UC Irvine
UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Composing (In)Commensurable Publics: Dual Sponsorship and Askesis in the Writings of Detained Youth

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2rj9s088

Author

Catchings, Elizabeth Martin

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Composing (In)Commensurable Publics: Dual Sponsorship
and *Askēsis* in the Writings of Detained Youth

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in English

by

Elizabeth M. Catchings

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Susan C. Jarratt, Co-Chair
Associate Professor Daniel M. Gross, Co-Chair
Professor Jonathan Alexander

2015

DEDICATION

To

My ever-supportive family,
who has helped me make a
once laughable dream a feasible goal

To

Silas,
who can't read yet
(but maybe someday will be proud)

And finally, to

Alan, whose compassion, patience, and faith
continue to give me the courage
to do this work the best that I can

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CURRICULUM VITAE

Elizabeth M. Catchings

1998   B.A., Humanities, Department of Comparative Literature, University of Colorado, Boulder

1998-99   Lecturer in Literary Theory and American Literature, Sichuan International Studies University, Chongqing (China)

2002-03   Education Volunteer, U.S. Peace Corps, Republic of Benin

2004-06   Projects and Volunteer Coordinator, Fresno Center for Nonviolence

2009   M.A. in English, University of California, Irvine

2009-14   Teaching Assistant in Composition and English (Critical Reading and Rhetoric; Rhetoric and Research; Drama; Literary Journalism; Advanced Expository Writing), University of California, Irvine

2013-15   Graduate Writing Fellow, Office of the Campus Writing Coordinator and Writing Center, University of California, Irvine

2015   Ph.D. in English, University of California, Irvine

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Elizabeth M. Catchings

Doctor of Philosophy in English

University of California, Irvine, 2015

Professors Susan C. Jarratt and Daniel M. Gross, Co-Chairs

Critical race theory's dire account of the prison-slave throws the hopeful pragmatisms of rhetoric and composition into stark relief, urging us to consider the extent to which writing about, with, and for imprisoned writers fulfills the discipline's civic and progressivist aims, or retrenches structural oppression. Using a suite of rhetorical and qualitative analyses, this project looks at a detention-based community publication serving youth and adults to understand how public writing and prison-based literacy sponsorship operate in ways not accounted for in the discourses of transcendence, resistance, and suffering that pervade prison writing scholarship. In so doing, I offer a set of curatorial practices that rhetorical field researchers, community engagement scholars, teachers, and activists might employ to render vernacular rhetorics in ways that both respond to critical race theory's critiques, and help them stand in more ethical solidarity with the communities and causes they take up in their work.

After examining prison scholarship's affinity with nineteenth-century abolitionist rhetorics of whiteness, I propose a set of rhetorical-representational correctives to prevent extending what Spillers might call a "grammar" of prisoner suffering. Taking up an exercise in

phronēsis that honors public writing pedagogy's debt to the classical rhetorical tradition, I turn to the prudential reasoning and situated experience made available by qualitative method to reveal what radical critical theory does not. I do so by first conducting an archival analysis of a detention-based community publication known as *The Beat Within*. I then triangulate those findings through a rhetorical field study designed in partnership with *Beat* members. Noting the affinities between *The Beat's* practices around writing emotion and ascetic truth-practices described by Foucault, I suggest *The Beat's* cultivation of a kind of *ethopoietic* training serves as a precondition for public engagement, whether that engagement follow the contours of civil society as defined by the institution, assert counter-public spaces writers create for (and among) themselves, or embrace both domains simultaneously.

INTRODUCTION

> *[B]y observation we can define the society of believers*
> *by two distinguishing marks. First, since the society of*
> *believers is established by what in principle is not mundane,*
> *it is a community with others grounded not in a pre-existing*
> *reality in the world, but in a specific possibility.*
> Arendt, *Love and Saint Augustine* 98.

Where whiteness is concerned, work registers
as a constituent element. And the black body must
be processed through a kind of civil death for this
constituent element of whiteness to gain coherence....
We are meant to be warehoused and die.
Wilderson, "Gramsci's Black Marx: Whither the Slave in Civil Society?" 238.

It could be a chance encounter at a local coffee shop, or a formal lecture to fellow

scholars; either way, from what I've seen, Frank Wilderson addresses his interlocutors with

the utmost courtesy -- even as he calls for poetic destruction of the liberal-democratic

project and the world as we know it. Declaring the United States unethical based on its

systemic power differentials, ("Gramsci's Black Marx" 230), Wilderson positions his work

among the critical contributions of Saidiya Hartman, Jared Sexton, Hortense Spillers, and

others, to form a constellation of theorists who make up contemporary Afro-pessimist

thought. Collectively, these scholars posit the Black subject, constructed by the gratuitous

violence of slavery,[1] as inhabiting a political ontology of non-being, or, permanent social

---

[1]Afro-pessimists Steve Martinot and Jared Sexton explain that "gratuitous violence" is a fundamental

component of antiblackness by white supremacist interests, since such violence occurs at a deep structural

level, without motivation, to the point of banality (Martinot and Sexton 174-5). This excess is different from

extrajudicial violence, insofar as its structural foundations encompass both the law itself and those who

commit violence against Blacks without legal sanction.

death.[2] Though Afro-pessimism shares closer genealogy with postcolonial studies and critical race theory via Frantz Fanon,[3] Wilderson's work also strikes a particular chord for those invested in critical rhetoric, critical literacy, and pedagogies of public writing. Where a wide swath of rhet-comp and education scholars make use of Gramsci's theories of education and hegemony in developing critical literacy among those writing from the margins (Villanueva 1993, 1994; Isaksen; Fishman and McCarthy 2006; Glasswell and Kamberelis 2006; Weiler 200), Wilderson dismisses Gramsci's logic of advancement for the subaltern as not just problematically unraced ("Gramsci's Black Marx" 229-230), but fundamentally exploitative. In Wilderson's assessment, the "silent scandal" for liberal-democratic civil society derives from the fact that systemic violence against and coercion of the Black slave body has created the very condition of possibility for the modern bourgeois state (229) -- such that notions of hegemonic advancement, consensus, and democratic freedom cease to have ethical meaning, and coalitions across racial boundaries meet only incommensurability. As a result, he concludes that "black citizenship and black civic obligation are oxymorons" ("(Silent) Scandal" 23); as for other citizen-subjects of that society mooring its goals and values to the belief that any group can struggle towards

---

[2] I take my understanding of social death from Orlando Patterson, who defines it as, "the loss of ties of birth in both ascending and descending generations" as well as a "loss of native status" (Patterson 5); a state of total domination "disguised under the shape of social relations between labor and power" (19).

[3] To name a few, Hartman considers Fanon's place of exile in her account of the legacies of slavery (*Lose Your Mother* 36); Sexton uses Fanon's characterization of "crushing objecthood" to in his account of structural antagonisms playing out in multiculturalism ("People of Color-Blindness" 44); and Wilderson draws heavily on Fanon in both his critique of democracy and his account of anti-blackness as a structural antagonism ("Hegemony's (Silent) Scandal," *Red, White and Black*).

greater freedom and hegemony, Wilderson's scandal constitutes "a catastrophe in epistemological coherence" (Interview II).

This is heady stuff for a rhet-comp scholar attempting to map the confines and possibilities of public discourse onto the terrain of a modern democratic state, even as one acknowledges that, post-Habermas, public discourse is in no way unitary, beneficial, or even assured. Gwendolyn Pough and Nancy Fraser remind us of the multiple publics that overlap and contend with one another, including the counter-publics constituted in the streets, churches, and traditionally "private" spaces that challenge the "exclusionary violence of much public space in the United States" (Pough 16, Fraser 60). Susan Wells tells us that public discourse is merely a performance in time, temporary and unstable, with the capacity to consolidate power or defuse it (Wells 327); Paula Mathieu goes so far as to sketch it as a phantom presence, one that, "[f]rom a street perspective, … has been converted into something of a residual phenomenon, a leftover (and left behind) space for the subordinated, the marginalized, and the poor" (Mathieu xiii). These scholars prepare us for the possibility of such an antagonism. And yet, the totality of Afro-pessimism begs further consideration - not the least of which because, for me, as a graduate teacher-scholar in rhetoric and composition at UC Irvine, Wilderson teaches in pedagogic spaces literally adjacent to, and in some cases overlapping with, my own - spaces where students are being asked to entertain his strategic nihilism on the one hand and the promises of rhetorical awareness on the other. This moment becomes an opportunity to interrogate the role of theory in facilitating political agency[4] in a democratic context, and the extent to which

---

[4] I take my definition of agency from linguistic anthropologist Laura Ahearn, as linguistic anthropology understands language as a form of social action. In her survey of the various characterizations of agency

rhetoric can empower the composing subject to political action in spite of, or even through, models that predict the kind of structural paralysis that Wilderson does.

Yet, that antagonism is in no way relegated to the specter of history; radical-critical scholarship in legal theory (Binder; Dayan) and prison studies (Davis, *Are Prisons Obsolete?*; Martin and Sexton 177; Wacquant), remind us of the extent to which the prison-industrial complex extends slavery's role as a mechanism of incapacitation and forced labor production. That Black males are incarcerated at nearly seven times the number of white males (Guerino, Harrison, and Sabol 7) suggests that a trenchant bond between structural subjugation of the Black body and American democracy endures, even as the U.S. Justice Department had in August 2013 begun to shift their policy away from imposing punitive mandatory minimum sentences for the nonviolent and low-level drug offenses (Reilly) that affect Black men more than any other group (Guerino, Harrison, and Sabol 28). Such a configuration troubles the ethical logic of public writing as a path to empowerment and becoming for our student-citizens, if, as Wilderson suggests, civil society accommodates "the demands and finite antagonisms of [its] junior partners (i.e., immigrants, white women, and the working class), but forecloses on the insatiable demands ... of the [Black]

within the academy, she provides a comprehensive, yet admittedly provisional definition: "Agency refers to the socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (Ahearn 112). Ahearn intends this definition to account more fully for the spectrum of capacities to act; where some scholars in subaltern and feminist studies have reductively equated agency either with free will, or resistance (114-15), Ahearn cautions against a "romance of resistance" that fails to account for complex relations in which agents accommodate or ignore dominant paradigms (116). By way of Saïd (*The World, The Text, and the Critic*), Ahearn also critiques the totalizing nature of the refusal of agency in Foucault, who, she argues, focuses on broad discursive strokes at the expense of recognizing individual human actions (Ahearn 117).

prison-slave" ("(Silent) Scandal" 23). In other words, in the context of Wilderson's Black

prison-slave, even a pedagogy that valorizes the positionality of those writing from the

margins becomes marked with a kind of venality. Here, the advancement of the subaltern

actually manages to disempower the prison-slave through a flawed logic of substitution,

where the progress of immigrants, white women, and the working class masks the singular

ontological condition of those for whom civil society was never meant to function: the

Black body forced to labor without consent. The prison simply becomes the place where

Black laboring bodies "are meant to be warehoused and die" (23). Wilderson's formulation,

then, not only imposes a radical incoherence upon the empowering logic of writing toward

rhetorical and political agency for those writing from the margins; its incoherence troubles

the very composedness of *any* text that attempts to write *for* or *about* the prison-slave.

This is where Wilderson's challenge becomes a hinge between my professional

identifications within the university and my personal identifications beyond its enclosure.

Though my disciplinary training has found Wilderson's work generative for marking the

parameters of rhetoric's emancipatory capacities for writing pedagogy, I come to that

pedagogical space by way of prisoner advocacy work, seeking to theorize the writing,

editing, and organizing that seemed so vital to realizing the justice I believed fundamental

to the American project -- especially for those who bear the full brunt of the law, often due

to structural antagonisms beyond their control. What are civil protections for, if not for all

people of the *polis*? Moreover, what are our rhetorical capacities worth, if they work for

people at campaign podiums, newspaper forums, and ivory tower gatherings, but not for

those whose rhetorical appeals often mean the difference between life and death?

Civil Death's Slave Inheritance

A host of Prison Studies scholars, including Dylan Rodríguez (*Forced Passages*, "Against Prison Writing"), Caleb Smith (*The Prison and the American Imagination*), Michelle Alexander (*The New Jim Crow* 61, 186-187) and Sora Han ("Purloined Prisoner") point out that the bleak political ontology of the prisoner exists as a condition of law and white supremacist state violence structured against people of color in general.[5] This characterization is supported by a wide body of sociological research that suggests that prisoners as a group are "meant to be warehoused and die": the emergence of a "new penology" at the end of the twentieth century[6] indicates that regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or duration of stay, the prison has, in the last two decades, become a place where all prisoners are quite deliberately stored without a purpose beyond incapacitation; moreover, given the profound social stigma (Western and Beckett), negative financial

---

[5] Though they discuss prisoners beyond African-American experience, these writers' portraits draw heavily on critical race theory based in Afro-pessimist scholarship, including Hartman's *Scenes of Subjection*, and Spillers's "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe", both of which characterize a violence particular to the Black slave body through spectacle. Prison Studies and Critical Race Theory's frequent appropriation of arguments based on the Black slave experience perpetuates a shared genealogy of representation which complicates the project of maintaining wholly distinct subjectivities for Black, brown, and imprisoned subjects respectively.

[6] Simon and Feeley and Garland note a shift in prison management over the course of the seventies and eighties away from moral responsibility and individual rehabilitation and towards an actuarial model, concerned with classification and management of large groups according to their "dangerousness" to the public (Garland 451-55; Simon and Feeley 452-456,). While rehabilitative programming has continued to exist, this model of incapacitation, guided by a logic of efficiency, has combined with the "tough on crime" rhetoric of politicians and disappearance of federal education funding (Page 358-360) to effectively devastate the possibility of successful reintegration with either family, economy, or community.

impact (Western and Beckett; Petersilia), disruption of life course (Sampson and Laub),

impact on health (Dayan 2001, 2010; Massoglia), political disenfranchisement (Uggen and

Manza, "Less than the Average Citizen;" Sentencing Project), and damage to both personal

identity and familial relationships (Clear, Rose and Ryder; Lopoo and Western; Wakefield)

even post-release, prisoners as a group suffer both a civil and social death that approach

the bleak ontology of the Black subject described by Afro-pessimism. That account is

corroborated by prisoners themselves; as Rodríguez observes from his work with

imprisoned intellectuals, "a discourse of death and disappearance has become a common

way for the currently and formerly imprisoned to describe both the social logic and the

experience of incarceration" (Rodríguez 2003 58).

     Legal theorist Colin Dayan illustrates the phenomenon of civil death by tracing the

genealogy of attainder, a mark of "bad blood" inheritance and "synthetic slavery" imposed

upon the legal body of the convicted through English law[7] and later American case law

("Legal Slaves" 2). Dayan emphasizes the inherent violence of civil death by explaining

how, in the legal fiction produced by attainder, a "sacrifice" occurs, where "nature must be

killed off, disguised, and reproduced in the sacraments of law" (3). Dayan adds rhetorical

flourish to this process by describing it as a work of sorcery, a voodoo spirit possession

that "mak[es] a man not into a thing but into a spirit. (29). This artificial body -- this

resignation of the natural in exchange for the protections of the law evacuates the legal

subject of any agency. Though the "blackening" of those marked with legal attainder

became associated with the blackness of the American slave in the eighteenth century, this

legal fiction, a conferment of symbolic death upon incarceration, remains intact in the eyes

---

[7] Dayan traces civil death and the corruption of blood as far back as the Norman Conquest (7-8).

of the law, as evidenced by a spate of legal precedents in the 1980s and 1990s effectively

determining that barbaric living conditions and solitary confinement do not necessarily

violate the Eighth Amendment's protections against cruel and unusual punishment (9-11).

More pointedly, the residue of attainder surfaces in opinions that justify the treatment of

felons as "slaves of the State" (*Ruffin v. Commonwealth,* qtd. in "Legal Slaves" 12), language

in an 1871 decision later recalled by Justices Marshall, Brennan and Stevens to negate

felon's rights in 1976, 1977, and 1996 (12).

  Slavery as a condition of civil death surfaces explicitly in the regularity with which

prisoners are used as forced labor; though many prisoners are compensated for cents on

the dollar for their labor for industries as diverse as office furniture and school lunches,

body armor and hotel reservations, others are not paid at all (Elk and Sloan; Fraser and

Freeman), thereby inviting further comparison with their slave antecedents. The

impossibility of writing about Wilderson's prison-slave, then, extends to incarcerated

writers as a social, civil, and economic class across race, as well; as Dylan Rodríguez notes,

> Structuring the order and coherence of imprisonment is the constant dis-
> integration of the writer's body, psyche, and subjectivity -- the fundamental
> logic of the punitive carceral is the institutionalized killing of the subject, a
> process far more complex than even the spectacles of physical extermination
> emblematized by the death row execution…. The writer in prison is never
> simply *free to write* ("Against Prison Writing" 409).

To be clear, it is not that the experience of the Black prison-slave becomes

commensurable with that of the non-Black prisoner; rather, it is that the experience of

the prisoner emerges as possessing an incommensurability all its own, defying

composedness on its own terms. Though the ethical burden of this incommensurability

might invite use of Jean-François Lyotard's *différend,*[8] the problem for prison-based

rhetoricians and compositionists is not an ethical peril borne of language incommensurable

to the other party. Whether or not the terms and commonplaces invoked by these different

parties to articulate the plight of the prison-slave correspond, the political ontology of the

witness -- civil subjects empowered by the very socio-legal structures that produce the

imprisoned object of inquiry -- refutes commensurability and, moreover, the possibility of

ethical intervention on the part of the scholar bearing witness.

Composing An Impossible Subject

Composition has faced the problem of incommensurability before, to varying

degrees, most often in its negotiation of inequality and difference. In keeping with the

social turn's attention to the impact of social, political, and economic forces on literate

practice, Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg offered a suite of new historicist readings of

conflicts ranging from the settlement by the puritans to the Vietnam War, aimed at

providing students with rhetorical tools for negotiating the unequal distributions of power

manifest in the contact zones of multicultural America (*Negotiating Difference*). Even as the

---

[8] For Lyotard, the *différend* occurs when "conflict between (at least) two parties ... cannot be equitably

resolved for lack of a rule of judgment applicable to both arguments" (Lyotard xi). The injury, for Lyotard,

"results from the fact that the rules of the genre of discourse by which one judges are not those of the judged

genre or genres of discourse" (xi). Lyotard goes on to articulate this challenge for the (historical) scholar as

one fundamentally bound to the language of representation (28). Though Lyotard's project focuses on the

difficulty in transmitting the victimhood of the Jewish people in the Holocaust, Lyotard's *différend* usefully

names the position of the witness to victimization as one fraught with ethical peril -- a peril that might also

apply to witnessing the totality of the prison-slave, if only in principle, and not in kind.

field has become more complex and kaleidoscopic, composition scholarship has continued to cite Bizzell and Herzberg's work in its discussions of rhetoric, critical literacy and community engagement, as Huckin *et al.* do in their survey of rhetoric and composition's use of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (109-110). Yet, recognizing and navigating difference, even with the acknowledgment that such difference originates with historical power differentials, does not account for the way in which *incommensurable* difference defies the possibility of negotiation in any form.

Relevant to negotiable difference as connected to Blackness, Todd Taylor raised the possibility of the non-negotiable in his discussion of the way in which bodily and linguistic cues mark racial difference for instructors of African-American students in the technical writing classroom (171). Taylor traces the field's negotiation impulse back to Bartholomae's "Inventing the University," which, he suggests, codes difference as a "malleable obstacle" rather than a "non-transient" difference that simply cannot be resolved; he concludes that, "at least some borders are impermeable, even online. In short, we can never really understand what it is like to stand in someone else's shoes" (171). Despite this incisive observation, both Taylor and the field largely leave the possibilities of his epistemological statement by the wayside. Taylor's ultimate conclusion is to treat students as individuals rather than as members of a group (177), thereby eschewing broader discursive and epistemological concerns in favor of a practical classroom pedagogy tailored to individual student response. Those who have cited Taylor since the article's publication focus on the locus of instruction, and note only in passing that he has *addressed* racial difference, without pursuing the implications of a non-negotiable subject beyond his caution to avoid essentialism (McKee, Redd, DeVoss *et al.*).

J. David Cisneros, on the other hand, a scholar on border rhetorics, does consider what the illegibility of an incommensurable subject might mean to public discourse more broadly; looking at what historian Mai Ngai calls the "impossible subject" of non-citizen immigration, (Ngai 5), Cisneros remarks on the way in which their "troublesome" legal status challenges the contours and trajectory logic of U.S. citizenship (Cisneros 27). However, while he does probe the implications of this impossibility for the public sphere, he does not consider the implications of that impossibility for rhetoric and composition pedagogy. Moreover, while Cisnero's impossible subject presents a problem to the law in terms of taxonomy, the illegality of the non-citizen subject does not carry the degree of legal attainder or civil death experienced by the prison-slave; while the non-citizen subject may be doubly (un)determined by the law through incarceration, Cisneros himself argues that this legal ambivalence affords non-citizen subjects the ability to "resist and rewrite dominant representations of the ideal US citizen" (27); in other words, the experiences of these impossible subjects are not commensurable with the totalizing desubjectivization of the prisoner, nor is the scandal to liberal democratic society as profound.

