CCC February 2020 (71.3) Podcast Episode Transcripts

Episode 1: "From Dissertation to a Journal Article"

A conversation with Antonio Byrd, author of "'Like Coming Home': African Americans Tinkering and Playing toward a Computer Code Bootcamp."

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] Welcome to the *CCC* podcast. I am your host, Kefaya Diab.

For this podcast I talked to Antonio Byrd, the author of "'Like Coming Home': African Americans Tinkering and Playing toward a Computer Code Bootcamp." Our conversation focused on the process of writing and revising this article that came out of his dissertation. So, whether you are in the process of writing your dissertation, or done with it and now thinking of publishing it as journal articles, Antonio is here to talk to you about how he did it.

Kefaya Diab: Thank you first for wanting to talk to us about "'Like Coming Home': African Americans Tinkering and Playing toward a Computer Code Bootcamp." So tell me from the very beginning, how did you come up with the title? And what did your process of writing look like?

Antonio Byrd: The process for putting together the article began with connecting with another graduate student at UW-Madison who had done volunteer work at Clearwater Academy. When she learned about the research I do from another classmate of ours, she suggested that I tap into Clearwater Academy and do research there. So after I got permission to do research with their students for the year of 2017, I began doing data collection with spring semester students, doing data collection which involved doing observation and doing like history interviews with them. And as soon as the spring semester had ended, I began to really bring my field notes together and started looking through the life history interviews over the course of the summer, developing themes. And part of that process was involving conversations with my dissertation chair, Kate Vieira, and also with my committee members, especially Dr. Matthew Berland, and over the course of the summer develop a real core thesis and begin to see what were some key things to argue coming from that data by the time August came around, later that year.

Kefaya Diab: How long did it take you to finish your dissertation?

Antonio Byrd: About a year, almost a year and a half, to really finishing the four drafts. And then another few months of doing editing leading into 2019.

Kefaya Diab: How did you decide to submit it to the 3Cs?

Antonio Byrd: The Cs was a part of a list, one of the places that we decided to submit to, part of it because of the nature of the research would probably be a good fit for a lot of the other conversations that were happening in Cs. Before I actually submitted to Cs, I went through seven drafts with this article. Making that, leading up to that, and I do want to point that out, primarily because it is a process to think about what does it mean to write in a seminar and then what does

it mean to write an article; they are very different pieces, although they are very similar at the same time.

Kefaya Diab: How are they different?

Antonio Byrd: I think one key feedback that I got when writing this article was that it was taking too long to get to the point. That there was a lot of, in the words of Kate, "throat-clearing" at the very beginning. So, there is this background, you set up a problem, then we're kinda walking through the literature and what other people have said, but it took like six pages to get to what the article was really about. So, I was definitely in that mode of trying to prove that I did my homework leading up to my research, which is something that I found myself often doing for my seminar courses, and here I had to move it a lot faster. So, there is a lot of cutting at the very opening where you get to the point within the first two or three pages of the draft itself. So that's one of the ways that there were differences that I was contending with.

Kefaya Diab: Well, I can relate. Because the first article that I worked on for publication from my dissertation, I had that. And again, because when we write a dissertation for our committee, we want to show them that we know the literature, but when we publish for the field, it's like we're already established, they believe that we know [laughter], so it's a different dynamic.

Antonio Byrd: And I think it was really important that I had these conversations with my dissertation chair because every journal looks different, they have different expectations. Some journals are more interested in the methods and want some real detail into the methods, and others are just looking for more a sense of what the methods are, but like let's get into the stories that you're trying to develop. So, once we had figured that Cs would be one of the core pieces, that kinda shaped what the draft would actually look like. So, it could be identified as a possible Cs article with further development with peer reviewers and the editors.

Kefaya Diab: So how did the process with the reviewers go? Did you get frustrated? Did you feel like giving up on the article?

