved/volunteer/groups/ncte-charlotte-huck-award-for-outstanding-fiction-for-children/

Orbis Pictus Award for Outstanding Nonfiction for Children
https://ncte.org/get-involved/volunteer/groups/orbis-pictus-award-for-outstanding-nonfiction-for-childrens-literature-committee/

Award for Excellence in Poetry for Children
https://ncte.org/get-involved/volunteer/groups/ncte-childrens-poetry-awards-committee/

For more information about the awards and the application forms, please follow the links listed. To be considered for membership on an award committee, submit the application form, a current vita or résumé, and one example of a book annotation,

book review, or evaluative comments about a recent book. The example should be written by the applicant. **Application deadline: December 1.**

Promising Researcher Award

The Promising Researcher Award Competition is open to individuals who have **completed** dissertations within the approximately two years immediately preceding the award year (for the 2022 award year, between December 1, 2020, and January 31, 2023). Manuscript, cover letter, and letter of verification are due by **March 1, 2023**. Please see our website for more details: https://ncte.org/awards/promising-researcher-award/.

Call for Nominations: 2023 David H. Russell Research Award

The David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English recognizes published research in language, literature, rhetoric, teaching procedures, or cognitive processes that may sharpen the teaching or the content of English courses at any level. Any work of scholarship or research in language, literature, rhetoric, or pedagogy and learning published during the past five years (between January 2017 and December 2022) is eligible. Works nominated should be exemplary instances of the genre, address broad research questions, contain material that is accessibly reported, and reflect a project that stands the test of time.

Nomination information can be found on the NCTE website at http://www.ncte.org/awards/david-h-russell-research-award/ and must be submitted by **March 1, 2023**. The award will be presented at the NCTE Awards Ceremony associated with the Annual Convention.

Edwyna Wheadon Postgraduate Training Scholarship for Public School Teachers

English language arts teachers working in public educational institutions are eligible to apply for an Edwyna Wheadon Postgraduate Training Scholarship. This $500 award supports postgraduate training to enhance teaching skills and/or career development in teaching. To qualify, the recipient's degree or nondegree course must be provided by an accredited, degree-granting, public or private two-year junior or community college, a four-year college or university, or a graduate or professional school. Recipients must be NCTE members at the time of award. The application deadline is **January 31, 2023**. For more information, see https://ncte.org/awards/edwyna-wheadon-postgraduate-scholarship/.

Cultivating New Voices among Scholars of Color Program 2022-2024

The NCTE Research Foundation's Cultivating New Voices among Scholars of Color (CNV) program is designed to provide two years of support, mentoring,

and networking opportunities for early career scholars of color. The program aims to work with doctoral candidates and early career postsecondary faculty of color to cultivate the ability to draw from their own cultural and linguistic perspectives as they conceptualize, plan, conduct, write, and disseminate findings from their research. The program provides socialization into the research community and interaction with established scholars whose own work can be enriched by their engagement with new ideas and perspectives. The 2022–2024 CNV program participants are listed below:

Tasha Austin, University at Buffalo
Jordan Bell, CUNY Graduate Center
Theresa Burruel Stone, Sonoma State University
José Luis Cano Jr., Texas Christian University
Autumn Griffin, University of Pennsylvania
Sharim Hannegan-Martinez, University of Kentucky
Alicia K. Hatcher, The University of Scranton
Ileana Jiménez, Teachers College, Columbia University
Naitnaphit Limlamai, Colorado State University
Pratigya Marhatta, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Tamara Nicole Moten, University of Georgia
Lauren Elizabeth Reine Johnson, University of Illinois at Chicago
Renée Wilmot, Michigan State University
Alexis Morgan Young, University of Maryland, College Park