However, it is Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes's manifesto on the impossibility of queerness that most closely articulates a modality of relation that helps outline the difficulties of presenting the prison-slave as an ordered object of scrutiny for composition. Alexander and Rhodes write about the challenges posed by attempting to bring queer bodies to the center of the field through personal narrative, concluding that such efforts are vexed both in terms of ethics and epistemology ("Queer: An Impossible Subject"). As with Wilderson's subject, Alexander and Rhodes suggest that the illegibility of the queer subject offers "the hard realization that some subjects *cannot be known,* with the

understanding that certain realms of experience are incommensurable and hence *not* open

to mutual understanding" (emphasis authors', 196). This illegibility derives from the

fundamental excesses of a queer subjectivity that defines the relation between the body,

literacy, and desire differently from institutions guided by heteronormative culture - a

relation that, given the normatively separate threads of sex and school, creates a distinctly

queer distance between the signifier/act and the idea (180), thereby revealing a

fundamental irony for those who might attempt to compose queerness through an

embodied rhetoric. As a result, Alexander and Rhodes challenge the utility of even

attempting to bring the experience of queerness to the center of composition (179); in spite

of the field's well-meaning attempts to affirm the queer experience through personal

narrative, by asking one to articulate the self and "one's other-ness in relation to

others"(194), such representations instead become a set of tropes (180), insufficient to the

task of fostering critical rhetorical awareness. This contention anticipates the

epistemological problem faced by those teacher-scholars who attempt to write for, about,

or with the prisoner[9] -- particularly if, as Han and Rodríguez suggest, the ritual violence of

---

[9] According to Thomas Deans, there are three kinds of community writing: writing *for, about*, and *with* the

community (*Writing Partnerships* 17). All three modes of engagement surface composition's work in prisons,

to include classroom pedagogies where instructors use prisons as a topic for college learners; a site of

engagement, where college learners participate in communicative exchange with prisoners, sometimes

characterized as service-learning; and community literacy work, where teacher-scholars represent and

advocate for prison literacies as a means of affecting social change.

the prison is always already gratuitous[10] (Han 160, Rodríguez, *Forced Passages* 17), and

counter-hegemonic advancement for the imprisoned writer follows not from classroom

settings or "traditionally identifiable social movements and political organizations," but

rather from what Rodríguez calls "non-negotiable utterings" ("Against Prison Writing"

413). Here, the gratuity that characterizes the violence against the prisoner functions as an

excess which, like the excess of the queer subject, defies manageability; furthermore, as

with the queer separation of signifier/act and idea, the very notion of a "non-negotiable

utterance" separates speech from act in such a way as to suggest that the powers of

language, of embodied rhetoric, are starkly finite. For prison-based writing, too, then,

composedness is an impossible task, since the "non-negotiable" utterance -- the insatiable

demand of a subject moored to an unconditionally captive body, marked by civil and social

death -- exceeds the capabilities of those ordered attempts to empower that accompany

approved classroom pedagogies, social movements, organizations, or ideologies, however

mindful the inquiry, or libratory the intent. In other words, just as Alexander and Rhodes's

queer subject resists a composedness predicated on relation to others, so does the prison-

slave's utterance refute a logic bound to genres of activity traditionally associated with

counter-hegemonic advancement and the attendant critical literacy efforts so part and

parcel of composition's use of the prison as a site of community engagement. Even as

community engagement compositionists such as Linda Flower ("Intercultural Inquiry")

exhort practitioners to recognize "the multitude of disparate elements, voices and

---

[10] Rodríguez works from the gratuitous violence of characterized by Sexton and Martinot as applicable to

prisoners more generally, since the prison functions as a manifestation of a white supremacist state that

benefits from a "militarized conceptions of hierarchized human difference" (*Forced Passages* 11).

viewpoints that emerge as contradictory ideologies and practices within events and the activity systems that shape them" (182), there is a way in which naming the paradox is insufficient to the task of "knowing" the fundamental excess of the imprisoned writer. In effect, the prisoner's resistance to composedness of any kind precludes the possibility of composition offering a coherent representation of those who write from behind bars.

A refusal of the prison-slave as an ordered object of scrutiny also troubles the possibility that composition's work in prisons might perform any kind of meaningful intervention, despite Jacobi's concession to "meaningful" rather than equal exchange in the prison setting. Here, too, Alexander and Rhodes provide a useful analogy for the ethical and practical implications of a writing subject not open to mutual understanding, particularly through their consideration of the unique nexus of knowledge and power created by bringing queerness and composition face to face. Working from the queer and crip theory-based inquiries of Robert McRuer, Alexander and Rhodes ask whether "composition theory [can] work against the simplistic formulation of that which is proper, orderly, and harmonious" (Alexander and Rhodes 194), when the very act of calling the queer, raced, or disabled subject to compose itself in relation to others "may necessarily result in a process of *disciplining* that other" (emphasis authors') (194). The question of discipline becomes a particular sticking point for composition as an ethical intervention.

Discipline is a particularly vexed concept for those working with prison writers, given the prison's historical function as a disciplinary institution, and the damaging impact of that disciplinary regime to health, economic livelihood, identity, and interpersonal relationships. Of course, composition scholarship has long recognized the disciplining of the writing subject as a necessary part of entering into discourse -- learning what can be

14

said, and how, so as to enter into relation with particular discourse communities. Those

"malleable" obstacles Taylor recalls from "Inventing the University" are malleable precisely

because, as Bartholomae notes, the act of writing *demands* that the student either

"appropriate or be appropriated by a specialized discourse" (Bartholomae 74).

Nevertheless, "discipline" carries with it a sense of pedagogical violence, the residue of the

intimate co-emergence of the prison and the school from an Enlightenment turn towards

the body as an analyzable, manipulable object; as Foucault explains in *Discipline and Punish,*

education evolved to create systems of presences and absences allowing people to not only

organize analytical space (*Discipline and Punish* 143), but encourage internal regulation of

the bodies in classrooms, much the same way the prison evolved to subdue and correct the

juridical subject in physical space (128-129). Foucault's genealogy demonstrates the

difficulty of disentangling disciplinary violence from the empowering aims of rhetorical

education, even as sociolinguist-ethnographer Laura Ahearn reminds us of the limitations

of an account that passes over individual action in favor of broad structural discourse

("Language and Agency" 116-117), and Lynn Worsham observes that even those post-

structural and critical pedagogies attempting to subvert that system may reinstates

paradigms of class and masculine power rather than identify sites of struggle allowing

voices from the margins to reclaim categories of race, class, and gender (Worsham 231).

This violence carries a negative valence for a pedagogy that encourages what

Alexander and Rhodes characterize as a composedness towards a more "harmonious"

unitary subject, thereby establishing a tacit pedagogical ethics of "right" and "wrong"

practice. While Judith Butler argues that the split subjectivity and unrecoverable loss

achieved through such violence is a necessary condition for entering into ethical relation

(Butler 2001), Alexander and Rhodes suggest that, for composition, ethical practice desires

to "make articulate and ordered the subjects under scrutiny" (Alexander and Rhodes 196),

by encouraging a narrativization of the experiences of groups where composition subverts

or resists normative relations (194). The ethical problem presented by such an encounter

with queerness is that composition seeks to impose an order that queer, raced, and

differently-abled practices refuse, thereby invoking relations of power that privilege

hegemonic systems of knowledge and sociality over those "unruly" practices already in

place.

Dylan Rodríguez's critique of prison writing as a genre suggests that such a move

towards legibility anticipates a comparable violence by composition and community

literacy practitioners and the carceral writing subject.[11] To Rodríguez, the mere act of

articulating a genre of prison literary production immobilizes the writing subject in a

"structure of enjoyment that thrives from the horror of an imprisoned Other's suffering"

("Against Prison Writing" 411).[12] That Rodríguez names the *structure* of enjoyment is

---

[11] Community engagement scholar Ellen Cushman acknowledges the peril of violence that comes with

narrativizing communities outside the ivory tower (Cushman 1996 236), and Flower offers the "rival

hypothesis" to encourage reciprocity and understanding through inclusion of diverse and even contra-dictory

voices -- voices that undermine paradigms where published writers are the "authorities" (Flower 189). Yet,

even Flower's rival hypothesis still presumes that the rivals in question -- in her case, student writers and the

communities that are their objects of study -- are in some sense free to participate in an agonistic space of

equals, thereby failing to account for the uniquely gratuitous violence of the prison setting.

[12] Rodríguez's notion of the "structure of enjoyment" here derives from his reading of Saidiya Hartman's

Scenes of Subjection, in which Hartman contemplates the precarious line between witnessing and taking

voyeuristic pleasure in producing and consuming representations of the horrors of slavery. Here, as with

important: he does not suggest that participation in the production of this literary genre is

a conscious exercise in sadism, or even titillation; rather, he renders visible the unseen

mechanism of spectacle. Such an attitude of horror contributes to what Sora Han sees as a

sentimentalism about the toll of mass incarceration more broadly, as it contributes to (or

masks) formation of the carceral subject (Han 157). Beyond insufficiency, however, the

sentiment invoked by toll in and of itself empties the carceral subject and his or her

legal/social/political relations of all but his or her affective properties - a series of tropes

bound to a damaged physicality. More than a sin of omission that presents a sketch merely

incomplete, the troping of the suffering prisoner enacts a violence with *each utterance*

which, in the act of naming, calcifies a discourse that scaffolds all other characterizations -

to be repeated again and again, to be reified with each successive iteration. Hortense

Spillers provides a template for this operation when she describes how the narrativization

of violence against the Black slave body -- with every account -- functions as "an act of

domination …, [where] every writing is a revision [that] makes the 'discovery' all over

again" (Spillers 68). As with Spillers's grammar of slavery, the troping of the imprisoned

enacts a grammar of suffering that becomes a "ruling episteme,"[13] aided and abetted by the

---

other prison studies scholarship, Rodríguez conflates the subjection of Black slave with the prisoner more

broadly.

[13] Spillers suggests that dismantling the American grammar of slavery requires a new "syntax" and "semantic

field more appropriate to his/her own historic movement" (79). Yet, for Composition in the prison, this would

mean introducing a semantic field that, by virtue of the epistemological incoherence of its subject, refuses

naming altogether.

double-psychagogic[14] operation of *leading* the souls of an audience, while simultaneously

conjuring the spectral presence of those already tainted by civil and social death by

mobilizing a trope, emptied of personhood. If the imprisoned writer, then, like the queer

subject, is reduced to a series of (suffering) tropes through the narrativization of their

experiences -- such that they recede into the shadows of a (manageable) discursive Other,

then those compositionists who chronicle and encourage such narratives as a means of

mitigating the negative effects of the prison's disciplinary task in fact risk reinforcing its

devastation. The irony of this relation is that such devastation becomes the condition of

possibility for composition's *ēthos* as a champion of empowering the writing subject, if, as

Nietzsche by way of Butler suggests, "we become conscious of ourselves only after injuries

have been inflicted", and our relation to morality only emerges after the task of giving our

personal account (Butler 2005). Here, then, the relation of composition to prison poses

serious problems for ethical pedagogical practice.

Nevertheless, the analogy is incomplete. Though Alexander and Rhodes argue for a

need to "ground communicative exchange -- and ethical responsibility toward one another

-- in ways that do not assume commonality, similarity, or identity" (Alexander and Rhodes

197), they still exhort their readers to strive toward development of an ethics of exchange

that, while resisting the constraints of identity models, do so with the aims of cultivating

---

[14]"Psychagogic" references Socrates's characterization of successful rhetoric as a kind of "conjuring" in *The*

Phaedrus. While Plato mobilizes the term in a variety of ways over the course of the dialogue, the earliest

meaning of the term is to conjure or evoke the souls of the dead (Asmus 155-156). In this way, *psychagogia*

extends Colin Dayan's metaphorization of civil death*;* though my use of Plato's term amends Dayan's voodoo

spirit possession by suggesting that it operates most effectively when produced by, with, and for an audience.

"strategic discourse with other groups seeking to enhance their experience of freedom in our society" (198). Whether or not Alexander and Rhodes believe that the experience of freedom is a legally defined position or affective state, there remains a logic here which presumes that communicative exchange based in non-identitarian ethics is capable of actually *achieving* freedom for other groups, thereby omitting the intransigent reality of political ontologies wherein the concept of "freedom" is meaningless, as in the case of the prison-slave. The authors do qualify their discussion of freedom by cordoning off, by way of Foucault, "what one can and cannot do with one's *available* freedom" (Foucault, qtd. in Alexander and Rhodes 182, emphasis mine), thereby suggesting a freedom that shifts according to space, temporality, and subject position. This attitude of contingency aligns with their opening gesture to "enact and embody both the possibility of speaking queerly to composition and the impossibility of composing queerness" (177) -- a possibility where queer resistance performs an assertion of values that allows for configuration of queer lives in spite of the restrictive confines of heteronormative society (197). Nowhere do the authors indicate that such an assertion is an assurance of escaping those confines altogether.

Even so, Alexander and Rhodes continue, however cautiously, to presume a causal relation between "strategic discourse" and "freedom" that does not account for the totality of the prison-slave ontology -- namely, that strategic discourse can have no impact if every "available" freedom exists at the pleasure of the State. One need only look to the August 19, 2013 ruling by the U.S. District Court allowing California prisons to force-feed prisoners hunger striking against the barbarity of SHU (secure housing units, or solitary confinement) conditions (Bernstein, "California allowed to force-feed") to see that even the

most fundamental performance of values -- in this case, the choice to reject the sustenance that assures not just continued captivity, but life itself -- is meaningless when the thinking/writing/collaborating subject can be silenced and left to die (in the SHU) or revived (with the force-feeding) at any time. The irony of such dehumanization is that a composedness does coalesce -- around the scars of the psychological trauma imposed by the instruments of solitary confinement and force-feeding -- in the testimony that emerges in statistics on mental illness, suicide, and other fatalities.[15] However, the only available freedom here is the freedom to embrace subjection to the state. In the words of Han, "[t]he civilly dead person's spirit survives not by individual will (writing letters, stories, press statements, complaints, etc.) but by the letter of the law" (Han 170). Dylan Rodríguez offers the example of Jose Solis Jordan as a political prisoner who does just that, embracing solitary confinement as a "self-immersion into the thickness of one's own subjection [as] a primary *political* practice" towards a collective "identity and praxis of captive radical intellectuals" (*Forced Passages* 76). Yet the communication of this embrace through scholar-activists like Rodríguez, even as it serves to condemn the gratuitous violence of the prison, does not enhance Jordan's freedom in a manner commensurate to the process of strategic discourse Alexander and Rhodes describe, particularly as even indirect discourse between imprisoned subjects may be prevented entirely through bodily isolation.

---

[15] Dayan observes that the SHU's role as a site of mental disintegration belies the prison's (medicalized) characterization of solitary confinement as a place for attending to prisoners' "special needs;" she calls attention to this irony by noting that, "the mind is only recognized as worthy of saving if it has been lost, the body only worthy of saving if visibly harmed" ("Cruel and Unusual" 27, "Legal Slaves" 25-28).

The problem of prison for composition, then, is not only its resistance to composedness on epistemological terms, but also the profound difficulty of the prison-slave speaking to composition as a matter of political-ontological constraint -- compounded by the paradox enacted by those well-meaning teacher-scholars who strive to bring imprisoned voices to the center of the field, even as they risk reducing testimonies of irretrievable loss to a series of tropes. While those narratives deserve to be shared, however, they also risk retrenching a voyeuristic sentimentality for an imprisoned Other -- a site that becomes a backdrop for staging the discipline's enduring anxieties about its place within English studies and beyond.

And yet, in spite of such an impossibility, composition retains an abiding interest in the prison as a site of critical literacy and community engagement, wherein the carceral subject becomes a frequent object of inquiry and affirmation for the narratives of hope and possibility that characterize the *ēthos* of public writing pedagogy more broadly. Community engagement scholar Tom Deans sees social hope as a critical part of the subfield's embrace of a Deweyan experimentalism ("Richard Rorty's Social Hope" 3-4), a hope that, for some community literacy practitioners, takes on a moral dimension toward agendas of reform (8).[16] Dale Jacobs, on the other hand, observes hope's hold on composition more broadly. In

---

[16] Expanding on Dewey's maxim, "Growth is the only moral end," Deans notes that Dewey also believed that "truth and justice are directions of change rather than metaphysical or universal ideals"("Richard Rorty's Social Hope" 8). While Dewey considered "growth" to be a process of experimentation rather than a fixed goal in service of democracy as "a way of life" (Dewey, qtd. in "Richard Rorty's Social Hope" 8), even this open-endedness hints at a directionality *toward* a state of absolute truth or justice grounded in Enlightenment thought that Wilderson would argue shares (un)ethical foundations with the unraced Gramscian struggle he

his study of hope's oft-cited but rarely explicitly qualified invocation in both scholarship

and classroom practice using critical pedagogical texts such as Freire's *Pedagogy of Hope*

and hooks's *Teaching Community: a Pedagogy of Hope* (798), he notes that, "[t]he problem

isn't that we never mention hope in composition studies - hope is everywhere around us,

so much a part of our conversations that we take little notice of it" (Jacobs 799-800).

Echoing Deans's characterization of hope in community engagement work as explicitly

social, Jacobs uses Christian existential philosopher Gabriel Marcel to identify hope's

dependency on the fabric of social relations. However, Marcel's existentialists roots become

apparent when Jacobs emphasizes hope's dependency on the temporal fixity of despair

(Jacobs 785-6); to Marcel's statement, "I hope for thee in us" (Marcel, qtd. In Jacobs 785),

Jacobs adds that, "Hope is at its core thoroughly intersubjective, a horizontal relationship of

mutuality that looks toward a shared future" (786), a Christian and critical-pedagogical

orientation which he qualifies repeatedly as love (785-800). From Marcel's assertion that

"there can strictly speaking be no hope except where the temptation to despair exists"

(Marcel, qtd. in Jacobs 792), Jacobs concludes that hope is the means by which the future

can exist "as possibility rather than historical inevitability", which he sees as a critical

lesson for educators, since "it links our orientation toward possibility/action ... as [a]

function of time" (Jacobs 792), thereby affording us agency in the face of a Freirean "limit-

situation" (793). Jacobs's view of hope as a critical function of education *particularly* in the

face of despair helps illuminate why the prison, a site of distinct despair and temporal

finitude, holds impassioned interest for teacher-scholars invested in building critical

charges with structural anti-blackness. That moral dimension is present in the work of certain prison-based

literacy advocates I discuss in Chapter One.

literacies towards narratives of empowerment in general. Between this existential

rationale and Deans's account of community literacy as bound to a certain kind of Deweyan

patriotism (Deans 3), it is possible to see how community literacy in prisons becomes a

project about empowerment in the context of a distinctly American public imaginary -- a

community grounded, to borrow from Arendt, in "specific possibility" (*Love and Saint

Augustine* 98).

Still, Wilderson's portrait of the prison-slave, framed by the representational

dilemmas posed by Rodríguez and Spillers, nonetheless characterizes a difficulty for public

discourse more broadly that provides a productive point of entry for those invested in both

public writing and the prison as a site of community engagement -- both in terms of

method and ethics. Jacobs's promotion of hope as a loving, critical practice does not fully

prepare public writing pedagogy for the ethical and epistemological scandal the prison-

slave presents, particularly as the liberational logics of Jacobs's Christian and critical-

pedagogical touchstones are themselves predicated upon discourses of agency and

contractual mutuality that are built upon social, legal and economic mechanisms bound to

historical exploitation of the Black body.

And though compositionist Deans presents a Rortyan variant on social hope that

eschews moral absolutes and a unitary "we" in favor of a hope that stitches together an

ever-expanding "polychrome quilt" of tiny commonalities ("Richard Rorty's Social Hope"

12), Deans extends a social hope that ultimately privileges reform of existing institutions

over recognition of their foundational flaws (13) -- flaws that, for Wilderson and Rodríguez,

make the project of reform an utter sham. The question, then, becomes not, how do we

"orient ourselves toward the future, to imagine what is possible so that we can transcend

the limit-situation in which we find ourselves" (Jacobs 799), as Jacobs, hooks, and Freire do, but first, what are the ethical burdens of a rhetorical and pedagogical practice that anticipates public writing as a means of empowering the democratic subject in civil society, when the system it upholds is predicated on a structural subjugation, legally and socially inscribed? Furthermore, how might an understanding of that burden inform both the praxis of community literacy practitioners who sponsor the creation of personal narratives in prisons, and that of composition as a field? Finally, how can composition even begin to address these ethical, practical and rhetorical concerns -- even a pragmatic effort toward tiny commonalities -- when the incommensurable experience of the prison-slave resists the stitches of composedness -- or to other composed subjects -- altogether?