Antonio Byrd: I wasn't frustrated or anything, or wanted to give up, it was actually anxiety. When I first got the reviewer comments, I admit that I did not immediately open the email because there was a little bit of worry. It helped that Dr. Powell had a nice note at the very beginning that kinda shows the overall comments, that explained the overall comments and what were some changes I had to make, but I didn't open up the actual documents with the reviewer comments. I just gave myself some time, a few days' time to really think about that, and then I realized, oh, it's actually, these are very helpful comments, it's not as bad. I just have anxiety about writing all the time, I never know if it's any good [laughter]. I will say though that the only thing that I was really torn about is when I had to take out one of my participants, out of the final draft before it was published. As much as I, because I wanted to turn the mic up on the voices of people like me, of marginalized people, and I was really happy that I could bring as many people's voices into that article as possible. But part of my job is to theorize literacy, like how we understand literacy and race from this kind of example, and as much as I wanted the story, it seemed to point to a different conversation on literacy than the one that was in the article. So, I felt bad, but this voice is in a different article and in a different chapter that may be published

one day. That's the other thing, is that sometimes you have to cut things out, but don't delete them.

Kefaya Diab: How many drafts did you produce after you submitted it, how many times did it go back and forth?

Antonio Byrd: Just one draft, I did not get a bounce back for further conversation.

Kefaya Diab: Lucky you!

Antonio Byrd: Right, yeah, well as a first time I never know, am I making the right revisions, are the justifications enough? And as far as a second draft, was mainly just doing the copy editing, looking through what the copy editor had suggested to clarify or to look at the grammar.

Kefaya Diab: So, what would be your advice for graduate students, PhD students like you who are working on dissertations in separate chapters with the idea that they're going to publish the dissertation as a series of articles, what would your advice to them be?

Antonio Byrd: One thing I would say is embrace the process, don't get frustrated if, like, for me you have to write several drafts of your first article-slash-chapter for your dissertation, and part of the reason is that you're really learning a new way of writing and a new way of thinking about your research on the page that you may not have had to think about when you were doing course work. And it's okay if you're not done, or haven't mastered writing, because you're still learning, even to the very end, that you get your PhD, and enjoy it as much as you can.

Kefaya Diab: I felt kinda like you, I enjoyed writing my dissertation, feeling that, okay, I can screw up here because I will have a second chance when I work on it as a book, so I really enjoyed it, so I agree with you. So who do you wish to read the article now that it's done and published?

Antonio Byrd: I think we in literacy studies have done a really good job in thinking deeply about the cultural perspectives of literacy, and because we have a lot of those tools, we are poised to really put that onto computer programing and really think about how this coding works within marginalized communities. I think that one of the bigger conversations is, what does software do to marginalized people, but what I'm hoping that people will take away is really think about what do marginalized people do *with* coding? How do they try to transform it? As opposed to getting this sense of passiveness, like things are done *to* people like me, I realize, wait, no, there is like a back and forth that's going on here, and so . . .

Kefaya Diab: Communication

Antonio Byrd: Yeah, there is a communication, there is a reaction, a response that is happening from marginalized communities when they encounter them, and that, I hope, will be a big takeaway and others can build on it.

Kefaya Diab: This is wonderful. Thank you so much for this conversation.

Antonio Byrd: Well, thank you for having me, I really appreciate it.

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] From *CCC,* this is Kefaya Diab. Thank you for listening to us today, and we hope that you will listen again. [Music]

Episode 2: "Why We Need to Talk about Self-care in Rhetoric and Composition"

A conversation with Dana Lynn Driscoll, S. Rebecca Leigh, and Nadia Francine Zamin, authors of "Self-Care as Professionalization: A Case for Ethical Doctoral Education in Composition Studies"

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] Welcome to the *College Composition and Communication* podcast. I am your host, the *CCC* editorial fellow, Kefaya Diab.

Have you ever felt burned out in your academic job, that you felt you had so much teaching, research, and service and not enough time to accomplish all of what was expected of you?

Have you ever felt that as a woman, a person of color, or a minority member, you're expected to do much more?

Have you ever heard burnout, anxiety, and depression normalized in academia as well as in our specific field?

Have you ever felt ashamed for attempting to take care of yourself, or taking time to care for your family while you postponed some academic duties?

Whether you are a graduate student, adjunct, tenured, or nontenured faculty in composition and rhetoric, and especially if you are a woman, person of color, or a minority member, chances are that you're familiar with such challenges.

In today's episode, my guest authors Dana Lynn Driscoll, Rebecca Leigh, and Nadia Francine Zamin are here to point out workload, burnout, and mental illness in rhetoric and composition as institutional problems that require systematic intervention.

Kefaya Diab: Thank you Dana, Nadia, and Rebecca for being here today to talk about your research project. My first question to you all: how did you come up with the idea to collaborate and work on this project?

S. Rebecca Leigh: It basically started with an article in a magazine that I had seen on self-care. It wasn't about academia, it was simply more broadly talking about women and how they practice self-care or don't practice self-care, what are the expectations of society. And Dana and I happened to be at the same literacy conference just right after I had read that article, and we were having a conversation over cheese and wine [laughter] and sort of talking about that piece, and then I think the conversation precipitated after that. At that time Nadia was a doc student working with Dana, and it just kinda snowballed from there.

Nadia Francine Zamin: Right, sort of analogously at the same time as Rebecca and Dana were having this conversation, I was working on a dissertation project on mindfulness intervention for dissertation writers, so talking with Dana, it kinda came out of those conversations from the lit

review and the dissertation, and some of the feedback and what I was seeing in my participants. Participants were really struggling with a lot of these issues. So with Dana, we talked about this from very, very early on in your time at IUP.

Dana Lynn Driscoll: Oh, yeah, yeah, well I had been at Rebecca's institution prior to coming to IUP, so that's how we knew each other. We were sort of catching up, and I was teaching in an undergraduate writing program. We had a writing-rhetoric major and teaching the undergraduates, and then I transitioned to teaching almost solely PhD students and some master's students. And for me it was really there was a huge distinction in the ways in which students managed stress and the stress levels, and I just sort of started seeing some patterns that I found really disturbing. In terms of sort of the ways in which both faculty and graduate students in the program were pushing themselves in unhealthy ways. At that point, I had been a faculty member for 6 years and had established my own work-life balance. It was really weird, like I had this philosophy like if you want to tackle a problem, sometimes the best way to do that is to see if it's an actual problem, like to gather some data, and then go from there, see what data says. I think that's where I was coming from. Then we had that conversation at NCTE, and then I was like, "Hey, Nadia, why don't you join us for this because it's really tied to the scholarship that you're doing." So, it's neat to see how it all turned out, really.

Nadia Francine Zamin: There was a faculty side of it, and we saw a graduate students' side of it. The suffering was not limited to a group, it was widespread.

Dana Lynn Driscoll: And almost it was being perpetuated down, so you were behaving in ways that your faculty normalized. Like, I'm going to work on weekends at 2:00 a.m., on Christmas day, whatever, and then if grad students see faculty doing that, they're more likely to do it as well, which of course is not healthy.

Kefaya Diab: I actually have a personal question for each one of you. So Rebecca, since the idea came to you after reading that article, what did you feel was a gap or missing? Because it seems from the citations in this article there's been lots of work done about self-care and about burnout. So what did you think at that time, why did you feel that we need to do something?

S. Rebecca Leigh: When you talk to colleagues, and there are some colleagues who kind of keep things close to their chest and they don't really say how they spend their free time, or there is a sense that when they do, they very shyly share that they went to the movies, and they're waiting for the other shoe to drop, like, "You took time out to do something for yourself, how dare you!" [laughter]. And then there are some who are not afraid to share what they do, the healthy parameters they set for themselves so that they can do things that sustain them, kind of recharge their batteries, so to speak. And when they're not afraid to share that, invariably you can hear some offhand comment, or you can just see an eyebrow raise, and some other academic in that circle is passing some degree of judgment, of "Oh, you don't check email on the weekends? You don't work on the weekends?" So for me that's the largest gap. You read these articles, whether they're in academia in the *Chronicle* and or you read them in a fashion magazine or a general magazine like *TIME* magazine, and there is just this pervasive talk about self-care, but you just don't see a lot of people talking about how exactly they practice it. And when you demonstrate

how and why you do it, you rub up against some tradition or traditions of what people expect. They expect you to hold all kinds of crazy hours, or there is an expectation that you're always working, and if you share that you sometimes binge-watch Netflix, you should be able to share that among your colleagues and still be productive and active in the academic community. So, just after that article, I think that was my first year as a coordinator for our doc program, you visit with students, and students would start sharing that as well, you know, how they are trying to kinda carve out the best, healthiest life that they can for themselves—be academic, be productive, and still be able to do things that nurture and sustain who they are, without judgment. So for me that's the gap, those who practice, where are you? And when you do speak up, why is it that there is a feeling of judgment when you do?