These are, admittedly, big questions -- questions that cannot possibly yield easy answers. The materiality of bodies, of place, of culture, and capital pervade every compositional and rhetorical act, and as such, preclude the possibility of the flattening abstraction radical ontologies present. Though the problem of the prison-slave for composition cannot (and should not) so easily be reduced to a dyad of white citizen/black slave, the structural residue of that historical relation endures, inflecting relations of power among other groups, as well. As whiteness scholars Ryden and Marshall point out in their recent study on rhetorics of whiteness, James Berlin attempted address some of these concerns through the self-consciousness of social-epistemic rhetoric, encouraging awareness of how various rhetorics privilege certain social, political and economic positions -- including teaching itself -- through Shor's "false consciousness," a state of being bound by assumptions about the natural order of beings and the world (Berlin 680). But in Keith Gilyard's view, Berlin's social-epistemic narrative still failed to account for his own

unraced subjectivity, saying, "It is strong testimony to how potentially invisible, or invisibly potent, that particular code signifies…. From the subject position of a white teacher, a label he did not reject, how could he teach students to 'resist' and 'negotiate' the controlling discourse that whiteness is?" (Gilyard, qtd. in Ryden and Marshall 9). Gilyard's use of "testimony," here, is important, insofar as he calls attention to how performing the critical-rhetorical subject through self-consciousness narrative labors towards an authenticity that is insufficient to the task of dismantling white discourse. As Ryden and Marshall observe, avowal of one's complicity in structural subjugation is not only insufficient, but potentially counter-productive; in fact, the "confession" of the anti-racist, liberal subject risks "recentering of the white subject as a cultural and scholarly concern"(16), as well as enshrining a cathartic process of personal narrative in such a way as to create what Ryden calls, "narrative kitsch" (39). If performing the anti-racist liberal subject -- and an anti-racist rhetorical pedagogy, to boot -- is such a perilous task, then the ethics and practice of rhet-comp's work in the prison -- an institution defined on so many levels by racial discourse -- is equally vexed.

Literacy Sponsorship and the Hazards of a Moral Disposition

The ethical, epistemological and ontological questions raised above reside in some ways at a remove from the day-to-day realities of the prison-based programming that serves as a site of most prison literacy scholarship. Whether helping prisoners become literate enough to engage the appeals process, encouraging creative expression as a means of therapy, or providing a critical outlet for abolitionist activity, prison-based writing pedagogy faces very practical (and tactical) challenges related to low levels of educational attainment. In their discussion of felon disenfranchisement and its relationship to

education, sociologists Uggen and Manza cite USDOJ statistics showing that less than a third

of prisoners in state institutions nation-wide finished high school (USDOJ, qtd. in

"Democratic Contraction" 781), while Richard Arum and Gary Lafree find that the risk of

incarceration increases with lower levels of educational attainment across multiple

generations of inmates nation-wide (Arum and LaFree 408). The pervasiveness of low

educational attainment among prisoners across institutions suggests that prison-based

teacher-scholars necessarily perform a significant role in the sponsorship of basic literacy,

a concept coined by Deborah Brandt.[17] However, that Brandt historicizes her account

through comparison to Spanish colonial *compradrazgo* ("Sponsors of Literacy" 167-8) -- a

patronage system brought to Mexico as a means of assuring successful religious conversion

(Mintz and Wolf 341-68) -- serves as an important reminder of how literacy sponsorship,

even at its most benign, remains a relation between unequal parties, particularly where a

captive recipients in prison are concerned. As Brandt notes, "In whatever form, sponsors

deliver the ideological freight that must be borne for access to what they have …[, even if]

oblivious to or innovative with this ideological burden" (Brandt 1998 168).

---

[17]Brandt described literacy sponsors as "agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who teach, model,

support, recruit, extort, deny, or suppress literacy and gain advantage by it in some way" (Brandt 1998);

those sponsors can be secular or religious, bureaucratic, technical, or commercial. That sponsorship can take

place along a continuum of coercion, but power differentials between sponsor and recipient are always at

play, regardless of whether the relation is benign or onerous. Brandt's formulation has been a critical

contribution to both composition's social turn and the field of literacy studies, as it not only accounts for the

way in which literacies reveal power differentials created by various kinds of symbolic capital, but also allows

for seeing how both sponsor and sponsored party may use intended literacies for their own purposes, a

function known as literacy diversion. ("Sponsors of Literacy," *Literacy in American Lives"*).

Though it predates Brandt's model by nearly a decade, Linda Brodkey's "On the Subjects of Class and Gender in 'The Literacy Letters'" narrativizes just such a movement of ideological freight by demonstrating how, even in an era of post-structural discursive awareness, institutional discourses continue to construct teaching practices so as to maintain the very hierarchies practitioners of critical pedagogy seek to disarm. The project, a series of letters exchanged between teachers and students of an Adult Basic Education program, sought to resist traditional, educational discourse by taking teacher and student out of the prescribed setting of the classroom and allowing a "freer" discursive space to develop (Brodkey 139-140). This unwitting assertion of discursive hegemony, particularly in an alternative literacy space such as an adult education setting, might just as easily characterize the challenge prison literacy scholarship faces in confronting the undercurrents of white hegemonic discourse that Wilderson *et al.* critique, in spite of the best of intentions. That tension comes to the fore with the subfield's use of the term, "sponsorship." In spite of practitioners' mindfulness about the problematic implications of the sponsorship designation -- a term yoked, as Tobi Jacobi notes, to religious and substance recovery programming (2008 83; Jacobi and Johnston 2011), practitioners nevertheless acknowledge the utility of sponsorship as a framework, and invoke it with some regularity (Branch; Kerr 2006; Jacobi 2008, 2011, and 2013; Plemons 2013; Tomlinson). Moreover, many of those accounts assume a universalizing moral discourse that reinforces the power differential Brodkey describes, whether praising the "humanizing" effects of education (Appleman 29), lauding "colleagues [who] have taken it upon themselves to educate the most marginalized members of our society" (Rogers 121), or speaking of prison literacy work as a site of "moral action" (Branch 11). Here, the very

act of assuming moral discourse undermines the ethical project that much of prison

literacy scholarship pursues by reinforcing dyadic representations of sponsor-hero and

prisoner as what Toni Morrison might call "some suffering thing" (Morrison 3-4).

Sponsorship and Curatorial Ethics

However, at least one aspect of the predicament posed by this incommensurability

might be broached by talking about the extent to which praxis in these spaces is shaped by

the *curation*[18] of the narratives produced in prisons for consideration by rhetoric and

composition scholars, particularly through the rhetorical appeals made to affirm not only

the value of the literacy community in question, but also the *ēthos* of the sponsors who

facilitate and promote those literacies to audiences in conference settings, professional

journals, and community engagement-focused classrooms. Though the term that more

readily calls to mind the archive or the museum, I choose the term, "curation" deliberately

for community literacy scholarship, so as to foreground the ways in which its methods are

distinguished by an ethical burden of care, a self-reflexiveness about the researcher's role

as *archon,* and explicitly crafted to participate in public discourse. "Curation" as lens, then,

captures a rhetorical and pedagogical modality concerned with audience in a way that the

term, "research methodology" does not.

First, though, it is worth noting the ways in which curatorial practice echoes some of

composition's own historical moves and disciplinary concerns. As with composition

studies, for example, curatorial studies has gone through its version of the "social turn." In

her discussion of curation's engagement with discursive space, Rebecca Uchill notes that

---

[18] The term, "curator" derives from the Latin for "care-taker"; its more recent meaning, adopted in the

seventeenth-century, denotes legal, and at times ecclesiastical, guardianship ("Curator").

curatorial studies has, with influence from Nancy Fraser (1990) and Spivak's notion of audience as co-investigator (Rooney and Spivak 1989), moved away from placement of objects for the cultural welfare of a general assembly, towards cultivation of experiences for disparate audiences -- attempting to become what Simon Sheikh (2006) sees as a platform for "agonism" that frames democracy as a site of instability and negotiation (Uchill 2012). Such a framing echoes precisely Wells's characterization of the necessarily capricious nature of public discourse for composition, anchored only to particular moments in time (Wells 327). Similarly, theorists in curatorial studies consider the implications and limits of rendering such negotiations visible to those who would enter these pedagogical spaces (Uchill 31); just as Bruce Herzberg's concerns about service learning's capacity to move students beyond momentary emotion towards lasting critical awareness ("Community Service" 3) continue to resonate with community engagement scholars twenty years later (Greenbaum 90-99; Saltmarsh and Zlotowski 89), Uchill wonders if, "confronting [the] shortcomings of [art spaces] in rendering [discursive] limits legible to their publics" might actually help "realize their democratic potential" (31).

Finally, the two fields both tread the somewhat vexed terrain of the "care-taker," an *ēthos* that has implications for both method and disciplinary identity. Curatorial studies is ever aware of its Latin origins; visual theorist Mieke Bal (201) argues that while the curator may take on varying degrees of creativity and interactivity in a given art space, "at the root of his or her acts is the notion of care" (Bal 181) -- a notion that Bal links to the curator's responsibility of framing the objects for reception by an audience. This visual framing of objects in a particular fashion becomes a way to "influence visitors, enriching them, guiding their thought processes, or even causing pain" (179). Admittedly, Bal's curator does not

29

carry the dismissive, feminized yoke that composition continues to face in the academy,[19] occupying instead a position more like the Derridean *archon,* who presides over documents representing law and order (*Archive Fever*). Nevertheless, both fields participate in pedagogical framing practices that also carry a sense of moral responsibility -- a framing of both the pedagogical subject and the objects themselves that suggests rhetorical arrangement. The notion of "care" becomes *triply* determined, then, for practitioners and scholars of community literacy sponsorship, since 1) literacy sponsorship carries the burden of responsible care over emerging literate practice in alternate education spaces; 2) the genre community literacy scholarship which depicts those relations carries, as Deans suggests, a moral dimension toward "progress;" and 3) community literacy scholarship presents an archive of testimonials to that emergence, deliberately arranged for fostering a particular discourse among readers -- a rhetorical arrangement that contributes to genre recognition, and ultimately, a Burkean identification[20] that affirms disciplinary *ēthos* and solidarity.[21]

---

[19] Several compositionists have remarked at this gender stereotype, including Susan Miller on "feminization" ("The Feminization of Composition"); Cynthia Tuell ("Composition Teaching as 'Women's Work'"), who looks at instructors' representation as handmaids, daughters, mothers, and whores; and Laura Micciche, (2002) who laments the gendered discourse that continues to pervade conceptions of both composition and WPA work (435-439).

[20] I invoke Burke's definition of identification from *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1969)*,* where rhetoric is not only a space of "insult and injury," but also a space of "consubstantiality," where those with opposed interests are persuaded to believe their interests are joined. (Burke 1019-1020).

[21] For community literacy work in prisons, the yoke of that care takes on the freight of the physical body, or, the cure/elimination of a condition through medical treatment ("Cure"); as correctional education scholar

This curatorial use of testimonials towards a disciplinary *ēthos* serves to confirm

what narrative theorist and writing studies scholar Debra Journet argues about

composition methodology in general: namely, that the field has evolved to rely on the

conventions of the personal narrative genre to make arguments about "what kinds of

events and agents are important to the story of composing" (Journet 2012, 19);

furthermore, she suggests that the field has "invested a great deal of intellectual capital in

rhetorical conventions that primarily use *ēthos* (rather than method) to provide evidence

that the researcher has produced an authentic account" (19). While Journet importantly

acknowledges that narrative is an inescapable part of the work of rhetoric and

composition, and that narrative genres do carry revolutionary and progressive potential

(20), she urges the field to adopt a more critical stance towards a disciplinary logic that

makes claims about "the power of personal narrative as an inherently progressive and

libratory genre" (20). I argue that it is precisely this discursive logic, inflected with the

moral concerns of the Deweyan pragmatism identified by Dean,[22] that pervades scholarly

---

Randall Wright notes in a survey of prison educators on the role of care in their work, "Care is awakened as

prison teachers respond to a 'hurt' that demands their attention" (Wright 2004, 201). This notion of care is

reinforced by the clinical discourse that evolved with American prison and asylum reform movements of the

nineteenth century, emphasizing the individual body as the site of control through diagnosis and treatment

(Foucault 1975, 137; Simon and Feeley 1992; Bennett 1981, 48-9). I discuss the implications of the *ethos* of

care in greater detail in Chapter Two.

[22] It is not to say that the lessons of pragmatism, particularly those Deans offers from Rorty, are not useful in

attempting to answer these questions --- they are, as I will show in chapter four. It is that particular

pragmatist-identified positions retaining discursive assumptions about social hope are counter-productive to

or limited in answering the questions Wilderson raises.

representations of the writing that happens in prison literacy communities. Our discursive expectations lead us in the direction of a vocabulary that relies on tropes of hope and transformation, knowing that these are affective modes that, as Jacobs reminds us, our discipline responds to. And while I do not dispute the progressive and libratory potential of the narratives generated in those spaces, the lessons of Afro-pessimism, prison studies and rhetorics of whiteness suggest that such representations, in an effort to affirm narrative's power to constitute agency in the public sphere, re-center the disciplinary subject in such a way as to retrench a grammar of suffering for the very disciplin(ed) bodies that prison literacy practitioners like Branch, Rogers, Appleman, and Jacobi seek to empower. For this reason, my project proposes and attempts to enact a curatorial practice such that scholarly narratives based in prisons might become more mindful of how collection, analysis, and arrangement of material participates in that disciplinary discourse.

Chapter One ("Shedding Light on 'Some Suffering Thing': Lessons from the Abolitionists") looks to history to examine how abolitionist curation of slave testimony in the nineteenth-century might inform prison literacy scholarship's current curatorial practices. Taking as a point of departure Dwight McBride's look at abolitionist texts catering to white discursive expectations, I show how contemporary prison literacy scholarship draws on rhetorical economies grounded in Enlightenment discourse and a troping of light and darkness that Toni Morrison calls, "romancing the shadow" (Morrison 32-58). I then propose a method of curation that cultivates greater awareness about the portraits that community practitioners present to scholarly audiences, including a peer review process that engages imprisoned writers in dialogue about enthymemic content of language employed for rhetorical effect.

However, just as community literacy scholarship offers problematic representations of prison-based literacies, so do the dire ontological portraits of radical critical race theory and prison studies fail to fully account for the modes of sponsorship and writing that serve to empower detained writers in their everyday lives, reiterating a need for method that more comprehensively captures the polyvocality of those writers, and the sponsorships that shape their scenes of writing. For the publics-oriented teachers and scholars who understand prison-based writing as intimately bound to the psyche and welfare of the American *polis,* such a method might call on the classical-rhetorical concept of *phronēsis,* or, prudential wisdom, as a means of looking at the situated, material complexities of everyday life to articulate what the episteme cannot.[23] Doing so might not only strengthen the *ēthos* of scholarship facing incommensurability on the level of the episteme, but, beyond the necessary wisdom of *sophia,* might also affirm the ethical credibility of those teacher-scholars guided by progressive political impulses[24] To that end, I use qualitative analysis and rhetorical field methods to examine a particular detention-based literacy community in Chapters Two and Three, drawing from archival, participant-observation, and interview-based data.

Chapter Two (Performing the Emotional Purp: Prosthetic Emotion and Socratic *Parrhêsia* in *The Beat Within*) conducts a qualitative analysis of arched community zines

---

[23] Drawing on both the *Nichomachean Ethics* and the *Rhetoric,* Michael Bernard-Donals describes *phronēsis* in Aristotle's usage as concerning itself with "the production of human activity" that, more than *techne's* focus on "the production of objects or things" (42), focuses on "the production of a lived life" in a way that makes use of both wisdom and art towards human action in a way that science does not (42-6). While *phronēsis* is often identified as a philosophical virtue, a number of rhetorical scholars have discussed the extent to which *phronēsis* also performs rhetorical work (Hariman, Warnick).

[24] However, I do not invoke *phronēsis* for purposes of grounding my inquiry in classical Greek scholarship; rather, I invoke the term as a means of reflecting public writing pedagogy's debt to and sustained contemplation of classical rhetoric, and rhetorical field studies' (Hess, Middleton, *et al*) use of *phronēsis* to emphasize qualitative research's reliance on self-as-instrument; I explore this connection in greater detail in Chapter Three.

and organizational material from a writing program known as *The Beat* Within. Taking Deborah Brandt's sponsorship model as a point of departure, the chapter traces different articulations of the public, personal truth, and emotion in a two-year exchange between detained writer Lil' Purp and *The Beat*, and compares those articulations to *The Beat's* own account of Purp's progress to determine whether *The Beat's* literacy sponsorship extends or resists the structural antagonisms of the state*.* What emerges is a sponsorship dynamic that not only reflects the capriciousness of Brandt's model, but gestures to a modality of psychosocial sponsorship detailed in Foucault's lectures on Socratic *parrhêsia.* To the extent that Purp's "keeping it real" signals affective solidarity with a public not invested in the directional, rehabilitative logics of his sponsors, this analysis urges thinking about affect not as a process that moves *towards* political action, but rather *as* action in the immediate space of its utterance and reception -- a space of proto-citizenry never more fully formed than at its moment of becoming. I then consider the ethical implications of this curation for the organization and community-based scholarship, particularly as the texts examined are mostly unavailable to the public.

Chapter Three (Writing Their Way to Someone Else: *The Beat*'s *Askēsis* as Event-Practice in the Field) narrates a qualitative field study created in partnership with *The Beat Within* that serves to triangulate the findings from chapter two, while pursuing the situated judgment of *phronēsis* through use of self-as-instrument *.* Framed by an account of my experiences as a participant-observer in *The Beat's* workshop and publication process, this three-site, interview-based study examines responses from 44 program participants (21 detainees, 13 volunteers, and 10 detention counselors) to paint a clearer picture of the relationship between discipline, writing, emotion, and personal truth in *The Beat*'s

sponsorship at all levels, including youth, volunteer, and institution. Findings reveal a self-regulatory writing practice resembling the Stoic *askēsis* recounted by Foucault in his work on care of the self, in which an *ethopoietic* cycle of written reflection and action orients interlocutors toward not only social action, but ethical governance of self and others. The resonance between Beat sponsorship of detainee writing and Foucault's account of ascetic practice not only helps characterize a mode of ethical literacy that exceeds coercion- and exploitation-driven models of literacy, but also actualizes Foucault's project to craft histories marked by events over metonymical concepts. The chapter takes its title from my amendment of Foucault's "events" to encompass not just singular literacy events, but a suite of sustained, dialogic "event-practices." That chapter concludes with examination of my role as a phronetic instrument operating not only as a researcher, but also as a sponsor of *Beat* activity working in complicity with the correctional institution, particularly as the interviews conducted provided data for both personal research and *Beat* program evaluation for purposes of securing future program funding.

The Conclusion considers the implications of this study for community literacy scholarship, and for public writing pedagogy in the field of composition more broadly. Through-lines for that discussion include the concept of prosthetic emotion for the corporate-civil body, and its potential use in classroom-based composition pedagogy.

CHAPTER I

Shedding Light on "Some Suffering Thing":
Lessons from the Abolitionists

> *[P]rison can be understood, ironically and in spite of itself,*
> *as a critical literacy sponsor, insofar as it spawns reading, writing,*
> *and analyses and dialogue, both inside and out, that illuminate—*
> *or can illuminate—in unique ways, the effects of mass incarceration*
> *on individuals, society, and civilization.* (Kerr 2006, emphasis author's)

Prison writing. The term reverberates in my brain case like
kettle-drums. The anger returns.… [W]ho wants to hear about
loneliness, hopelessness, despair, loss of autonomy, harassment,
contempt, or civil death, except to feel real good that things aren't
as bad out in the world? Please don't think that I will allow myself
to be used as consolation for a civilian audience. (St. John 120-122)

Paul St. John's response to an artist and writing sponsor he calls, "Mother Nature"

bluntly rejects the possibility of prison-based writing functioning in any way other than a

palliative for its sponsors, dismissing her efforts to "find flowers where others saw only

seeds" (Mother Nature, qtd. in St. John 60), and redirecting what he sees as her investment

in "the revolution of the pen" towards the things he believes truly necessary, such as "real

food and vitamins to counterbalance the negative effects of the garbage I am fed" (61).