Kefaya Diab: So that actually takes me to the question for Dana, and you mentioned a tension that you felt between wanting to be open with your students but also wanting to be professional. Can you tell us a little bit about this tension? Why is there tension between [Dana laughs] being open and being professional?

Dana Lynn Driscoll: There is this idea that we should always be working that comes out of academic culture, but also comes out of American culture. American culture is particularly notorious for making people feel like they can work all the time, and for extending work hours, and so on. So, if you talk to people, say, in Europe, they don't necessarily have those problems. So I think if you're already a young scholar, and you're a woman, you're already at a disadvantage in many ways, and some of the sources we cite in the article look at that, like look at women's work in the academy and things like that. God forbid you have a child [laughter] or something like that on top of it, right? So I do think that the tension is really present for women and minorities much more so than it might be for more people of privilege in particular because there are these conceptions that we have to do more work to get where we want to go. So when I was in graduate school, I watched my own mentor, like, literally drive herself into the ground, and it was really hard to see. And I watched many of my colleagues and even talking to people like, y'know, we're out of grad school five years, talking to my cohort, about how we have really embodied and embraced that workaholic culture. And then, you know, when you get five or six years out of it or maybe even earlier, you finally kind of have the blinders come off and you're like, "Okay, what am I doing? And when do I get to live? If I spent all of my twenties getting these degrees, when do I get to live? Is it after tenure?" So it becomes like this cycle that needs to be broken. I did some work when I was still at Oakland, collaborating with one of the nurses in the nursing department, and it was really interesting to talk to her because this idea of professional care was actually central to the work that nurses did, it's like that was *in* their curriculum. And when I look at, okay, we are teachers, in many ways you could say we are a caring profession, like my job is to mentor and support my students, like Nadia [laughter], yet there was no discussion, practically no discussion, especially at the doctoral level, of "Hey, can we build programs that allow us to deal with the realities of the job market, the realities of graduate studies, but also be healthy and nurturing?" So, I guess that's kind of where I was coming from, and some of the tensions that I was experiencing.

Kefaya Diab: This is really very critical and important because when I read talking about self-care, I felt, wouldn't that put the responsibility on the person who's burned out? What about the system and administrative responsibility? So, Nadia, since you talked to graduate students, did they specifically point out that the matter is not that they're not able to take care of themselves and or manage their time, but there are forces beyond them?

Nadia Francine Zamin: I'll say, I'll start it that way, a number of the graduate students that I spoke with had a sense of hopelessness; they had by that point given up hope that it was going to work, partly from feeling the way that they were feeling, having internalized what seemed to be the practices of academia, and then also some of the feedback that they were getting from their own faculty. So, the doctoral students I talked to definitely, had I talked to them a few years earlier than when I talked to them, they might have located the onus in the program more, but I think at that point, many of them were fairly resigned to the idea that this was what it was going to be, this what it was, and they needed to figure out how to manage it. But right now, they didn't know how, and so let's talk about that instead, kinda thing.

S. Rebecca Leigh: We're not arguing that this *should* be on grad students alone. Like, ultimately you make decisions every day about what you do as a human being, right? But what we're arguing is this idea that as a discipline we have an ethical responsibility to take up this issue, and to build it into our courses and to make it a common thing that we do, so that we can be better teachers. So that we can go into these writing courses, which sometimes have difficult content, where students are dealing with their own mental health issues, and we can be the best people we can be. And at the end of the day, we can let that stuff go, go home and spend time with our families. I don't think that's an unreasonable expectation for anyone. So when we're looking at those suggestions we have at the end as highlights, we're really trying to ask the discipline to pick up this issue and to really think about it, and how do we have these conversations, I guess. And it's a catch-22 because on one hand we have to prepare our students to be marketable, we have to make sure that they can be successful on that market and be successful as faculty. But we shouldn't be killing them and killing ourselves to do it [laughter], like literally running ourselves into the ground causing illness and sickness. One of our findings was a lot of people had a self-care crisis after they ended up in the hospital or got diagnosed with a serious illness. I hope it doesn't have to get to that point for us to realize that we need to find ways of balancing that. So, I guess that's the only other comment I would have.