While the force of his anger is palpable, the critique, too, is incisive: St. John sees romantic

notions of writing-as-emancipatory possibility as gaining advantage on the level of

discourse for sponsors, but leaving the material deprivations of his imprisonment

untouched -- and even spectacularized -- by his civilian audience. This rendering of prison

literacy sponsorship stands in stark contrast to Kerr's capacious view of the way in which

such programming not only fosters dialogue, but can illuminate broad structural effects on

civilization itself towards change (Kerr 2006). And yet, St. John recognizes a flip side to

Kerr's understanding of the critical literacy that the prison provides: namely, that the

critical labor performed by prison-based texts on behalf of society-at-large functions more

therapeutically for the sponsors than for the recipients,[25] particularly for those whose

literacy advocacy serves as a marker of disciplinary *ēthos.* Raising the stakes even higher,

Dylan Rodríguez cites St. John to argue that the spectacle produced by prison writing, and

the very logics permitting and promoting that genre, reinscribe white supremacist state

violence ("Against" 410-411) -- undermining, discursively, the very critical-liberationist

projects that scholar-activists such as Kerr pursue. In so doing, Rodríguez and St. John

rearticulate the (in)justices and (im)possibilities of Wilderson's prison-slave. However,

while Rodríguez argues that prison writing's coherence as a genre categorically reproduces

the violence of the state, I would suggest that the community of scholars who sponsor and

circulate texts from prisons might address Rodríguez's concerns around spectacle by

engaging in a more critical examination of the rhetorical economies they employ to curate

prison writing for external audiences. Doing so constitutes an exercise that not only

interrogates the ethical terrain of opposing arguments in public discourse, but allows for a

fresh approach to method where theory falls short.

---

[25] Critical race and prison studies scholar Dylan Rodríguez (2003) makes use of St. John's remarks in service

of related critiques; as I note in my introduction, Rodríguez focuses on the way in which cultivation of prison

writing as a genre approximates the "structure of enjoyment" that defines the spectacle of slave suffering

described by Saidiya Hartman (Rodríguez 411). However, while Rodríguez's charges of "voyeuristic

gratification" (411) gesture to the prosthetic nature of prison literacy sponsorship, he does not pursue an

understanding of the spectator-sponsor's subject formation beyond its position as antagonist in a structure

characterized by "white supremacist state violence" (411).

Many sponsor-scholars who conduct this work acknowledge that this sponsorship entails a power differential that can never be erased. An authority on prison literacies and convener of the prison literacy scholar community, Tobi Jacobi recognizes the problematic nature of having "free" students address the problems experienced by those in prison, and suggests that her own work endeavors to "develop meaningful (rather than equal) reciprocities across participants" (Jacobi 2004 3). Others, such as Tom Kerr, acknowledge the naïveté of attempting to mitigate powerful representations of prison through written exchange between students and inmates (Kerr 2004), while Stephen John Hartnett (2010) understands that "even the best intentioned scholarship can sometimes address social issues while marginalizing the voices of the people we work with and for" (viii), sentiments echoed by Anna Plemons in her look at sponsorship in California facilities (2013). However, rather than dismiss St. John's statement as finite in its specificity, or flattening in its dismissal of literacy sponsorship wildly divergent in method and aims, his characterization of prison literacy work's civilian stakes identifies a stubborn problem for community literacy sponsors like Kerr, and composition as a field more broadly. This problem has to do with the fact that composition's work in prison, by virtue of its desire to cultivate agency towards participation in a civic imaginary both within and outside the carceral institution, often undermines those very aims by curating[26] prison-generated content in such a way as to retrench discourses of whiteness, primarily through its mobilization of a set of well-meaning tropes directed at external publics.

---

[26] The term, "curator" derives from the Latin for "care-taker"; its more recent meaning, adopted in the seventeenth-century, denotes legal, and at times ecclesiastical, guardianship ("Curator").

In the Introduction, I explored the ethical and epistemological challenges created by composition's attempt to bring the singular, incommensurable subject of the prisoner to the fore, and suggested that these efforts translate into a set of curatorial practices that affect scholarly representations on the level of method. As I noted previously, the "care" aspect of this curation becomes heavily determined for community literacy practitioners, since that sponsorship often presides over spaces of alternative and emergent literate practice, helps facilitate narratives that attest to that emergence, and presents those testimonies to external audiences rhetorically so as to confer a degree of legitimacy though expanded genre recognition. In so doing, community literacy scholarship assumes the *ēthos* of a Derridean *archon,* who consolidates the archive in such a way as to enhance institutional authority (*Archive Fever*). This chapter uses Dwight McBride's account of nineteenth-century abolitionist sponsorship of slave testimony and troping of the slave body to show how contemporary prison literacy scholarship in fact draws on a long tradition of rhetorical appeals grounded in Enlightenment discourse -- a troping that relies on figurations of light and darkness that Toni Morrison calls, "romancing the shadow" (Morrison 32-58). Insofar as the enthymemic content of those tropes relies on oppositions and logics formed by white Enlightenment discourse, this scholarship inadvertently extends the subjection of the imprisoned writing subject inherited from slavery, even as those efforts are informed by a desire for social justice. Following this analysis, I offer set of curatorial practices that might be employed to supplement existing methods of curation, and recuperate a progressive *ēthos* for those who envision prison-based literacy work as not only "places to begin much needed inquiries into social issues," as David Coogan does (Coogan 161), but spaces to effect social change. First, however, I briefly outline the

parameters of this problem with respect to the field at large, by tracing the *topos* of the

prison as it intersects with composition's public turn, the moral terrain of the field's

progressive impulses, and the ongoing struggle for disciplinary identity.

COMPOSITION and PRISON LITERACY: FELLOW TRAVELERS

The prison has been a site of inquiry for composition at least since the mid-1970s.

An array of factors, including an increase in prisoner speech rights and other legal

protections (Useem and Kimball 11-12), media exposure of widespread prisoner abuse

(Mitford 1971), and a highly publicized series of prison riots beginning with Attica in 1971

(Useem and Kimball 11) combined to raise the visibility of the prisoner's plight as one in

tight lock-step with other ongoing struggles for civil rights, including those attached to

Freire's Pedagogy of Liberation;[27] at the same time, higher education as an institution

turned its attention to the prison as Title IV of the Federal Higher Education Act allowed

increasing numbers of prisoners to receive Federal Pell grants for college degree

programming. While only twelve institutions offered such degree-granting programs to

prisoners in 1965, by 1976 that number had increased nearly twenty-fold, and continued

to grow until the mid-nineties, when Clinton ended Pell grants for convicted offenders by

signing the 1994 Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. During that time and in spite of

decreased funding, publications on the prison as a site of critical and community literacy,

---

[27] A series of texts written by Freire became available in the United States in 1970, including the seminal
Pedagogy of the Oppressed, and back-to-back articles on adult literacy and social action in the *Harvard
Educational Review.* The mid-seventies saw a flurry of composition pedagogy texts dedicated to the notion of
writing as a liberatory process with potential for social action, including a number of texts using the prison as
a site of inquiry.

basic learning, composition pedagogy, and service learning for college students, have

proliferated, both in composition, Creative Writing, and in the emergent field of

Correctional Education. A Melvyl search of the terms, "prison AND writing", "prison AND

rhetoric", "prison literacy," and "prison AND pedagogy", combined with results from the

CompPile database from 1970-2014, revealed the steady emergence of a sub-field of

composition pedagogy focusing on the prison,[28] culminating in 2004 with twenty-three

publications, including a special edition of the Syracuse-based *Reflections* Journal 4.1, in

which the writings of fourteen sponsor-scholars[29] across the country were combined with

texts generated by prisoners themselves. This development says nothing of the rapid rise

and steady presence of anthologies dedicated to the writings of prisoners, both in single

volumes, and as ongoing series - a testament to prison-generated texts as artifacts of

institutional culture and the pedagogical experiences of those who sponsor production of

those texts. If anything, the interest has become more insistent, as illustrated by the field's

contributions to subsequent special editions on prison writing, to include PMLA (2008) and

Critical Survey (Winter 2011).

Yet, nowhere is this sub-field's import to the larger discipline more evident than the

2012 Conference on College Composition and Communication; no fewer than fourteen

sessions either showcased individual prison-based research, or were dedicated entirely to

the phenomenon of writing in or about prisons, including a featured address and response

---

[28] See Figure A, a graph tracing the frequency of both critical texts and anthologies from 1967 to 2012.

[29] I have chosen the term, "sponsor-scholar" as a means of capturing an array of pedagogical, literacy support, and research roles that these writers occupy, including workshop facilitation, copy-editing, program administration, community publication, and research writing.

by Jimmy Santiago Baca and Deborah Appleman (NCTE, "Program 2012"). And though there is a wide diversity of objectives, scholarly and tactical approaches, and resulting conclusions about prison-based writing pedagogy, service learning, and community literacy, there is a way in which the work of composition in prisons, insofar as it shares both thematic and practical concerns of movements and literacies aimed at social and political engagement, becomes explicitly a project about the role of writing in constructing public discourse. Diana George notes in her promotion of a composition pedagogy informed by community action groups that, "It is when we open our classrooms to communication of all sorts – not just to … academic cultural critique – that we begin to understand the role communication plays in the lives of active participants in this democracy" (George 58). Although prison literacies are just one type of the community literacies George describes, the prison constitutes a unique locus for the performance of public discourse in a democratic context; Susan Wells suggests as much when she borrows Negt and Kluge's metaphor of the prison visiting room to crystallize her vision of the constraints and multiple discursive agendas mediating public and private spheres that composition should (Wells 335). Furthermore, as Foucault's Discipline and Punishment reminds us, the semiotic of punishment in the form of the modern prison symbolizes the explicit consequences and benefits of adhering to the law and abiding by the social contract that constitutes citizenship itself (Discipline and Punish 90-94). The topos of the prison, then, in an affirmation of Kerr's comments on critical literacy sponsorship, is inherently pedagogical in nature; moreover, it becomes a test-case for the efficacy of public writing as a means of political agency in a democratic context, and as such, a test-case for the public turn more broadly.

This is a contentious claim, even as composition has, in recent decades, adopted the "public turn" as a taxonomic class for a diverse and ever-evolving discipline. Frank Farmer (2013) suggests that, while rhetoric is, as a matter of origin and historical practice, always already public, composition studies "remains too varied and too complex for any one turn to supplant or govern all others", and is not always aware of where those turns might be headed (Farmer 8). Vorris Nunley helps us see that the rhetorical practice inherent in "public" writing is in no way exclusive to use in the context of mainstream civil society (*Keepin' it Hushed* 37); in his examination of African-American hush harbors, Nunley notes that the use of rhetoric in public spaces need not function as a mode of engagement with or resistance to mainstream civil society at all, but rather, as a means of producing and maintaining meaning in distinct lifeworlds (37). Such observations denaturalize the assumed relation of "composition" and "public," and therefore undermine the potential significance of a claim for the prison as a test-case for the discipline as a whole, a troubled relation that unravels even further when considering the prison-slave's resistance to composedness as a matter of political ontology, an ethical and epistemological problem for the field.

Even so, its prominence as a topos in both publication and gatherings such as the CCCC suggests that such a discourse continues to inform composition as a field, while also gesturing to the way in which the marginality of the imprisoned voice has become a vehicle for staging the discipline's enduring anxieties about its place within English studies and beyond. Farmer gives voice to this sentiment in his look at composition's failure to respond to reductive characterizations offered by outsiders, noting, "We are a counterpublic because, in this threshold moment we now inhabit, we find ourselves in marginal and

oppositional relationship to other, more dominant publics that determine how we get represented" (Farmer 2008, 632). The brute politics of recognition also continue to challenge composition's disciplinary identity on the home court, manifesting in struggles over funding, staffing, and course allocation within departments of English. Gwendolyn Pough acknowledges the continued "fight for our place as a discipline" in her 2011 CCCC chair's address (Pough 2011 306), even as she takes pride in her role as a "sister outsider" who embraces inter-disciplinarity.[30] This sense of imperiled identity puts the field on the defensive, while lending itself to an activist orientation in line with the advocacy aspects of the Public Turn characterized by Mathieu.

Scholars such as Diana George ("Word on the Street") and David Coogan ("Service Learning and Social Change") suggest service-learning or community engagement-based literacy work as a component of disciplinary identity, but others name a challenge for which service-learning-based pedagogy has been deemed the answer. Following Gerald Graff's call (1992) to revitalize the cultural standing of the humanities by teaching to controversy, Ellen Cushman proposed service learning as a means of not only making English studies "a more 'legible institution' that [would] reduce students' alienation from academic discourse" (Cushman 1996 210), but also increasing the cultural capital of a field often beleaguered by charges of vocationalism (206).[31] Cushman's call has become a

[30] Pough cites Susan Jarratt on interdisciplinarity, who calls attention to the bind created when fields like academic feminism and composition studies "seek disciplinarity to achieve academic legitimacy and obtain resources (faculty members, courses, research support)" even as their fundamental constitution demands the recreation of disciplinary boundaries (Jarratt 2).

[31] Steve Parks extends Cushman's self-noted "crassly materialist" consideration of the cultural capital generated by English studies by applying the metaphors of use- and exchange-value to illustrate how the

frequent refrain for practitioners of service-learning- and community-engagement-oriented work in the field (Himley 2004, Jay 2008, Rumsey 2010, Wheeler 2010), bolstered by those who argue for service learning as essential to cultivating civic virtue.[32] James Dubinsky (2002) names service learning as a critical means of examining the civic values of rhetoric espoused by Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero (Dubinsky 61), while Phyllis Ryder (2011) sees service-learning as not only instrumental to the *ēthos* of the university itself as a place for meaningful democratic deliberation (Ryder 246-7), but also as a mode of public writing that promotes the "public good" through projects aimed at greater equality and social justice (55), thereby setting the stage for the frequent assertion of values around social justice in prison-based composition work. Here, again, surfaces the discursive logic binding "public" to composition, but with the additional mandate that public writing be used towards a public good -- a good marked by a sense of greater freedom and equality -- what Frank Wilderson understands as Enlightenment values inextricably bound to the historical exploitation of the prison-slave (2003, 2007).

To be clear, I am not proposing that composition and literacy practitioners who engage in the challenging work of writing with, for, or about prisons do so as a tactic

negotiations of race, class, and power generated by community publishing partnerships can also help revise the "economy of partnerships" between English and Composition studies (Parks 506). He concludes that viewing value production in this way performs one of the greatest tasks higher education can achieve, which is "to show people how to deliberate over contentious issues together" (525).

[32] Scott Myers-Lipton (1998) reported positive findings for his hypothesis connecting service learning in the college classroom to greater civic responsibility. Though the study observed students in sociology, its hypothesis and continued relevance to a wide body of research illustrate an enduring social turn in pedagogy across disciplines; as of September 2013, Google Scholar generated 103 citations of Myers-Lipton's work.

to garner either funds or recognition to mitigate anxieties around tenuous (academic)

institutional status. To do so cheapens the important work these sponsor-scholars do to

help realize what Cushman, Ryder, Parks ("Texts of Our Institutional Lives"), and others

understand to be the most vital work of composition: to address the tensions between

academe's posture of theoretical distance, and the kind of engagement that cultivates

reciprocity and solidarity with the communities that sponsor-scholars work with and write

about. Cushman (1996) voices this tension when she reminds us of Edward Schiappa's

assertion that being "political" in the classroom is "not a substitute for our direct civic

participation" (Cushman 22). A focus on those politics also obscures the admitted role that

narrative plays in the construction of identity for student and teacher alike. Though

Alexander and Rhodes caution that composition's call to narrative may serve to discipline

as well as empower, narrative remains a mode of meaning-making that cuts across

personal, professional, and disciplinary boundaries.

This notion of narrative commonality pervades prison literacy sponsorship, as

demonstrated by Jacobi's account of the selection process of prisoner writings for the

special edition of *Reflections*: "[W]e did not inquire about writers' backgrounds or

circumstances, nor did we ask contributors to write about their crimes; rather, we respect

writers in prison as storytellers and theorists who have multiple and varied stories to

share"(Jacobi 2004 2). That commonality also functions as a mode of meaning-making for

the sponsors themselves. Laura Rogers, in her six-person case study of basic writing

teachers working in prisons (2008), concludes that, writing pedagogy in prison for these

instructors was "a way for them to create a meaningful, socially responsible,

compassionate life"(Rogers 119).[33] Here, composition's role in facilitating and recording

the narratives of prisoners serves as a means of self-knowledge on multiple registers,

including a kind of Socratic care of the self for the teachers themselves.[34] Rogers's piece is

noteworthy because it not only acknowledges the subfield's debt to ethnographic method,

but also consciously builds on a definitive presentation of the prison-based literacies

articulated by Jacobi's foreword to the *Reflections* special edition (99, 121). In this way,

Rogers serves to reinforce a genealogy of attitudes about prison-based literacies and

pedagogies by practitioners themselves.

SETTING FOOT on MORAL TERRAIN: SPONSORING JUSTICE

        Yet, Rogers's contribution also deserves attention for the burden of responsibility it

carries. Revealing her shared investment in the "socially responsible, compassionate life"

her interviewees avow, she argues that encouraging narratives by and about prisoners may

provide the best means of understanding society's obligations to "those who have been

refused acceptance into the 'community of the educable'" (121). Here, Rogers echoes Kerr's

observations about prisoner narrative serving as a critical literacy sponsor for society-at-

large. Yet, while Rogers does emphasize that such a small sampling "offers no

generalizations about what teachers teaching in similar outreach kinds of communities

may experience" (121), she nevertheless closes her piece by assuming a universalizing

---

[33] Rogers observes that her conclusions echo Linda Brodkey's thoughts on ethnographic narrative: "[w]e

study other people's stories not because they are true or even false, but for the same reason that people tell

them and listen to them, in order to learn and to make sense out of their lives" (Brodkey 1987, qtd. in Rogers

104).

[34] An attitude of Socratic care of the self as articulated by Foucault (1986) permeates the pedagogical work of

other prison writing programs, including *The Beat Within,* which I discuss in chapters 2 and 3.

moral discourse for practitioners not only in contradistinction to other members of the field, but as distinct from members of a generalized public, lauding the efforts of "our colleagues [who] have taken it upon themselves to educate the most marginalized members of our society" (121). Rogers's tone, here, imbues the work of prison-based literacy sponsorship with a moral valence that goes above and beyond the legal obligations of the citizen-subject -- beyond Phyllis Ryder's articulation of public writing as a means of promoting a "public good" (Ryder 55) that labors for equality and justice in the context of a political compact defined by the distribution of freedoms and goods.[35] Though Ryder's articulation of public writing towards a public good participates in a kind of civic imaginary, Rogers's characterization of the work that prison-based literacy practitioners "take upon themselves" implies an exceeding of social contract towards transcendent moral relation. And Rogers is not alone; her appeal to a sense of moral obligation echoes the call to action in Kirk Branch's study of correctional education among other nontraditional adult education sites (2007): rather than "claiming to work for ends separate from the institutions we teach in (an impossible ideal), we need theories of pedagogy that allow for moral action in morally ambiguous contexts" (Branch 11).

---

35 The distribution of goods is a defining principle of political economy for John Stuart Mill (1884), and object of critique for Karl Marx (1867); this economy-inflected definition of the political surfaces in critical sociolinguistics via Norman Fairclough (2006) and James P.Gee (2011), and features prominently in the work of Wilderson (2005, 2007, 2008, 2010), Martinot and Sexton (2003), Angela Davis (1972, 1983, 2000, 2003), and Dylan Rodríguez (2000, 2006), all of whom count Marxian thought among their influences. The notion of "justice" in political economy as connected to the leveling redistribution of goods promoted by Marxist thought also informs critical pedagogies from the 1960s onward, notably in the work of Freire and McLaren.

This onus of obligation moves prison-based pedagogies beyond the descriptive terrain of the ethnographic narrative, beyond a social-epistemic practice that might empower the citizen-subject in a strictly rhetorical or legal capacity. While Rogers is careful to acknowledge the narrow parameters of findings based on just six practitioners, her assumption of moral discourse -- in tandem with a universalizing "we," and an invocation of the lineage of work represented by the special edition of *Reflections* -- is less an acknowledgment of related scholarship than it is a rhetorical strategy that mirrors the attitude of many contributors to prison-based literacy work -- an appeal that reflects the idea that what they do is a morally transcendent practice, part of some greater cause connected to the oft-invoked *topos* of "social justice," or "social responsibility" -- a *topos* that articulates a shared stock in public writing's orientation of hope and possibility. These appeals moreover have implications for the way in which these writers function as sponsors of literacy, even as literacy scholars have acknowledged, as Brandt, Jacobi, and Johnston do, the comfortable presence of the "spiritual redemption through literacy" discourse mobilized in prisons (Brandt 2001, 68), and the vexed nature of prison-based literacy sponsorship due to the religious underpinnings of drug rehabilitation programs like Alcoholics Anonymous so pervasive in prison programming (Jacobi 2008, Jacobi and Johnston 2011). It is here that the paradox of prison-based writing pedagogies emerge, where agents of narrative expression manage to not only retrench the very subjugation of those whom they seek to empower, but do so in service of an ethical mandate grounded in givens about freedom, equality, and liberation that contribute to not only civic personhood, but to disciplinary identity. While elsewhere Rogers acknowledges the seduction of what William H. Thelin and John Paul Tassoni (2000) identify as the "teacher as hero" narrative -

- even for critical educators like herself (Rogers 2011 70) -- she does "not think ... that many (if any) members of our profession who teach in prisons consciously think of themselves as "teacher-heroes" (70). These writers' rhetorical appeals tell a different story, demonstrating the extent to which such moral discourse permeates this work in spite of the best of intentions, and most thoughtful of reflections.

As Linda Brodkey and James Henry note in their essay honoring James Kinneavy, "That students and teachers labor to construct social identities and social relations when they speak and write to each other seems obvious. The difficulty is finding a way to characterize those experiences in theory and research on writing and writing pedagogy" (Brodkey and Henry 1992). Similarly, that prison compositionists and students labor to construct identities and relations is obvious; however, the difficulty lies in finding a way to process and characterize those experiences in such a way as to acknowledge -- and interrupt -- discourses that fail to account for the incommensurabilities of the prison-slave, and in so doing, reproduce the imprisoned subject in ways that retrench what Hortense Spillers might call a "grammar" of prisoner suffering.[36]

I do not make this argument to present a uniform, leveling, and ungenerous portrait of composition's work in prison. Cards on the table: if I venture to characterize prison literacy work in terms evoking religious fervor, I count myself among its adherents. As noted in the Introduction, I entered the academy after ten years of nonprofit work, many of which were spent working and volunteering for prisoner advocacy organizations in the

---

[36] Hortense Spillers's account of the "grammar of slavery" explains how successive narrativizations of violence against the Black slave body function as "an act of domination ..., [where] every writing is a revision [that] makes the 'discovery' all over again" (Spillers 68), ultimately becoming a "ruling episteme" (68).

California Central Valley and San Francisco Bay Area, covering public writing, religious education, and creative programming in local print, helping edit publications that both served as creative outlets and critical witness to violation of prisoners' legal rights. That work was what drew me -- dare I say, "converted" me -- to composition -- the occasion to pursue that path of "meaningful, socially responsible" work that Rogers describes, before I knew what theories of writing were, or what the word, "rhetoric" meant. Yet, the oppositional arguments of Wilderson and Rodríguez have helped me to understand that the sponsorship of prison literacy is not so easy as a pursuit of a socially responsible pedagogy; that it is, in fact, ethically and epistemologically, rather than just physically, fraught with peril -- a peril that undermines many well-intentioned discussions of prison-based writing pedagogy before they begin. I interrogate the discursive assumptions of prison literacy work, then, such that I might bolster its methods and recuperate its *ēthos* from the doubting gaze of critical race and prison studies scholarship. And as the discourse between these writers and their sponsors has somewhat of a precedent, I turn to the lessons of another literacy event with activist roots to help unpack the ways in which prison-based composition scholarship produces its subject in problematic ways. Though the majority of prison-based composition publications focus on immediate tactical programming concerns rather than the promotion of radical movements such as prison abolition, there is a way in which this literacy sponsorship reproduces the carceral subject in ways not dissimilar to American abolitionists' sponsorship of slave narratives during the nineteenth-century. By viewing the writings of the imprisoned and their subsequent depiction by sponsor-scholars as a kind of dual testimony, we can see how bidding these

literacy communities to speak in turn speaks volumes of those who would curate their content.

The analogy is not clear-cut, as few literacy action programs explicitly promote the cause of prison abolitionism, given the accession to institutional authority necessary for such programs to function in the first place. Jacobi notes that there have been a variety of tactical approaches to writing for, about, or with imprisoned populations in classrooms focused on community engagement (Jacobi 2008), and cautions that "[t]he introduction of potentially revolutionary writings and ideas, critical literacy practices, and methods for promoting alternatives to socially constructed identity narratives of incarcerated writers must be navigated with care" (80). She moreover recognizes the profound variance in responses to literacy education on the part of both practitioners and recipients, noting that there will be writers and teachers alike who choose not to pursue literate practice as a conduit for political activity ("Speaking Out" 50).[37] At the same time, however, Jacobi herself envisions community-based literacy work as an opportunity to encourage "counternarratives that pave the way for more ardent activism" in solidarity with the prison abolitionist movement (40), leaning heavily on Angela Davis's abolitionism throughout. Such an invitation functions as much as a description of possible actions on the part of prisoners themselves, as it does an anticipation of the desires of her disciplinary audience. That audience is made explicitly clear when she identifies those trained in

---

[37] Jacobi's observations have been echoed by a succession of other prison literacy and community engagement scholars, including Patrick Berry (2014), who concludes thoughts about his own classroom experience as an example of how the "hopes and beliefs about the power of reading and writing ... will vary among students and their teachers" (Berry 155).

rhetoric and composition as optimally suited for the kind of activism that Rodríguez calls

for:

> As Dylan Rodríguez claims, 'we require ... a scholarly activist framework to
> understand that the state can and must be radically confronted on multiple fronts by
> an abolitionist politics'. As those with access to advanced rhetorical and pedagogical
> training, we can extend the reach of our own literacy activism to such 'multiple
> fronts' through tactical work that allows us to remain within the gaze of both
> abolitionists and the correctional facilities whose partnership we require to engage
> in effective literacy work (50).

This declaration serves as a disciplinary *raison d'etre* as much as a recognition of rhetorical

savvy's utility among diverse audiences. What such a progressive orientation suggests,

then, is that the literacy practitioners sponsoring writing in prisons, like their abolitionist

antecedents, gain advantage on the order of discourse, insofar as the testimonies produced

constitute an affirmation of not just literacy, and sponsorship itself as a means of possibility

and agency in a civic imaginary - the very mandate that Dale Jacobs exhorts composition to

embrace when he advocates for a progressively-minded pedagogy that "sees hope as part

of the process of an unfinished, rather than historically determined, world" (799). Yet,

recurrent tropes in prison literacy scholarship, fueled by the progressive ethics embedded

in disciplinary identity, suggest that the world remains historically determined by

discourses of whiteness, despite practitioners' best efforts. Dwight McBride's analysis of

the troping of black slave bodies in abolitionist texts, partnered with Toni Morrison's look

at linguistic strategies operant in American literary discourse's "romance of the shadow"

(1994), helps us understand the extent to which the language of prison literacy scholarship reproduces discourse that is historically overdetermined.

TROPOLOGICAL TERRAIN: ABILITY and the FRONTIER

Built on Foucault's characterization of the way in which mental institutions create the conditions that enable the mad to speak, Dwight McBride's mapping of the tropological terrain inhabited by key nineteenth-century abolitionists asks the reader to appreciate how "the narrative and rhetorical strategies of black-authored texts of the period are overdetermined by [abolitionist] discourses", such that the reader becomes constructed by the witness, and the slave testimony itself must conform to certain codes to be legible to its audience (2). Sidonie Smith (1974) has long since observed the powerful, authenticating role of abolitionists in not only legitimizing slave autobiography visible to white audiences, but also shaping their very quality (Smith 9); Robert Stepto, too, has written about the role of abolitionist forewords in authenticating slave narrative through moral imperative (1991). However, McBride's emphasis on trope as constitutive of discourse provides an analytic more immediately available to discussions of critical rhetorical pedagogy, a concern for those who have followed composition's public turn into the streets, including community literacy.

As McBride traces abolitionist discourse from the rise of British abolitionism in the late eighteenth century to the competitive market of American slave-penned publications half a century later,[38] he outlines a series of discourses that inform abolitionist claims

---

[38] McBride notes that the sensationalism of the slave narrative had come to be an expected feature of the genre, such that writer Harriet Jacobs had difficulty getting her story published in 1860, being less explicit in its account of slave suffering than works such as Douglass's *Narrative* (McBride 154).

staking their legitimacy on the Black body -- discourses that surface in the works of

abolitionist writers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Margaret Fuller, which are then met

and mirrored in the works of the slaves themselves, and the work of Douglass in particular.

This discursive dynamic resurfaces in the work of contemporary prison literacy sponsors,

manifesting as tropes of ability and the frontier -- tropes that inadvertently extend

discourses of whiteness and faith in a civic imaginary dependent upon those sponsors to be

what I call, handmaidens of the human -- a mode of subjectivation[39] that troubles the logic

of prison literacy as a *topos* for pedagogical inquiry and as a conduit for writerly agency,

even as those tropes articulate disciplinary identity for those who use prison-based texts as

objects of meaningful exchange and inquiry. This phenomenon bears out what prison

studies scholar Joy James has observed about the dual nature of the narrative meaning-

making that happens in prison: "(Neo)Slave narratives emerge from the combative

discourse of the captive as well as the controlling discourse of the "master" state" (James,

New Abolitionists xxi-xxii). While James's dyadic rendering is somewhat reductive, its

identification of "controlling" discourse does serve to emphasize the reality of the unequal

power relations inscribed in the prisoner sponsorship dynamic, particularly as the texts

generated by prisoners constitute a form of emotional and intellectual labor redirected by

sponsors for an array of purposes, often exceeding those texts' original purpose.

---

[39] I use the term, "subjectivation" to reference Foucault's work on the *hupomnēmata* (*Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth)* in which he recounts how both written notebooks and correspondence help perform the work of subject formation via "the appropriation, the unification, and the subjectivation of a fragmentary and selected already-said." Though this later work focuses more on care of the self as an aesthetics of existence, there is a sense of continuity with that earlier investigation of madness taken up by McBride, insofar as Foucault continues to examine the nature of the relation between production of truth and power.

To illustrate the origins and continuity of ability as a trope, I draw on McBride's

analysis of Margaret Fuller's review (1845) of the *Narrative of the Life of Frederick

Douglass*, a platform she used to combat pro-slavery charges of African inhumanity. While

McBride is careful to note that Fuller's review was, at the time of its publication, a fairly

radical move, his investigation goes beneath Fuller's argument and intentions to the level

of ideology, where he contends that Fuller's rhetoric, circumscribed by the racialized

discourse that defines the terms of communicative exchange, subverts her intended

meaning (McBride 75). Specifically, he suggests that when Fuller names Douglass's work a

"specimen of the powers of the black race" (Fuller, qtd. in McBride 76), she employs him as

a figure to affirm a philosophical discourse where intellect is the condition of possibility for

the human -- a humanity that is capable of transcending the "outward form" (McBride 77).

While much of the review makes appeals to the Christian values of Fuller's audience, to

include a comparison of Douglass's achievement to the success of the mustard-seed (133)

and invocation of a Biblical "Avenger" who asks, "Where is thy brother?" (133), McBride is

right to suggest that Fuller's use of Douglass in a calculus equating written ability or

literacy to humanness constitutes an interest in problems of consciousness as much as it

does an investment in Christian morality. Here, Fuller shares methodological terrain with

Hegel, who mobilizes the figure of the slave to explore questions of freedom, consciousness,

and self-consciousness in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807).[40] Hegel struggled to give

---

[40] While there is no evidence that Fuller was directly influenced by Hegel's master-slave dialectic, she was

part of an American transcendentalist community that prided itself on robust philosophical inquiry, of which

German thought was a significant part. As one former member of Brook Farm remarked, the

transcendentalists "read Dante in the original Italian, [and] Hegel in the original German (Matteson 217-218).

shape to his epistemological project until the onset of the Haitian slave revolt; as historian

Susan Buck-Morss explains, "he used the sensational events of Haiti as the linchpin in his

argument.... The actual and successful revolution of Caribbean slaves against their masters

is the moment when the dialectical logic of recognition becomes visible as the thematic of

world history" (Buck-Morss 852). From this vantage point, one begins to see the troping of

the Black slave body as a familiar component of Enlightenment philosophical methodology

-- a methodology that, as McBride notes, Fuller perpetuates as part of her own

philosophical and activist agendas -- and one that, I argue, anticipates the *topos* of the

prison as a locus for interrogating the efficacy of public writing in a contemporary

democratic context.

     One might suggest that, given the unavoidable (and entirely topical) historical

events shaping Hegel and Fuller's worlds, figuration in and of itself as a means of inquiry

poses no ethical concern for the praxis of the abolitionist or her discursive descendents, no

obstacle to activist intervention. If anything, these authors seize a kairotic moment to

address issues of contemporary concern, particularly in a historical moment where the

perception of literacy as determinant of humanity is a pervasive phenomenon.[41] However,

---

Furthermore, Fuller translated several German works, including Goethe's *Torquato Tasso,* thought to be a

dialogue between Kant and Hegel's "aesthetic and pedagogical positions" (Zwarg 475), demonstrating not

only her conversancy, but also her investment in Hegel's thought as a point of departure for her own

investigations.

[41] For an account of literacy as not just determinant of humanity, but also of a degree of moral virtue

conferred by "the liberating force of free enterprise ideology" (Levine 136), see Robert Steven Levine's *Martin

Delany, Frederick Douglass, and the Politics of Representative Identity.* Levine examines the extent to which

Fuller's closing remarks reveal that the conception of transcendent humanity to which she appeals in her audience retains its moorings in whiteness; where she chastises those "spendthrift dandies, or the blows of mercenary brutes, in whom there is no whiteness except of the skin, no humanity except in the outward form" (Fuller, qtd. in McBride 76), McBride finds that she reinscribes a racial hierarchy determined by culture rather than phenotype (McBride 77), a point about abolitionist discourse McBride borrows from Mary Prince scholar Jenny Sharpe. Here, Fuller articulates a discourse in which humanity manifests according to ability rather than ontology, but that humanity remains a raced conception, retrenching the inhumanity of the Black slave even as she attempts to refute its logic. Even so, Fuller's praise for a narrative that illustrates the transcendent, humanizing engine of intellectual capacity -- "the *powers* of the black race" (emphasis mine) -- affirms the role of written testimony in subjectivation that not only humanizes the slave, but also legitimates the witness as a necessary arbiter of ability -- the handmaiden of the human. And given her placement of Douglass in context with other Black writers suffering maltreatment in "the Land of Freedom" (131) Fuller's literary review scans less as a philosophical inquiry than as a political act, demonstrating the extent to which her investment in (written) ability as determinant of humanity reflects belief in an equality conferred by a civic imaginary defined by rational thought.

And while McBride's discussion of Fuller in isolation may itself appear an over-determined example of abolitionist discourse-as-whiteness, it is important to note that McBride does observe instances in which certain abolitionists not only recognize their

---

both free-born blacks and escaped slaves mobilized self-representation through writing to shape their political futures.

struggle as constitutive of white culture, but also successfully articulate a critique of that

positionality; such is the case with his account of Emerson's denunciation of the Fugitive

Slave Law. While McBride remains troubled by Emerson's perpetuation of a "false

discourse of universality" through use of the pronoun, "we" in order to secure his

identification with a white, educated, male audience (48-9), McBride also remarks on the

historical radicalism -- and foresight -- of Emerson's rhetorical strategy, which not only

implicates that audience in a dynamic binding conservatism to whiteness, but also

recognizes that such a relation, borne of economic greed, is inescapable (70). Here,

McBride distinguishes the relative success of Emerson's discourse from that of Fuller by

emphasizing Emerson's awareness of his own complicity in a (white) culture with a

significant stake in the institution of slavery (74), both in its maintenance, and in its

abolition.

An emphasis on "ability," and written ability in particular, might be coded for

composition, and community literacy by extension, as the mechanism for seeing means of

persuasion towards rhetorical and political agency in the public sphere. Even as Susan

Wells offers the sober recognition that composition's "desire for a public derails the activity

that might construct one" by envisioning either a flattening, abstracted public, or self-

reflexive critique that excludes agency (Wells 334), she nonetheless acknowledges the

continued desire to imagine a public space for students to enter (326). However, the

privileging of practical capacity over ontology's comparative non-instrumentality has

implications for prison literacy work regardless of whether practitioners promote public

writing, creative writing, critical awareness, or vocational literacy, insofar as they

inadvertently repeat Fuller's ideological slip of coding ability as a move toward a

humanness bound to a polity for whom reintegration constitutes a move *away* from race,

thereby reinscribing a default position of cultural whiteness. This discourse surfaces tacitly

in representations of writing as a process by which prisoners can "unlock creative

potential" (Appleman 24), or "transformative potential" (Pompa 33) toward "change," that

unquantifiable value Jacobi invokes when she closes her appeal to the literacy action

community to bring "writers beyond the shadows of criminal identity into positions of

possibility" (Jacobi 2011 52). The problem is not that these practitioners valorize writing-

as-empowerment per se; as I note in my introduction, Dale Jacobs's notion (Jacobs 2005) of

hope as a critical function of education, particularly in light of the Deweyan progressivism

Thomas Deans views as bound to community literacy work (Deans 2009), clarifies the

extent to which the empowerment discourse functions as a condition of disciplinary

identity. However, that Appleman and Jacobi employ a figurative move from darkness to

light in order to characterize that move toward ability suggests a failure to recognize the

relationship between a troping of light and darkness and the materiality of their own

subjectivities as purveyors of possibility, particularly for a population significantly marked

by the blackness of criminal attainder.[42]

REINSCRIBING WHITENESS through ABILITY

---

[42] Legal theorist Colin Dayan traces the mark of "bad blood" inheritance imposed upon the legal body of the

convicted in English law, dating back to the Norman Conquest ("Legal Slaves" 2-8). Though the "blackening"

of those marked with legal attainder became associated with the blackness of the American slave in the

eighteenth century, this legal fiction, a conferment of symbolic death upon incarceration, remains intact in the

eyes of the law, as evidenced by a spate of legal precedents in the 1980s and 1990s effectively determining

that barbaric living conditions and solitary confinement do not necessarily violate the Eighth Amendment's

protections against cruel and unusual punishment (9-11).

Despite practitioners' thoughtfully considered efforts and often nuanced understandings of the complexities of race as a *topos,* they nonetheless manage to reinscribe human potentiality with degrees of whiteness -- not through explicit action or intention, but rather through how they make rhetorical appeals to the academic community: by representing the imprisoned through what Toni Morrison calls "romancing the shadow" (Morrison 32-58). In her seminal critical work, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (1994), she considers the way in which, historically, the Black subject has been used to "ignite critical moments of discovery or change or emphasis in literature not written by them" (viii). Kennedy, Middleton, and Ratcliffe (2005) acknowledge Morrison's piece as a seminal work for bringing whiteness studies to rhetoric and composition (Kennedy, Middleton, and Ratcliffe 360), working in tandem with contributions to critical race theory by Crenshaw, Harris, and Bell. This development, however, appears to have been overlooked by prison literacy scholarship. Just as Twain made use of Jim as a means of generating agency for Huck's struggle (55), just as Fuller appeals to a cultural whiteness even as she condemns slaver hypocrisy, so do key prison compositionists reinscribe a binary of darkness and light to articulate dehumanized and agentive positions, respectively, as facilitated by literate practice. This oversight by a field otherwise attentive to race, class, and ethnicity may stem from the way in which the prison houses a diversity of other bodies marked by race and class, and a polyvocality to match -- 2010 census data indicates that Blacks accounted for just 40 percent of the U.S. incarcerated, with 39% white inmates, and 19% Latino (Sakala). As pointed out in the Introduction, however, prisoners as a group inhabit the blackness of legal attainder and stigma of social death as part of the institutional inheritances of slavery, thereby

subsuming all prisoners under the mantle of blackness counterposed against the white supremacist violence of the state. Jacobi's rhetorical move is perhaps more subtle than that of Deborah Appleman, who explicitly links the ability endowed by writing practice to light over dark, saying, "Yes, the transformative power of our pedagogy and the power of language can travel even to the *darkest* of places [emphasis mine]. The proof is in their poetry" (Appleman 2013 24). Here, Appleman offers up the poetry of her students much the same way Fuller offers Douglass as a specimen of the powers of the black race, as a testimony to literacy's humanizing powers, and an investment in the institutions that allow the imprisoned to write as a way to "take responsibility for their actions" (28); Appleman even goes so far as to explicitly say that "it is education that humanizes us and ... these men become more human when they are learning, reading, and writing" (29).