Kefaya Diab: I think this is a great point, and I'm on the job market now, so I see all these advertisements that are overwhelming. The expectations are so high, like, when do you want me to have done this and then still be focused and all that. So, it's important that you're pointing out it's not only the professors and their students but also those who are going to hire them.

Nadia Francine Zamin: To Dana's point, that we need to teach our students how not to kill themselves going through this process and through the job market: the discussion of burnout and the discussion of the attempt to manage difficulty and emotional difficulty, or emotional challenge, or emotional mental health challenges, or burnout in early-stage faculty is important to note as well. So we're not just seeing this in students, this isn't just an issue of "Oh, we'll send them out into the world, out of grad school, and they'll get on the market and they can figure

their shit out, sorry, their stuff out for themselves." [laughter] It's the idea that they're taking these burnout-causing practices with them and these non-self-caring practices with them into the job market.

Kefaya Diab: Thank you all for your time and for your valuable insights. I enjoyed both reading the article and talking to you about these stories that led to the research project. I am also sure many in our field will enjoy the article and this episode as well.

S. Rebecca Leigh: That's great. Thank you so much for doing that, Kefaya.

Dana Lynn Driscoll: Yes, thank you.

Nadia Francine Zamin: Thank you.

Kefaya Diab: Thank you, so glad to meet you all face to face.

Driscoll, Leigh, Zamin: Thank you, thank you.

Kefaya Diab: Thank you for listening to us today. If you're interested in learning more about Dana, Rebecca, and Nadia's project, we invite you to read their article in *CCC*. Until the next episode, have a relaxing and self-caring time from me, your host, the *CCC* editorial fellow, Kefaya Diab.

[Music]

Episode 3: "Design Thinking as a Process of Learning beyond Success or Failure"

A conversation with Scott Wible, author of "Using Design Thinking to Teach Creative Problem Solving in Writing Courses"

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] Welcome to the *College Composition and Communication* podcast. I am your host, the *CCC* editorial fellow, Kefaya Diab.

In today's episode, I talk to Scott Wible about his implementation of a design thinking approach in his technical writing courses which resulted in his *CCC* article, "Using Design Thinking to Teach Creative Problem-Solving in Writing Courses."

Kefaya Diab: Thank you, Scott, for being here today to talk about design thinking in the writing classroom. As a starting point, what was the problem that motivated this project?

Scott Wible: In 2011, I started directing the Professional Writing Program at the University of Maryland. At that point, we had about sixty instructors. A large bulk of those courses were technical writing and business writing courses where students had to do a semester-long problem-solving type of project. They worked through a series of writing projects to identify a problem and then propose a solution to it. One of the recurring problems was students, very early on in the semester, not—I mean, identifying the problem but had a solution in mind already. So there wasn't a deep—a motivation even to do a deep exploration of the problem, who all it affected, what its causes and consequences were, etcetera. The second problem was students

really not—they are very much related, I think—they haven't defined the problem in a deep way, so they really didn't develop complex solutions to them either. Or, when they were complex solutions, they were kind of pulling examples that they found in other contexts and sort of just transplanting them directly into the university. In 2013, at the University of Maryland, our university president created what was called—what was and is called—the Academy for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. As a writing program director, I'm thinking about connections across campus, and as I was reading what that Academy for Innovation and Entrepreneurship was aiming to do—creative problem solving, understanding not just creative problem solving but creative problem solving of complex problems—it just was resonating with what I was seeing as problems in our typical approaches to teaching professional writing. So I reached out in 2013 to the Academy, had a meeting, started to talk through what I was seeing as problems, and it really resonated with what the Academy was hoping to do with faculty and with students.

Kefaya Diab: It is wonderful that the University of Maryland as a school was on board with your project. How did the implementation of design thinking look like in your classes?