However, while Fuller articulates fealty to a discourse of ability based on a philosophical premise, Appleman's fixation on the humanizing "light" of the ability bestowed by her creative writing workshops speaks to the way in which the prison setting serves to bolster a sense of disciplinary identity -- to affirm the *mechanism* of the "critical moments of discovery or change" made possible by the imprisoned subject "not written by them." As if to reinforce the fact that these imprisoned testimonies serve to affirm *pedagogical* subjectivity, Appleman includes two photographs of herself surrounded by incarcerated writers -- conspicuously faceless, turned away, presumably in accordance with institutional protections. And yet, however unintentional, she invokes a different binary of light and darkness: herself surrounded by young men of color, faceless, turned towards her encouraging smile (25, 29). It is here that Appleman manages to retrench the very grammar of subjection she presumably seeks to dispel with the "light" of writing

pedagogy -- a grammar of subjection she deemed effective enough to repeat as respondent to Jimmy Santiago Baca's featured address at the CCCC convention in 2012, using Baca's testimony discussing his autobiography, *A Place to Stand* (200) to reinforce her own findings about how, "through language, there can be light and laughter in a dark place" ("Writing as Libratory Gateway" 2012). And it is this production and representation of prisoner testimony that invites comparison to abolitionist discourse; just as slave testimonies of the nineteenth century are overdetermined by the discursive expectations of their abolitionist sponsors, so do the texts and bodies of imprisoned writers get caught in the constructions of the witness -- in this case, the literacy sponsor's discursive investment in the relationship of written ability to humanness, as well as an investment in disciplinary identity -- in this case, community literacy programming -- as a critical conduit to the human. Here, "witness" and "whiteness" come uncomfortably close, whether the countervailing darkness be the Black prison-slave, the brown bodies of prisoners like Baca, or other prisoners marked by the civil death and criminal attainder of conviction.

But neither is the problem that Jacobi and Appleman are, like most prison literacy sponsors, white.[43] Rather, the problem for prison-based community literacy, and the potential crisis for composition more broadly, is that this group of literacy practitioners

[43] In their overture to *Rhetoric Review's* symposium on whiteness, Kennedy, Joyce Middleton, and Krista Ratcliffe (2005) note that composition faculty are "overwhelmingly white," a disproportionality that becomes more apparent with "increasing percentages of non-white students in our classrooms" (367). Kennedy, Middleton, and Ratcliffe's piece constitutes somewhat of a position paper on the implications of whiteness studies for Rhetoric and Composition as a field, additionally offering specific recommendations for incorporating discussions of whiteness into classroom pedagogy.

largely fails to acknowledge its own subjectivity as raced participants in a tradition of literacy sponsorship historically marked by unequal positionalities, even as they recognize that struggle playing out within the carceral institution and in the subjectivities of their students -- both those within and outside the prison. By coding their own participation in these pedagogical and activist literacy efforts as unraced, they reinscribe a discourse of whiteness in ways not dissimilar to Fuller's reinscription of whiteness through her review of Douglass's text. This move to some extent undoes the advances in the field's awareness of whiteness as a "neutral category" that functions as a universal, socializing mechanism (Kennedy, Middleton, Ratcliffe 367), even as white practitioners denounce racism, and its iterations in the prison, with the best of intentions. Importantly, Jacobi's discussion of prison literacy elsewhere as a conduit for prison abolition does name "Critical Understanding of Subject Positioning" as one of three crucial values necessary for addressing the tactical challenges of literacy activism (Jacobi 2008 47-8). However, she plots this awareness along axes that contrast pedagogical goals of "transformation" and the "semiotics of restraint," and one charting varying degrees of "educentricity" (48). While she does acknowledge that "a repressive system ... has systematically kept at-risk youth, women, and people of color from achieving social and economic parity" (47), nowhere does she consider the extent to which assumption of an explicitly (un)raced semiotics on the part of prison literacy sponsors themselves might share the prison's discursive load as a repressive institution.

Anna Plemons, on the other hand, demonstrates a degree of awareness about rhetorical use of color, both in her own characterizations, and her analysis of those mobilized by others. In her consideration of literacy as an act of "creative resistance," for

example, she notes Lewis Hyde's representations of Douglass's "colored" voice (Plemons 2013A 47) as a factor in his literacy sponsorship. Yet, Plemons stops short of accounting for her own participation in rhetorics of color that code the writing subject in problematic ways; in her account of her own work as a writing teacher at CSP Sacramento, for example, she codes the aggregate of narratives she sponsors in terms of "complimentary" [*sic*] color theory, or, "an expression of wholeness in that it represents all three primary colors" (Plemons 2013B). Specifically, she insulates against the despair of what she hears in prison -- the "tender stories of dead grandmothers, dead daughters, and dead nephews" -- by "thinking about the stories [she] hear[s] as bits of color" that afford "opportunities to write ourselves as whole." Here, an abstracted, idealized rhetorics of color serve to obfuscate power differentials between raced bodies.

Coming full circle, Plemons's use of these "colors" as a means of instructing or healing a universal "we" vividly rearticulates Kerr's observations about the *topos* of the prison as a critical literacy sponsor for external audiences, noteworthy not the least of which because Kerr, too, relies on discourses of color -- and heavy opposition of darkness and light -- to heighten the rhetorical impact of his speech at the Long Island University - Brooklyn campus. Noting, with a tone of tragic import, the fact that the "prison renaissance" of the 1970s has been followed not "by an equally hopeful Age of Enlightenment", but rather, "the Dark Ages" (Kerr 2006 6), he extends the darkness metaphor across the duration of his argument, first by offering ways to "measure the darkness" of "sheer numbers of people incarcerated, by disproportionate representation of black and Latinos/Latinas" (6) -- an extension of the sentimental voyeurism prison studies scholars Han (Han 3) and Rodríguez ("Against Prison Writing") caution against, and then

through a negative figuration of "Crime and Punishment TV's ... much darker desire to incarcerate and execute our fellow Americans" (10). The problem, here, is not that he dares mobilize light and dark in connection with the prison at all; the problem is his uncritical conflation of moral penury and pre-Enlightenment dystopia with the darkness of the black and brown bodies for rhetorical effect. As Morrison writes of the linguistic strategies deployed in American fiction to characterize the slave, there is an easy "economy of stereotype" that works in tandem with metonymic displacement of color that "displace[s] rather than signif[ies] the Africanist character" (Morrison 63); insofar as Jacobi, Appleman, Plemons and Kerr reproduce this economy through their own rhetorical appeals, Morrison's concerns trouble prison literacy scholarship's potential to perform an ethical intervention in the very structural oppressions such sponsor-scholars seek to undermine.

One might dismiss charges of a pattern of reliance on rhetorics of dark and light based on these few texts. Yet, it is worth noting that, of the fourteen scholarly entries in the *Reflections* special edition, there is not a single mention of white subjectivity by the scholars themselves; there are twenty-one usages to denote recognition of whiteness in the testimonies of college students and prisoners, including the discursive figure of "the man," but zero instances in which the *curators* of those testimonies acknowledge the role of their own racial subjectivity in either their classrooms or in their address of a larger professional or discursive audience. Even acknowledgement of the role of "race" beyond whiteness gets short shrift; in the entire edition, there are only fourteen mentions of "race" or "racism;" again, none of them used in reference to the scholars or literacy activists themselves. "Race" is either one of several abstracted indices used to categorize statistical data (174, 194), a *topos* listed in descriptions of two workshops that categorize race as co-valent with

such *topoi* such as "power" and "space" (Hastings 87), "class" and "politics"(Pompa 25); or part of student (63) and prisoner work (Rogers 16, Keesling 125) included to explore other issues. While it is conceivable that the omission of this component from practitioner identity was intended to shift discussion away from race as a totalizing factor for incarceration, its conspicuous absence in a publication run through with personal reflection and autoethnographic accounts of pedagogical exchange is significant, given race's foundational role in the prison-industrial complex, the power relations of literacy sponsorship, and the political ontology of the prison-slave.

One could argue that the marginalization of race in this publication does not in and of itself reinscribe a discourse of whiteness, or grammar of suffering. If anything, one could argue that a privileging of racial discourse over other relevant factors such as gender, age, class, and ethnicity succeeds in retrenching a grammar of raced prisoner subjectivity beyond what any omission might accomplish: repeat anything often enough, and it becomes true -- or at the least, difficult to escape. That is, in part, what McBride himself argues when he suggests that abolitionist discourse in the nineteenth century became "overdetermined," insofar as slaves themselves found themselves pulled into the expected discourse of abolitionist projections of slave subjectivity because of the gravitational pull of its legibility. Time after time, prison literacy practitioners argue that they find it more helpful to the prisoners themselves to treat them as "equals" (Pompa 27), "students" (Karpowitz; Appleman 29); or "human beings" (Rogers 18, Pompa 28, 33).

And to be fair, these desires are also voiced by the imprisoned writers themselves, including not only a number of prisoners contributing to the *Reflections* special issue, but also Baca in his featured CCCC address -- constituting a critical part of McBride's

67

sponsorship dynamic, wherein "the imagined reader becomes completely discursive *for* the witness" (McBride 2), through a "confluence of political, moral, and social discursive concerns that animate, necessitate, and indeed make possible slave testimony itself" (McBride 151). McBride chooses Douglass as an exemplar for this dynamic because of his "blockbuster" status, and exceptional rhetorical savvy in imagining a Bakhtinian horizon in which pro-slavery advocates and abolitionists meet to debate black humanity (151). In McBride's reading, Douglass recognizes and meets the public's demand for "increasingly revealing and even pruriently detailed" accounts of slave suffering (154) by refusing his reader a detailed account of his escape, even as he voices a desire to tell. That desire for spectacle draws on discourses predicated on the injured materiality of the Black body -- both what Hortense Spillers calls the "ripped-apartedness" of the spectacle of violence against the slave (Spillers 67), and the "specimen" that Fuller mobilizes in her work as evidence of Black ability. That Douglass denies the discursive reader the gratification of knowing details of the full escape "in the name of "brotherhood" with his fellow slaves" (156), however, demonstrates a complex navigation of dominant discourse that both rewards readers' appetites for material evidence and the sensational, and scolds them for privileging the pleasures of spectatorship over the very moral, Christian bond of brotherhood they purport to avow for themselves - the same trope of brotherhood to which Fuller appeals at the end of her review. Yet, at the same time, McBride acknowledges that the abolitionist movement created the condition of possibility for the *Narrative's* emergence (157); despite, however, the over-determined conditions of its production, McBride names Douglass a success.

As a contemporary writer extolling the ability-forming, humanizing powers of prison literacy, Jimmy Santiago Baca constitutes somewhat of a corollary to Douglass, not the least of which because sponsors like Jacobi have had Baca speak about his writing to her college classes (Jacobi, "Slipping Pages" 72); this testimonial circuit, from small prison-themed discussions to hundred-person ballroom events like Baca's CCCC address in 2012, echoes the movements of the abolitionist speaking circuit of which Frederick Douglass was a part.[44] Where Jacobi and Appleman's troping of ability extends Fuller's discourse of literacy as a condition of possibility for a white civic imaginary, Baca, along with several imprisoned contributors to the special edition of *Reflections,* demonstrate the extent to which prisoner testimony, like that of its slave antecedents, "itself must conform to certain codes to be legible to its audience" (McBride 2). Simon Rolston observes this dynamic in his critique of the conversion narrative in Baca's autobiography, *A Place to Stand: The Making of a Poet*. Rolston notes that even as Baca voices empowerment and "a sense of belonging in ... an "imagined community" (Rolston 83) created by the "humanizing influences of reading and writing" (97), this transformative process "rehearses the story of the Rousseauian social contract" that uses literacy to replace bodily impulse with "the voice of duty" (97). Citing Dylan Rodríguez's concerns about the structural faults of prison narrative (5),

---

[44] Plemons and Kerr, too, participate in a kind of sponsorship circuit, circulating the story and writings of San Quentin inmate Spoon Jackson in conference presentations (Kerr 2011, Kerr 2012), college classroom exchange settings (Kerr, qtd. in Jackson), print (Plemons, "Working in Impossible Places", "Literacy as an Act"), and even Twitter (Plemons, "Spoon Jackson changed"). San Quentin-based prison educator Judith Tannenbaum collaborated with Jackson to co-write *By Heart: Poetry, Prison, and Two Lives*, a text that Spoon partially voice-recorded, which now appears on YouTube (atnightlyfilm). Plemons tweeted the link to publicize the memoir's publication.

Rolston provides an incisive critique of the way in which Baca's literacy narrative in fact reinscribes a discourse of "prisoners as inhuman and requiring self-control" (13) by extending the prison's historical conflation of religious transformation and rebirth into citizenship (21-25).

But even as Rolston emphasizes Baca's culpability as a purveyor of the narrative of rehabilitation and religious conversion, he fails to fully account for the *sponsoring mechanism* of Baca's work, -- or that of any of the other prison writers he examines -- beyond anthologization of those texts on the receiving end (5-6). Publication, for Rolston, is an abstracted process, mentioned in Rolston's analysis largely through passive construction: *A Place to Stand* "was published" (13), but his emphasis rests on the way in which Baca *himself* perpetuates the rehabilitative discourse. Incorporating Rodríguez's critique of the prison writing genre (63), Rolston does provide a useful account of the way in which Baca is simply participating in a nineteenth-century reformative discourse that binds religious transcendence to reintegration with a (human) citizenry (89-91). What Jacobi and Appleman's sponsorship -- and subsequent use of Baca's testimony suggests -- is that such a discourse is more intimately, mutually constitutive, between the writers and those individuals and representatives of organizations and institutions who actively sponsor imprisoned narratives -- the dynamic McBride describes when he pairs discussion of Fuller and Emerson with slaves' mirroring of abolitionist expectations, exemplified in Douglass. Nevertheless, in spite of these exemplars of success, white Enlightenment discourse continues to trouble prison literacy scholarship's efforts to promote counter-narrative as empowerment, in no small part because of its tandem troping of prison

literacy work as a kind of epistemological and pedagogical frontier, relegating prisoners

themselves as an affective landscape subordinate to sponsor subjectivity.

The TEMPTING *TOPOS* of LITERACY WORK "BEYOND"

As previously noted, Douglass's invitation to spectacle -- and subsequent

withholding of its rewards -- plays deftly on the prurience of his audience, even as he

incites its Christian outrage. At the same time, however, his refusal to fully lift the veil on

the full extent of slave suffering heightens the stark otherness of a world in which the

reader, comfortably anchored in the rights and freedoms of civil personhood, is gratified by

imagining or engaging with a space in which that subjectivity is not only challenged, but

fully negated. Here, Douglass leads his audience on a journey of the unknown and the

unspeakable -- a sublimity not unknown to Northern nineteenth-century readers primed

by circulation of texts from Edmund Burke to Edgar Allan Poe.[45] Douglass's subject matter

aside, the trope he employs is not in and of itself an unraced literary conception; to return

to Morrison's *Playing in the Dark,* the distinctly American romance of metaphorical

darkness "offered platforms for moralizing and fabulation, and for the imaginative

entertainment of violence, sublime incredibility, and terror" (Morrison 37). That romance,

as Buck-Morss's historicizing account of Hegel has shown, participates in the broader

Enlightenment project of defining knowledge and consciousness itself in the face of an

---

[45] Theresa A. Goddu notes that Douglass made use of Gothic conventions a means of both identifying with and

critiquing his audience; those conventions included the Gothic villain of the slave master (Goddu 137), and a

terror of the wilderness to be survived en route to freedom, a brush with the sublime Lance Newman

observes in both Douglass's *Narrative* and *The Heroic Slave* (129-132).

(enslaved) Other -- again, white subjectivity predicated on the conflation of darkness and the beyond.

That vexed discursive load resurfaces in prison literacy scholarship that imagines the prison as a frontier at the borders of knowledge and civic personhood. As Kerr proclaimed in an address quoted at the opening of this chapter, prison can "can illuminate—in unique ways, the effects of mass incarceration on individuals, society, and civilization" (Kerr 2006) -- what he calls a critical sponsor of literacy for an otherwise ignorant public. This sense of the frontier evokes the rich network of conversations around borders, contact zones, and margins, in composition more broadly, reminding us of the extent to which the "beyond" is an unavoidable *topos* for a discipline in which the composing process is, as a condition of epistemological development, an encounter with the Other as it manifests in self and others, whether inside or outside the classroom.[46] That discussion, moreover, often worries over the ethics of teacher-student positionality, particularly in light of power differentials afforded by the lenses of critical pedagogy and postcolonial theory. And it should be acknowledged that the prison, by virtue of its function as a site of mass, forced, and largely temporary displacement (if for years on end) -- is already necessarily a borderland, in which communicative activity serves to situate, dislocate, and relocate interlocutors, as well as break down very real barriers of

---

[46] It is important to acknowledge that boundaries and attendant conceptions of the "beyond" shape method's advantages and constraints on the level of vision. Nedra Reynolds, for example, and discusses the physical difficulties of boundary crossing, but also the difficulty in "developing and sustaining a set of research practices that begin with the ... acknowledgment that our own locations do much to determine our ability to "see" (Reynolds 117). Reynolds, however, does not explicitly discuss borders as tropes with particular rhetorical effects, but rather as ideological formations grounded in subject positioning.

understanding and ability. As Rogers notes, "Prison is a place of borders, divisions, and differences; literacy teachers and facilitators in prison need to recognize the role their classes or workshops can have in at least beginning to break down those divisions and creating a space for human interaction" (Rogers, "The Secret Soul of Prisoners" 76). However, there is a way in which the repeated troping of that border as a site of danger and invitation to knowledge for sponsors and outsiders risks reinforcing the intransigency of prisoner subjectivity as relegated to a non-agentive inhumanity beyond, while affording the (discursively white) witness the occasion to understand him or herself in relation to that beyond, and inadvertently casting the sponsors of the literacy work within as brave guides to that frontier. Here, the *ēthos* of moral obligation surfacing in the work of Rogers, Kerr, and others starts to look like Manifest Destiny.

Kerr, for his part, invokes the perilous encounter with the beyond through synecdoche in "Between Ivy and Razor Wire," following a marquis-sized threat of bodily injury with an account of, "teaching and learning in the long, dark and highly charged shadow of law and order ideology" ("Between Ivy" 62) -- a dramatization that both evokes Gothic villainy and haunted spaces. The body of the piece is a frank and self-effacing account of efforts to conduct student-inmate correspondence, at times struggling with student resistance to the gravity of material presented, acknowledging moments of failure, even acknowledging, in closing, the way in which he and his students were "*humanized* [and] *corrected"* (75, emphasis author's) by their incarcerated correspondents. And yet, Kerr's insistence on returning to the opening metaphor suggests an anticipation of a discursive reader who takes pleasure in the spectacle of prison-as-frontier, every part the "platform for moralizing and fabulation" that Morrison describes. While one might praise

Kerr for a sense of compositional or rhetorical unity, it's a rhetorical move that nevertheless fetishizes the prison, even as he attempts to neutralize its discursive hold on the imaginations of his students.

Jacobi, too, rhapsodizes on the danger of razor wire, framing it as a frontier for social action, and those that conduct prison literacy work in terms that evoke heroism, transgression, and bodily peril:

> "To slip through the razor wire is to challenge the system. To slip through the razor wire is risky, whether you are trying to slip contraband in—or make it visible to the rest of the world. And to slip through, under, or around razor wire with language—written or verbal—I suggest, is the work of social justice and a growing number of scholars in composition and rhetoric who are motivated by such issues and the possibility of change" (Jacobi, "Slipping Pages" 67).

This sense of frontier creates excitement intended to exhort the reader to social action, presumably those receptive to David Coogan's call for public writing to perform social inquiry towards social change (Coogan 161); Jacobi's work, after all, encompasses community literacy work that aims to cultivate learning opportunities for undergraduates, as well as encourage other writing teachers to "acknowledge the possibility" of such writing spaces (67). At the same time, however, Jacobi's opening portrait of this danger casts scholars and practitioners of social justice as actors in an environment where the imprisoned writers themselves are conspicuously absent, though it should be noted that elsewhere Jacobi partners with incarcerated writers such as Elliott Johnston (2012) to explore the tactical challenges of community publishing. It bears mention that, following this salvo, Jacobi spends considerable time parsing the logistical and ethical complexities of

negotiating change in such spaces, ultimately stressing the need to "consider the potential

needs and contributions of incarcerated writers," while forging partnerships between

institutions as a means of becoming more democratically engaged (83). However, in the

final paragraph of this text, Jacobi nevertheless returns to the violence of razor wire,

alluding to the ripped-apartedness of prison-based narratives "sliced and reordering by

razors" (83), if not the bodies of the imprisoned themselves. Even as she calls on her

audience to consider "larger cultural implications of locking up over two million people's

words" (83), Jacobi re-centers her audience on a rhetorical landscape in which the

imprisoned agents of these literacy practices are relegated to a static fate, as artifacts of

mass injury, while Jacobi and her compatriots face that frontier under the banners of

literacy, justice, and possibility. Here, as with Rogers's, Kerr's, and Branch's *ēthos* of moral

obligation, the "teacher as hero" narrative surfaces once again. Whether or not Jacobi's

work successfully meets prisoner needs, the rhetorical appeal she uses to promote her

cause nevertheless relegates the prisoner to a role of what Morrison might call, "some

suffering thing" (Morrison 3-4), mobilized by non-prisoners as a means of "ignit[ing]

critical moments of discovery or change or emphasis in literature not written by them

(Morrison viii). Here, as with the grammar described by Spillers, prison literacy scholarship

extends the ruling logics of slave suffering, even as Jacobi seeks to transcend them.

But although Jacobi's appeal suggests it is the work of the few and the brave, it turns

out that the troping of the prison as a frontier of discovery or change is wildly popular,

evidenced by replication of Temple University's Inside Out program on a national scale -- a

student-prisoner dialogue exchange whose mission, according to founder Lori Pompa, is to

"move out of the safety that distance provides, and go there -- in order to learn, to

experience, to be disturbed, to *read the life itself*" (Pompa 24, emphasis author's). Here, as

with Jacobi's invitation to injury and contraband, Pompa leads her discursive reader on a

perilous journey "behind the walls" to "disturb where we are comfortable" (24). Pompa's

aim to "read the life itself" invokes Freire's distinction between reading mere words and

"reading the world" (24), and envisions the prison as a site of fertile pedagogical terrain for

her students, an opportunity to unseat comfortable assumptions about the neat logics of

the criminal justice system. In so doing, she operationalizes the mandate of community

engagement work in composition, moving away from scholarly detachment towards civic

commitment, envisioning the program as a place where prisoners and students share class

"as equals, [where] borders disintegrate and barriers recede" (27). Yet, Pompa's

positioning of prison as a disturbing encounter with otherness intensifies the status of the

prisoner as Morrison's "suffering thing," an effect reinforced by an even more theatrical

staging of her own introduction to the prison, which she characterizes in terms of sensory

overload:

> a sensory cacophony of stale sweat, old sneakers, clanging bars, crumbling
>
> cement, deafening announcements over the P.A. system, and men...hundreds of men,
>
> who seemed to be locked in some bizarre dance, a listless fugue arrested in time
>
> (24).[47]

---

[47] This grotesque rendering bears striking resemblance to another literary depiction of a frontier marked

with human despair, notably Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* -- a depiction that Chinua Achebe famously critiques

for reducing Africans to a set of props for working out the struggles of the European psyche (Achebe 1977).

Conrad characterizes Africans as, " nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation lying confusedly in

the greenish gloom;" Achebe is disappointed to discover that his American students and colleagues at

From here, she recounts her growth as an individual literacy sponsor and the gradual

creation of the Inside Out program, culminating in a "transformative literacy" in which

college students, facilitators, and inmates alike are able to participate in a dialogue of

understanding between "personal and collective realities in new, creative, and critical

ways" (Pompa 31-34). In other words, fear of the unknown gives way to not only shared

interpretation, but Michael Warner's "poetic world-making" (Warner 114) -- a fulfillment

of the hope and possibility so part and parcel of the broader work of composition.

     Yet, it is Pompa's appeal to the prison's affective structure -- heightened by her

subsequent performance of voyeuristic obsession -- that reveals her discursive kinship

with the damaging fabulation of slave suffering that Morrison and Spillers describe.

Following her grotesque tableau of men caught in a "listless fugue arrested in time" (Pompa

24), Pompa recounts her desire to then follow her need to look beneath the surface: "There

were realities behind those walls that I wanted to understand, truths hidden beneath

the surface that begged to be revealed"(24-25). The rhetorical (and poetic) strategy Pompa

employs here is a shrewd one, setting up a sensational stage of the prison's strangeness,

which she then transforms by offering a pedagogy that dramatically undermines that

otherness -- a satisfying, Aristotelian reversal, and site of knowledge production. It is also a

successful one, as Pompa's piece has been published in and cited by multiple venues aimed

at community literacy and prison literacy audiences (Berry, Chlup and Baird, Deans *et al.*,

Hirschinger-Blank *et al.*, Holsinger, Wetzel and "Wes"), a success that echoes the discursive

circuitry McBride describes in his account of the codes deployed by slaves and abolitionists

---

Amherst have absorbed this discourse, which Morrison confirms in her analysis of American literary

discourse.

like Fuller. Just as abolitionism demonstrated successive reliance on a troping of the Black body to "conform to certain codes to be legible to its audience" (McBride 2), so does the proliferation of both Pompa's text and program design suggest the frontier trope as a powerful force in the rhetorical economy of prison literacy scholarship, and rhetoric and composition more broadly, received and retransmitted by scholars and imprisoned literacy recipients, alike, such that it becomes a satisfying commonplace, and "ruling episteme."

It follows, then, that the thrill of passing contraband through razor wire, the compositional interest of juxtaposing light and darkness, and the dramatic realization of an ability that transcends race become a set of expectations and a rewards for the discursive reader with each successive telling. And as McBride, Rodríguez, Spillers, and Morrison show, that system of tropes and rewards continue to reproduce the discursive logics of American slavery, even as the thoughtful curation of prisoner-penned texts seeks to empower those voices and amplify the knowledge they convey. By extension, uncritical circulation of these logics situates community literacy scholarship squarely in a rhetoric of whiteness; and to the extent that this economy of representation operates as part of a larger argument for composition's role in fostering civic engagement and political agency, it stands to reason that it is a rhetoric of representation that troubles the field's relationship both to rhetoric, and to the subaltern voices composition scholarship often represents.

CURATING FORWARD: WRITING "ABOUT" without WRITING "OUT"

So, what next? What do scholars and practitioners of prison-based community literacy do with this onerous discursive lineage, and the double-bind of a curatorial practice that must simultaneously "conform to certain codes" to be rhetorically effective, and denounce those very codes for the oppressive baggage they convey? All of these

scholars acknowledge the unavoidable structural oppressions of the prison-industrial

complex, and power differentials inherent in any working relationship that brings

prisoners and outsiders together. Yet, just as we cannot entirely escape the institutional

discourses that enable interaction with these literacy communities in the first place, so can

we not deny our own need to craft, to narrativize, to dramatize the formative moments of

our own identities as advocates, teachers, and scholars who work in the singularly,

powerfully affective environment that is the prison.

It's a need that, as Debra Journet notes, has become an inescapable part of the work

of rhetoric and composition (Journet 20); in her piece, "Narrative Turns in Writing Studies

Research" (2012), she observes that composition methodology leans heavily on the

personal narrative genre to make arguments about "what kinds of events and agents are

important to the story of composing" (Journet 19); furthermore, she suggests that the field

has "invested a great deal of intellectual capital in rhetorical conventions that primarily use

ēthos (rather than method) to provide evidence that the researcher has produced an

authentic account" (19). The affective structure of the narratives that Kerr, *et al.* present,

from the longing of Plemons's color theory, to Pompa's grotesque visions of dancing bodies,

then, serve as markers of *ēthos* and narrative authenticity. However, while Journet

importantly acknowledges that narrative is an inescapable part of the work of rhetoric and

composition, and that narrative genres do carry revolutionary and progressive potential

(20), she urges the field to adopt a more critical stance towards a disciplinary logic that

makes claims about "the power of personal narrative as an inherently progressive and

libratory genre" (20). As John Lucaites and Celeste Condit observe (1985), narrative plays a

vital role in the development of social consciousness; accordingly, rhetorical agents need to

discover the social and political consequences of certain narrative forms (page). The trick, then, is to adopt a rhetorical and curatorial approach to "writing about" prison-based community literacy that affirms scholarly *ēthos* and the discursive expectations of one's audience *not* at the expense of the prisoners themselves. Below, then, I offer a set of curatorial recommendations for writing about writers in prison, such that the field might retain the modes of narration vital to its disciplinary identity, but also more effectively respond to the criticisms of critical race theory and prison studies offered by scholars such as Spillers, Wilderson, Rodríguez, and others. At the same time, these curatorial practices constitute a method that might work alongside and supplement modes of curation already in use.

CRITICAL SUBJECT POSITIONING in PRINT, not just the CLASSROOM

The first of these is critical subject positioning for the sponsor-scholar as a raced rhetorical agent in print. In her examination of how community literacy program work might contribute to social movements such as prison abolition, Jacobi importantly seeks to address the empty complicity of teachers being, "'just us' sitting around the table cultivating a momentary sense of agency through collaborative moments" (Jacobi, "Speaking Out" 47) by engaging in "critical reflection on the subject positioning of the prison educator herself, a positioning that requires a certain degree of complicity by definition" (47). Here, Jacobi acknowledges the vexed subjectivity of those who sponsor literacy in prison, primarily along the lines of the institutional complicity that comes with being an educator - the "educentric" orientation noted earlier in this chapter (48). Yet, while critical reflection on the biases and affordances of one's institutional identifications remains vital to this and other community literacy projects, *sponsor-scholars must also*

interrogate the extent to which their positioning as raced, gendered, and classed subjects

informs the research narratives they craft to represent the communities they serve. While we

may never erase the privileges afforded by raced, classed, gendered, and educational

identifications, or fully escape the circuitry of a (white) Enlightenment discourse, ethical

curation of prison-based literacy communities demands thoughtful consideration of how

sponsor-scholars' own orientations and discursive assumptions inflect the linguistic and

rhetorical economies we rely on to reach certain audiences. If Morrison's study of the

shadow in American fiction suggests that hazardous linguistic economies grounded in

whiteness have permeated cultural consciousness for the last several hundred years, the

prison literacy scholarship cited above offers proof positive that those linguistic economies

are alive and well. The critical and emancipatory aims of prison literacy work, then,

demand a subject positioning that 1) interrogates the privilege of using tropes that may

dehumanize or fetishize violence against raced and/or imprisoned bodies, even as they

may be deployed to progressive ends; and 2) considers the discursive assumptions of

prison-based research writing in which discussion of the curator's own raced, classed, and

disciplinary investments is conspicuously absent. In the words of Keith Gilyard, responding

to James Berlin's failure to adequately address race in his study of rhetoric and ideology:

"From the subject position of a white teacher, a label he did not reject, how could he teach

students to 'resist' and 'negotiate' the controlling discourse that whiteness is? (Higher

Learning 48).

     This does not mean, however, engaging in a ritual confession of white subjectivity,

such that narrative recognition of discursive whiteness eclipses the narratives of prisoners

themselves. As rhetorical whiteness scholars Wendy Ryden and Ian Marshall suggest, such

"moral accounting" can serve to reveal discursive structures (14), but it can also "recenter the white subject by paying attention to the particularity of whiteness in its various incarnations" (5). While, as Journet has shown, personal narrative has become a marker of methodological authenticity *par excellence,* sponsor-scholars must cultivate a meta-awareness about how the acknowledgment of raced (or unraced) subjectivity itself functions narratively and rhetorically in their research publications. And while Ryden and Marshall's appraisal of whiteness "kitsch" performs its own reductive, monolithic rendering of scholars writing about whiteness, Ryden and Marshall's use of Koziak on Aristotelian recognition and Jeffrey Walker on catharsis (105-132) prove useful in locating the *thumos* of both the confessional impulse, and the avoidance of that confessional impulse, insofar as a decision to avoid mention of raced subjectivity suggests a body of discursive desires grounded in a need for hope, transcendent ability, and the "socially responsible, compassionate life" Laura Rogers and her fellow teachers seek in their work. Acknowledging the sponsor-scholar as a raced rhetorical agent *especially* in the research narrative can at least help prison literacy practitioners to identify those moral/emotional/ discursive impulses for what they are -- and the extent to which those impulses operate in circuits formed by historical practices that have done (and continue to do) both good and ill. One way to facilitate that critical positioning might be to engage the prisoners themselves in a dialogue about the rhetorical demands placed on sponsor-scholars to represent that literacy community in particular ways.

INCLUDING SUBJECT REVIEW and the RIGHT to CO-INTERPRETATION

A second part to better curatorial practice would be to precede peer review with review and co-interpretation by those being sponsored, represented, and circulated

publicly in print, demonstrating a dialogic attunement to one's subjects as individuals with their own sense of self-representation. Inviting subject review and response to the rhetorical economies mobilized in a given manuscript not only answers Jacqueline Jones Royster's call to "talk across boundaries *with* others, instead of for, about, and around them"[48] (Royster 38), it is the very kind of negotiation that rhetorician Krista Ratcliffe cultivates in her formulation of "rhetorical listening" (*Rhetorical Listening*) -- a project that emerged from interrogating her own challenges of negotiating whiteness and gender. Ratcliffe responded to Royster's call by envisioning a rhetorical listening that might "be employed to hear people's intersecting identifications in order to facilitate cross-cultural communication about any topic" (Ratcliffe 17). A review process that engages imprisoned writers in dialogue about enthymemic content of language employed for rhetorical effect might serve to open productive conversations about 1) the affordances and consequences of representing imprisoned writers in particular ways, and 2) the extent to which said representations more clearly articulate the intersectional subjectivities of sponsor/scholars themselves as members of different discourse communities. In so doing, prison-based sponsor-scholars might attune more effectively to the concerns voiced by critical race and prison studies scholarship, thereby enacting a practice of mutuality on multiple registers. Moreover, such a review assures what literacy theorist Thomas Newkirk calls the "rights of co-interpretation" (Newkirk 12), so as to enact an "ethics of rendering" that avoids the enticements of "bad news" critique (12) -- a dynamic Newkirk sees in the stark, dyadic rendering of the basic learning course characterized by Linda Brodkey in "The

---

48 Royster advocates for this mode of dialogue after recounting a series of personal anecdotes in which scholarship like The Bell Curve, colleagues, and other non-

African American audiences have relegated Royster and African-Americans more broadly to a narrow, univocal role.

83

Literacy Letters" (1996). It may also afford advantage on the level of discourse, insofar as

such a practice might, in turn, combat what some might see as reductive and unfair charges

of voyeurism (Rodríguez), thereby encouraging consideration of the extent to which such

radical-critical accounts of prison-slave subjection themselves traffic in aestheticized

rhetorics mobilized for rhetorical effect.

The field already stresses the vital import of dialogue, as well as mutuality, and

collaboration. Pompa advocates for a "being with" that asks college students and inmates to

work out their relationship to crime and punishment side by side (Pompa 27); Jacobi, too,

offers the *Reflections* 4.1 special edition as a "hybrid space for academic texts and prison

writings to weave together a collaborative and reflective narrative (Jacobi 2004 2), a

configuration she repeats when partnering with prisoner Elliot Johnston in the anthology,

Circulating Communities: The Tactics and Strategies of Community Publishing, and Grace

Wetzel and "Wes", an incarcerated participant in Wetzel's collaborative writing venture,

identify mutuality the cornerstone of a completed student-prisoner exchange that "did not

preclude systemic considerations, but rather produced productive, political outcomes"

(Wetzel and "Wes" 66). "Wes," in his response to Wetzel, noted being particularly

heartened by the "relational element of the project" (82), wagering that "most prisoners

would lament that we are seldom spoken *to* as much as we are spoken *about*" (82). Here,

"Wes" demonstrates the degree to which community literacy work in prisons already

practices thoughtful curation of prisoner experiences and the texts they compose.

However, in order to effectively combat the kind of tropological oversight outlined in this

chapter, we need to foster greater metadiscursive awareness and methodological rigor by

making critical rhetorical analysis and the politics of representation a more central part of

the research writing process, understanding that the final documents, as archival texts and mechanisms of civic and pedagogical encounter, have distinct material effects.

DOING JUST FINE ON THEIR OWN: GENIUS from (RHETORICAL) HYBRIDITY

In worrying over the discursive violence of these tropes, I recognize the dual peril of limiting the writers in these spaces to just one voice -- one overcome by the gravitational pull of legal and social death, and of bodily injury, incapable of wielding or transforming these tropes for their own ends. In this narrative, uncritical repetition of Spillers's "ripped-apartedness" becomes its own distant, aestheticized discourse, a strategic nihilism that adherents must address on its own metadiscursive terms. As Douglass, Baca, and others demonstrate, however, these appeals can be used by multiple agents, in myriad, even unpredictable ways -- "hybrid" people who, to quote Jacqueline Royster, "have the capacity by right of history and development ... to move with dexterity across cultural boundaries, to make themselves comfortable, and to make sense amid the chaos of difference" (Royster 37). Royster reminds us that someone "gave Maria Stewart, Gertrude Mossell…, Toni Morrison, ... bell hooks, Angela Davis and a cadre of other African American women a pencil, a pen, a computer keyboard. In both instances, genius emerges from hybridity, …. And I venture to say that all of their voices are authentic" (37). The capricious turn of the trope, then, in the hands of imprisoned writers, can serve to afford and empower, to create new meaning, even as it carries the discursive burden of a raced, enslaved history.[49] Prison-

---

[49] Jacobi hints at this capriciousness when she invokes de Certeau's *perruque* to describe how inmates and teachers use literacy tactically to navigate the strictures of the prison (Jacobi and Johnston 199). In order to achieve the mutuality and reciprocity the field seeks, however, the writing *with* and the writing *about* need to exist on the same rhetorical field.

based community literacy practitioners open up the radical possibilities for the change

they seek when the mystifications of a raced rhetorical economy are laid bare for all to see -

- and work beyond.

CHAPTER II

Performing the Emotional Purp:
Prosthetic Emotion and Socratic *Parrēsia* in *The Beat Within*

<u>*Mad as Hell*</u>

Mad as hell right now wish I was out
probably gotta do time is what I found out,
But I'm going through some thangs
people don't understand on my way to Santa Rita 'bout to be a grown man,
Partner just died so my head on spin
Everything twisted so my case I'm tryin' to win,
So stressed out that the kid wants to fight
I need to get out I swear Juvenile Hall ain't right.[50]
-Lil' Purp

<u>*From The Beat:*</u> *It's good to see that instead of going off*
on staff, getting locked up, or hurting yourself somehow,
you just put your rage and disappointment on a piece of
paper. That's what great artists do – they turn their
emotions into a message for the world to feel.

The Beat Within, Vol. 13.48 (2008) 29

Lil' Purp and *The Beat* share this exchange surrounded by the din of literally

hundreds of other voices captured in a sea of Xerox print, on folded eleven-by-seventeen

sheets, published every two weeks and delivered nation-wide to the juvenile detention

facilities where *The Beat* conducts its writing workshops. There are no staples, since

staples constitute a possible weapon, either for self-harm, or harm to others. Purp is one of

thousands of incarcerated youth and adults who have written to *The Beat* since it began in

San Francisco in 1996 as a site of collective lament over the loss of Tupac Shakur.

Though short, Purp's narrative is dense, railing against a system that compounds the

grief and madness of having lost someone to the streets, while recognizing that his passage

into adulthood corresponds to a sentence that will put him in an Alameda County jail. One

---

[50] The formatting of this piece reflects *The Beat's* own editorial choice in the printed publication.

could offer Purp's piece as a testament to the way in which writing either humanizes those for whom incarceration has erased personhood, or overdetermines them as subjects of civil and social death. Chapter One argues that such discourses are alive and well, among community literacy practitioners and critical race scholars such as Wilderson and Rodríguez -- discourses that rely on testimonials like Purp's as a source of rhetorical affect in a variety of social, political and scholarly projects. Importantly, however, this testimony does not function in isolation; rather, it is part of a dialogue between Purp and a publication that functions simultaneously as public forum and personal mentor, revealing competing and sometimes surprising notions of publics, emotion, and literate practice for writers like Purp, and the editor-sponsors who run *The Beat Within*.

With the emergence of New Literacy Studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s, came the ability to see such an exchange not so much as an articulation of conflict around acquisition of skills, but rather as a set of social practices. Turning away from decontextualized standards of literate competency, contributors to the movement made use of social-scientific method to show how literacy practices are anchored in particular communities, and participate in particular discourses of power.[51] Notable contributors such as Shirley Brice-Heath drew on the cross-cultural inquiries and the ethnographic methods of anthropology to characterize literacy acquisition through literacy "events" ("The Book," "Ethnography in Communities"), while Street used cultural anthropology to

---

[51] The term, "New Literacy Studies" is one Gee uses to characterize one movement among many taking part in a broader social turn that occurred across disciplines in the 1980s and 1990s (Gee 2000). It should not be confused with "new literacies," associated with emergent practices around the Internet in the 1990s, first circulated by David Buckingham (1993).

distinguish between distinct literacy events and the embedded literacy practices that occur

across ideological and political domains (*Literacy in Theory and Practice, Cross-Cultural*

Approaches).

      To the extent that the NLS movement developed a set of research practices that

emphasized both contextual uses of literacy and the situated knowledge of ethnographic

method, its scholarship provides a useful set of qualitative tools and case studies for

parsing contemporary prison literacy activity. Moreover, its qualitative disposition

parallels (and in some cases overlaps with) Communications scholarship that rhetorical

field scholars such as Aaron Hess ("Critical-Rhetorical Ethnography") and Michael

Middleton, Samatha Senda-Cook, and Danielle Endres ("Articulating Rhetorical Field

Methods") have drawn on to examine vernacular rhetorical spaces.[52] For this reason, some

of the tools and terminologies of literacy scholarship are useful auxiliaries to rhetorical

field studies and a situated, qualitative examination of prison-based literacy communities

like *The Beat.* Furthermore, to the extent that NLS contributions were vital to the

development of the social turn in Composition[53] -- the impetus for much of the hope-

---

[52] Gerard Hauser, for example, grounded his vernacular rhetorics (*Vernacular* Voices) on Ono and Sloop's

("Critique of Vernacular Discourse") use of discourse analysis to caution rhetoric against idealized

conceptions of vernacular activity. For additional reading demonstrating Rhet-Comm scholarship's

methodological overlap with literacy studies, see Samuel McCormick's work on "everyday talk" ("Earning

One's Inheritance"), and Tracy, McDaniel, and Gronbeck's use of fieldwork and discourse analysis in their

examination of "ordinary democracy" (*The Prettier Doll*).