Scott Wible: The Office of Faculty Affairs at Maryland approached me. They knew we had a professional writing minor—so it was sort of different than the gen ed writing program I directed—but they asked I think a pretty simple request: "Could you have students create 'Welcome to Maryland' videos for new faculty?" Kind of like, "Here's a student perspective." And I started to think of that in the same way as those students in the gen ed writing course, like, here is the problem and look, I have an answer right away, it's week one of the semester and I know exactly what I want to say. Having been a faculty member myself, that "Welcome to Maryland" thing is nice [laughter], but I felt like here is an opportunity to try to speak to some of the real challenges and concerns that faculty have. So I turned it into a design thinking project, and I thought particularly because it was in an upper-level professional writing minor course, it created a more substantive project for students to spend some time exploring and talking with faculty, and they spent six weeks talking with faculty, new faculty about what that transition to life as a faculty member, that transition to life in a new institution is like. And that was really eye opening for a lot of students. So they went out and did six weeks of interviews, they created what in design thinking we call a point-of-view statement, and they created poster presentations—so that was like another genre, but it was a genre to allow them to present back to the Office of Faculty Affairs: "Here are a half dozen problems we've identified," and the poster had the point-of-view statement, and it had, like, representative quotations from the interviews, and it had a, sort of a description of how they analyzed the data.

Kefaya Diab: So it seems to me that design thinking has much in common with information design, writing as a process approach, writing as research, and even labor-based learning approaches. In what ways do you see the design thinking unique in comparison with these approaches?

Scott Wible: You know, I think that there actually is some critique of design thinking as being not wholly new—I know I've heard [laughter] folks in composition say, "We've done things like this a lot." And one thing I kinda struggled in the article with, one of the critiques of design thinking is, it's just a process and you follow and march through the process and that's gonna

give you a solution. It's a lot more iterative than that, there is a lot more looping back, and have I really defined the problem well? At later stages of design thinking you sort of loop back and maybe revisit your problem statement, so I think maybe it's that iterative nature of it that's a similar but also valuable type of approach. I could see students, they learned as they were prototyping their solution ideas that it wasn't really working well [laughter]. Well, design thinking would then say, "That's good learning. You've prototyped it, you haven't invested months and months or years of your life in it, where is the next direction?" It's okay for them to say, "It's week 15, I learned a lot, I still don't have a solution, but here is what I learned and here is the future direction it points to."

Kefaya Diab: What about assessment at the end of the project? Everybody is high on assessment; how do you assess students' work if failure itself is not a problem?

Scott Wible: A project that totally fails [laughter], fails on, like, the surface—they haven't figured out a way to solve the problem. But there's so much learning, and there's so much good reflection that happens. Like, what do you do from, like, an assessment perspective that way? That's kind of why we reworked some of the assignments that we've done at the tail of end of class to value that. For example, those point-of-view posters, we kind of generated the rubric through the class discussions. So we talked about the genre, we looked through a lot of examples as they drafted and revised, so we sort of built the rubrics up. Not everyone got A's on those point-of-view posters because they didn't draw on enough evidence, or the evidence wasn't connected to their point of view, or they didn't really engage in the substantive revision. [laughter] I talked a lot.

Kefaya Diab: But that's wonderful, thank you so much for talking to us today, and for motivating the listeners to read your article.

Scott Wible: Thank you for reading the article.

Kefaya Diab: Of course, and we hope to read more from you about this topic in the future. [music background] To our audience I say thank you for listening to us today, and from me, Kefaya Diab, the *CCC* editorial fellow, have a good day. [music]

Episode 4: "On Implementing Feminist Theory in the Writing Classroom without Naming It"

A conversation with Cassandra Woody, author of "Re-Engaging Rhetorical Education through Procedural Feminism: Designing First-Year Writing Curricula That Listen"

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] Welcome to the *College Composition and Communication* podcast. I am your host, the *CCC* fellow, Kefaya Diab.

In today's episode, Cassandra Woody speaks to us about her feminist pedagogy in teaching writing in what she calls procedural feminism. If you are looking for ways to engage feminist

theory in your first-year writing courses without driving students away, today's episode might be of special interest to you.

Thank you for being here, Cassandra, to talk about the project behind your article, "Re-Engaging Rhetorical Education through Procedural Feminism: Designing First-Year Writing Curricula That Listen." My first question is about this term that you came up with, *procedural feminism.* Where does it come from?

Cassandra Woody: Yeah, sure, it was actually a really serendipitous moment for me and this article, I'd say. So, I was still in grad school, and I was an assistant director of first-year composition, and we were going through a major shift at the time. So we had a current, well, we had gone through like, it seemed we were switching directors quite a bit, so I think we may have had three curricula in circulation at the time, and the provost wasn't really happy with anything that was going on, and our student responses, it just didn't feel that they were connecting. We know as rhetoricians or when we're doing scholarship that it is really important to take, especially if we're doing feminist rhetoric, to take into account the way rhetoric has been approached or talked about has been from a very singular perspective, and we have to shift that, even the way we research and approach research. And there didn't seem to be room in the classroom and in first-year composition curricula to do that. So, I started kind of, my practice and theory were working side by side the entire time, and so that's where procedural feminism came from. As I was doing assessment and reading real students, I mean like hundreds and hundreds, if maybe not up to a thousand students' responses to the curriculum. How they can feel alienated by theory, but I knew that theory was so critical. I thought, we have to find a way to distill theory to embed it in our curriculum in a way that we're not presenting it to them as, like, this is a feminist course, but that this is a course in rhetoric and then everything we do is like a feminist approach to rhetoric. It has to make sense, especially if we're bringing it to our first-year students in a general education course. So, it was this desire to kinda balance all these things at once. Like, really taking our feminist rhetoric seriously, of redesigning curricula that takes into account student needs, and then we have the provost also telling us, you know like the politics of the university, we needed something different, we need to do this, we need our students to respond to it, and then also doing it in a way that our instructors, whether they are master's students, because at OU we have master's students teach in the classroom as well, and we might have a master's student who is studying medieval literature, they have no concept of rhetorical theory. They're not reading Burke or Ratcliffe or Kirsch or anyone; they're rooted in a very different place. I had to think like, how can we distill this in a way that they can effectively teach it, and understand it as well.

Kefaya Diab: Well, that's great that you found a way to negotiate the implementation of feminist approaches amid these political tensions. So, what does procedural feminism look like in your courses? Would you give us some examples?

Cassandra Woody: I gave three specific assignments, and each of them is kind of taking different feminist approaches to rhetoric. The first one is a values analysis, which on the surface they are like, "Oh yeah, I did this in high school. I wrote about what's most important to me or I did a 'This I Believe.'" But what we specifically do, like the focus in that, is to make our students very aware that there is no universal understanding of any value. These are all very

rooted in personal history, material reality, and how we have experienced and been experienced by the world, which is the first step in breaking down assumptions that the whole world operates for everyone the way it operates for me. And then the next one in my article is one where they investigate an organization that's intervening in a social issue, and it's through a values analysis again. They look to see what value they see driving all that they do and how that value kind of brings difference together. So suddenly, you can see like sameness and difference are coexisting in one place to achieve a certain goal. And the third one is my absolute favorite, which really stresses rhetorical listening: it is very, very purposefully *not* a Rogerian argument; it's very purposefully *not* doing what I think a lot of assignments have done, to where they have students write from the opposition's point of view with the understanding of to really be able to hear someone, you have to argue for them. And so I thought, how do we get students to be able to understand or hear the cultural logic from which something comes but not feel obligated to support it or defend it or be swayed by it? So they have to do a close read of a text that's taking a position that they disagree with. And throughout the entire thing, their task was never ever moving into dismissing or accepting it. I had a white, male student say, "I want to write about the wage gap because I think it's nonsense." And I'm like, okay, well first of all that's not really like something you can vote on, right, it needs to be a political issue; this is just you disagreeing. But let's go further than that: what do you have at stake in the wage gap debate? Like, as a white male, what do you have at stake in this, other than you just wanna say, no, it's fine, women get paid what they deserve. So we always have to trace back these things too, so we can think, are you just arguing for the sake to be confrontational? Because I think that's something that we really need to work on moving students out of as well. Are you arguing because you care and you have stake in something?

Kefaya Diab: I am sure that many instructors and WPAs would be interested in reading this article and perhaps applying procedural feminism and other theories the way you did. Thank you so much for being with us today, and I'm looking forward to reading more from you in the future.

Cassandra Woody: [laughter] Yes, thank you.

Kefaya Diab: [Background music] Thank you for listening to us today. From me, the *CCC* editorial fellow, Kefaya Diab, have a nice day. [Music]