[53] Emerging in tandem with the CCCC statement on Students' Rights to Their Own Language, the social turn

coalesced around the critical literacy efforts of Paulo Freire (*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*), as well as the class-,

race-, and ethnicity-minded literacy narratives of Mike Rose (*Lives on the Boundary*), Victor Villanueva

oriented community-based and publics-minded writing scholarship facing the scandal of the prison-slave, literacy-oriented methods and terminologies remain important to this dissertation, particularly the notion of sponsorship.

The NLS and Composition also come together in the sub-field of Community Literacy, which cultivates relationships between scholars and community partners in order to characterize knowledge disseminated beyond traditional work and school institutions, and promote literacy in those domains. At the same time, Community Literacy scholarship and programming often operate as part of the institution-based community engagement and service learning initiatives that serve as a locus for public writing, attempting to fulfill the democratic exigencies of Composition's public turn.

Among this array of contributions, however, Deborah Brandt's formulation of literacy sponsorship remains one of the richest mechanisms for understanding community literacy work, for reasons related to both method and scope, primarily in her use of historicity, her mapping of a sponsorship continuum, an accounting for the unpredictability of "literacy diversion," ("Sponsors of Literacy," *Literacy and Learning*) and a framing of that diversion in such a way as to capture literacy's mobility as capital, whether for social, political, or economic gain.

(*Bootstraps*), Keith Gilyard (*Voice of the Self*), and Lisa Delpit (*Other People's Children*). The NLS and Composition have, in turn, contributed both method and scope to Writing Studies, which draws not only on Anthropology, Composition and Education, but also fields as diverse as Law, Economics, and Information Science to see writing, in the words of Charles Bazerman, "as a set of intertwined technologies -- of symbol system, of production and distribution, [and] of the book", tied not just to literacy education, but also to other developments in "human history" (Bazerman 3)."

As noted in the introduction, Brandt's framing of sponsorship in terms of patronage and Spanish-colonial *compradrazgo* ("Sponsors of Literacy" 168) emphasizes a historicity that, as the editors of the recent anthology, *Literacy, Economy, and Power: Writing after Literacy in American Lives* point out, marked an important departure from the "ethnographic present'" favored by much of New Literacy Studies (Duffy *et al.* 2). This sense of sponsorship, informed by literacy as a cumulative, structurally-formed capacity, continues to provide a useful dimension of context for presentist ethnographies that remain a prominent narrative tool in contemporary community literacy research, even as scholars continue to debate the extent to which the contours of a given literacy community are defined by local or external forces.

Brandt's sponsorship model, however, stands apart from other theories and histories of literacy in its distinct ability to capture a continuum of power differentials at work between literacy sponsors and their recipients, from the benign, to "euphemized coercions in schools and workplaces, to the most notorious impositions and deprivations by church and state" ("Sponsors" 168). Regardless of the variance in degree of coercion, however, Brandt maintains that, "sponsors deliver the ideological freight that must be borne for access to what they have," even as they may be oblivious to that burden (168). This provision that sponsorship might extend ideology unawares demonstrates Brandt's heavy debt to Bourdieu's *habitus,* and its role in the reproduction of cultural capital, influences which she acknowledges, but hopes to expand beyond articulation of class to literacy as a natural resource "in the way that electricity is a resource: Its circulation keeps the lights on" (*Literacy in American Lives* 6).

The electricity metaphor also serves to capture literacy's energy and mobility beyond perception as determined exclusively by class, gesturing towards an *energeia* that echoes what public rhetoric scholar Ralph Cintron sees as the operant power of democracy: a "[storehouse] of social energies of organizers of our life worlds," material only insofar as we allow material to be organized by said structures (Cintron 100-102). This description of literacy, in turn, accounts for its potential to be mobilized capriciously, innovatively, unintentionally, or on the sly, in spite of what sponsor or recipient may intend -- a quality Brandt captures in her case study of Oneida tribe member Carol White (*Literacy and Learning* 42-3). Here, Brandt carves out a space for the way in which the perils and potentials of literacy sponsorship overlap with the im/possibilities [54] of rhetorical pedagogy more broadly.

Yet, this model, which makes room for both literacy's capriciousness and its embeddedness in a social fabric determined by ideology, personal experience, and historical events, becomes a particularly useful analytic in looking at literacies sponsored within and around prisons, as Brandt herself gestures to both literacy's role in constructing legal personhood, and its significance as a site of struggle for position and resources in

---

[54]"Im/possibilities" is intended here to reference Aristotelian *dunamis,* translated alternately as possibility, capacity, or potentiality (Makin 401), and "a source of movement or change" (*Metaphysics V*). The adjective *to dunaton,* meaning, possible or capable (401), Aristotle defines as "that which can begin a movement (or a change in general, for even that which can bring things to rest is a 'potent' thing) in another thing or in itself" (*Metaphysics V*). Critical to the capriciousness of Brandt's sponsorship model is the way in which literacy might be used in any number of ways.

what Edward Stevens calls an "advanced contractarian society"[55] (Stevens, qtd. in "Sponsors" 176). Even as some prison literacy practitioners find the "sponsorship" designation problematic because of its religious and substance abuse programming connotations, as Tobi Jacobi does ("Slipping Pages" 83), they nonetheless recognize the utility of sponsorship as a framework, and invoke it with some regularity. Jacobi considers the challenges posed by the competing and sometimes conflicting sponsors of literacy prison educators face as they work towards social justice ("Speaking Out"), while echoing Brandt's observations about mobility, as she characterizes the diverse narrative and tactical uses of literacy by program facilitators in terms of de Certeau's *la perruque* (Jacobi and Johnston 199). Kirk Branch invokes Brandt to consider the extent to which teacher-scholars' own sense of agency informs the competing aims of literacy sponsorship they encounter and perform in carceral spaces (Branch). Plemons meditates on the potential for both hope and exploitation that Brant's [*sic*] sponsorship model offers in the prison setting ("Literacy as an Act"), while Tom Kerr inverts the relation of pedagogue to prisoner, arguing that the prison itself constitutes a "critical literacy sponsor" for society, as a means of illuminating the effects of incarceration for those on the outside ("Prison U").[56]

---

[55] Brandt invokes contract literacy in her comparison of union worker Dwayne Lowery to Johnny Ames, an illiterate sharecropper who learned to read and write in prison as a means of asserting his civil rights and pushing for access to legal and mental health resources (*Literacy in American Lives*).

[56] Kerr's argument, however, does not account for the way in which compositionists like himself willingly submit to the gravitational pull of the prison *topos* as a means of testing the efficacy of critical literacy in a democratic setting; for a more detailed analysis of this framing of the prison in community literacy scholarship, see Chapter One.

The Beat Within poses an interest for community literacy scholars insofar as the organization promotes literacy both within and outside the parameters of the school and correctional systems of which the detained youth and *The Beat's* volunteers are a part. Equally important to Community Literacy and to Composition, however, is that the publication represents an intersection of multiple communities, figured worlds, and notions of audience, from the editor's more abstract conception of "the world" in the example above, to the more explicit sense of community shared among the detained writers themselves from all over the country. For this group, *The Beat Within* becomes a narrative prop[57] in cultivating community and affective solidarity among individuals who otherwise function in segregated confinement. That the editors of *The Beat* use their responses to publicly exhort each writer to cultivate relationships to self and others, however, makes for a rich study of both how a particular sponsorship occupies a range of (and even conflicting) positions along Brandt's continuum, and how the literacy and rhetorical capacity shaped by that sponsorship move in unintended ways, towards the construction of publics that may or may not coincide with the publics imagined by *The Beat.*

With literacy sponsorship and public rhetoric in mind, then, this chapter builds upon the modality of scholarship presented by the NLS movement in order to examine how writing is being sponsored and used in these correctional spaces to perform particular tasks, supplementing the curatorial practices of existing prison literacy- and radical critical scholarships with the qualitative methods applied by NLS and Writing Studies to capture

---

[57] Shirley Brice-Heath sketches out the "narrative prop" as a means of language acquisition in her ethnography of Southern family literacy practices ("The Book as a Prop").

lived social practice. Through a qualitative analysis of Purp's 28 printed exchanges with

The Beat, supplemented by analysis of a *Beat*-sponsored report charting Purp's progress

from plagiarism to self-aware civic engagement, I show how the figured worlds of writer

and sponsor interact to reveal a suite of discursive assumptions about the relationship

between literacy, emotion, and notions of the public in the context of detention. These

dynamics, in turn, allow us to consider the extent to which *The Beat Within'*s literacy

sponsorship resists or extends the instruments of domination characterized by those

critical of the prison industrial complex, or embraces the discourse of transcendence and

empowerment espoused by prison literacy advocates within and outside of academe.

METHODOLOGY

In order to capture the localized fluidity of *Beat Within* sponsorship and its

imbrication with various ideologies and historical forces, this case study makes use of a

combination of design, analysis, and interpretive methods. While my interest in *The Beat's*

literacy sponsorship is shaped in part by literacy studies, an archival analysis of

submissions spanning several years invites an approach to data collection that eschews the

live-talk and circumstance-focused design of the discourse analysis favored by

sociolinguists in literacy studies (See Gee's influential *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*)

for one that allows for (but does not insist on) broader scale and generalizability. The

empirically-based RAD (Replicable, Aggregable, and Data-Supported) design characterized

by Richard Haswell ("NCTE's War"), used by writing researchers employing qualitative

methods legible to education research and other social-scientific disciplines, allows for

inquiry that can be tested and verified, with or without numeric data, thereby increasing its

legibility among disciplines defined by more rigorous standards of systematicity. This kind

of legibility becomes useful to a study looking at writing practices in correctional facilities insofar as a number of disciplines, including social psychology, prison studies, and criminology, examine prison-based writing through modes of analysis that incorporate varying degrees of qualitative and quantitative method; RAD scholarship encourages the possibility of working across disciplines to answer questions about these literacy communities in more comprehensive ways, even as it allows for recognition of singular rhetorical events, situated in particular historical moments.

Furthermore, to the extent that the current case study attempts to interrogate what radical critical theorists like Rodríguez see as a totalizing condition of subjection for the imprisoned writer nation-wide, it stands to reason that a study design able to accommodate collection and analysis of decades of archival data is better suited to examining phenomena on a vast scale, in a way that invites future scholars to continue that work in like fashion, towards a more meaningful consilience of findings. This is not to say that the qualitative tools favored by literacy scholarship cannot perform that work; it is only to say that RAD data design and collection lends itself more readily to the possibility of scaling this archival analysis either up or down, in ways that may be either generalized or narrowly situated. However, it is important to note that, while RAD scholarship design invites systematic analysis and accommodates generalizable and even quantitative analysis, it also avoids false oppositions between empirical and qualitative research (Haswell 201-202). Rather than reject the rich portraits and unique, disparate bodies offered by the more humanistic, narrative approaches to literacy and composition research, RAD scholarship's focus on aggregable data incorporates those portraits into increasingly discernible constellations, while also allowing for the testing of an individual study's

discursive assumptions. At the same time, however, it is important to point out that RAD

scholarship also risks losing the rhetorical specificity of a particular historical, social or

geographic context; for this reason, the disparate portraits and the constellations they

create remain, to some degree, in tension.

While acknowledging the importance of singular experience and rhetorical context,

however, my data collection method nevertheless employs a RAD approach, as I evaluate a

prolonged exchange between an individual writer and publication editor that might be

replicated by looking at exchanges between *The Beat* and other writers responding to

similar prompts, over comparable time frames. Subsequent studies might then reveal gaps

in my own analysis while still contributing to a more comprehensive sense of the

discourses at work in this literacy community, thereby allowing for the kind of

methodological thinking that, to borrow from Hawk, might be less encumbered by the

"abstract principles" (Hawks 110) or *topoi* that lead to inaccurate or even damaging

curation of prison-based texts.

This orientation of openness is vital to ameliorating one significant limitation to

archival analysis: namely, that the publication is just one aspect of *The Beat Within* as a

literacy community -- providing points of asynchronous dialogue that capture neither what

happens in the intervening days or weeks between points of written contact, or the quality

of synchronous exchange in the face-to-face workshop setting.[58] As anthropologist Annelise

Riles (*Documents*) points out, reducing ethnographic inquiry to the symbolic dimensions of

---

[58] The extent to which the detained writers register *The Beat's* printed counsel in their composing process is

discussed in Chapter Three, which details a set of face-to-face interviews with detained writers volunteers,

and probation counselors across three institutions.

experience constitutes a practice that cannot fully represent "the articulatory needs of social life" (Riles 12). However, publication nevertheless remains a deliberate inscription of social practice by sponsor and recipient within that community.

Working with what can be known, then, I use RAD-based qualitative design as a means of incorporating greater transparency into an interpretive analysis of a significant document in the life of *The Beat*, such that I might both capture a more accurate portrait of that community, and avoid broad, interpretive strokes that risk appealing to a discursive (disciplinary) audience at the expense of the community itself. In Chapter One, I explore how certain prison-based literacy practitioner-scholars curate their subjects in such a way as to extend discourses of whiteness through a set of tropes shared by nineteenth-century abolitionists, even as those practitioners attempt to affirm the value of prisoner, program, and disciplinary *ēthos* to a broader public imaginary. The extent to which curatorial practice itself constitutes a means of enabling, supporting, recruiting, and teaching literacy so as to gain advantage by it in some way (Brandt, "Sponsors") attests to the need for a mindfulness about the role of representation in the sponsorship that community literacy scholarship provides, taking into account not only intra-community dynamics, but also the occasions of address generated for various external publics. Such mindfulness articulates a scholarly ethics that attempts to recuperate prison-based community literacy research from both an uncritical optimism and the critical gaze of a radical-ontological position that understands prison literacy efforts as necessarily repressive.

DATA COLLECTION

Data was taken from three primary sources: the online archive of *Beat Within* newsletter available to the public, editorial guidelines, including a rubric, and an

organization-sponsored report that is part of a collection of materials *The Beat* provided to

facilitate our partnership in a qualitative, interview-based program evaluation on a larger

scale; I discuss the details of the interview component of this study in Chapter Three.

Because there are thousands of exchanges in *The Beat Within* archive, I turned to an

organizational report*, Writing for their Lives: The Impact of the Beat Within Program on Five*

Incarcerated or Formerly Incarcerated Youth to locate exemplars of the kind of progress

that *The Beat* offers as proof of their value as an organization, drawing on grounded

theory[59] to uncover emergent categories of significance. *The Beat*'s criteria for youth

eligible for the report were: significant duration with the program, production of a

"significant body of work," and the expression of "a common Beat Within experience, one

we recognized as both positive and reflective of growth that we often see in our writers"

(4). Among the five case studies in the report, the years-long narrative around Lil' Purp

("Lil' Purp: from Imitation to Innovation") was one of the more compelling portraits of how

these interlocutors construct both public and progress, narrativized by *The Beat* as a

journey from plagiarist to memoirist and Obama supporter, a journey made possible by a

writing process in which "his own emotions came more and more to the surface" (13). This

---

[59] Developed by sociologists Glaser and Strauss, grounded theory is a mode of qualitative data analysis in
which one employs constant comparison between data describing "social units", and the emergent categories
that allow new theories of discourse to emerge (*The Discovery of Grounded Theory*). Adapted for language
features, grounded theory-based methodologies appear frequently in journals such as *Written
Communication,* a number of recent writing research anthologies (McGrath; Powell and Takayoshi; Nickoson,
Sheridan, and Kirsch), and foundational Education-focused qualitative research guides by Miles and
Huberman (*Qualitative Data Analysis*), and J.A. Maxwell (*Qualitative Research Design*).

narrative generated four significant categories I code for in later stages: namely, personal

truth/authenticity, writing, emotion, and the idea of a public imaginary.

ANALYSIS

Originating as a mode of analysis for structural linguistics (de Saussure 1916, Peirce

1931-58), the practice of coding makes these texts and this community available to

qualitative, discourse, and rhetorical analyses through capture of the semiotic systems that

inform the taxonomies and affective content of language, social practice, ideology, and

rhetorical commonplace. At the same time, coding outlines the pathways between these

different modes of analysis, thereby emphasizing the way in which they might be used in

tandem to provide more comprehensive accounts of how language, knowledge, and power

intersect in a given literacy community.[60]

In Chapter One, I use Dwight McBride's mapping of codes in nineteenth-century

slave-abolitionist discourse to illustrate how certain prison literacy scholars produce

particular kinds of truth about the recipients of their sponsorship to affirm their own

discursive investments and disciplinary identity. For McBride, coding defines the

parameters of what slave testimony must look like in order to be legible to its audience

(McBride 2); it encompasses both the genres that slave and abolitionist discourse assume

to conduct their work, and the tropes that animate those genres, including abstract

---

[60] Semiotician Umberto Eco, for example, understands rhetoric as a particular mode of sign production based

on choice and probable premises "clothed" in rhetorical figures towards persuasion, tied closely to such

"extra-logical conditions" as emotion, historical context, and "pragmatic motivations" (*Theory of Semiotics*

277-278). In this way, tropes are the vehicles for logical and extra-logical freight of rhetorical discourse, a

particular mode of sign production that culminates in exchange that may or may not result in persuasion.

concepts such as reason, the figure of the black body, and markers of *ēthos* such as the

"live-to-tell" trope present in the slave narrative genre. While McBride's rhetorical

approach to discourse analysis helps makes a strong case for the formation of slave

discourse in the nineteenth-century as represented by prominent figures in the abolitionist

movement, his troping of this sponsorship dynamic is to some extent an exercise in

expressionist portraiture, composed of vibrant strokes that might be argued to be highly

interpretive and overdetermined in their own right, though his use of trope as a mapping

tool is more deliberate and systematic than Dayan's rhetorical flourish, metaphorizing civil

death as voodoo sorcery ("Legal Slaves"). Any analytical shortcomings of either McBride or

Dayan's approach, however, risk becoming ethical failings when applied with the same

decisive brush to the living practices of literacy communities like *The Beat,* since such

characterizations risk confining its members to a narrow representational landscape that

could hamper that community's ability to define or re-define its own parameters,

particularly as *The Beat* continues to operate. Margaret Fuller and Frederick Douglass

cannot protest McBride's representations, but nor do they suffer potential loss of access to

resources, audience, or funding.

Nevertheless, because *The Beat's* editorial staff is made up of volunteers across the

country, coding enables inductive identification of patterns across time, geographical

difference, and individual editors to demonstrate the extent to which unique responses

share discursive terrain. For these reasons, I eschew McBride's more casual coding strategy

in favor of the more granular, layered coding process favored by qualitative researchers in

applied social-scientific fields such as Writing Studies and Education. After isolating the 28

exchanges between Purp and *The Beat,* I then engaged in an iterative process with multiple

layers of coding, based on qualitative methods assembled by J. Saldaña[61] (*Coding Manual*

for Qualitative Researchers). The first stage of coding segmented data according to stanzas[62]

as a means of both honoring the street-influenced syntax of youth submissions, and

facilitating identification of particular genres[63] of address.[64] My segmentation, however,

does not reflect *The Beat's* own formatting of Purp's texts as printed in the publication, but

rather the structure revealed when reading for Purp's use of rhyme. Informed by the

trajectory of the plagiarism to self-aware civic engagement narrative in the organizational

report, a second round of coding added references to various publics. A third round of

---

[61] Saldaña's manual synthesizes modes of qualitative analysis from an array of social-scientific fields to

present a highly systematized, multi-layered coding process that allows for various content- and structure-

based dimensions, including grammatical, content, and affective schema.

[62] James Gee explains stanzas as, "a group of lines about one important event, happening, or state of affairs at

one time and place, or focuses on a specific character, theme." (*Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* 137).

[63] Arguing that rhetorical theory had not provided a complete account of genre, Carolyn R. Miller defined

genre as a social practice: "Genre [is] more than a formal entity; it becomes pragmatic, fully rhetorical, a point

of connection between intention and effect, an aspect of social action" (Miller 153). Miller's work has

provided a vital point of entry for Rhetoric, Composition, and Writing Studies more broadly, influencing the

work of Charles Bazerman (*Shaping Written Knowledge*, "Systems of Genres", "Speech Acts, Genres, and

Activity Systems"), Anis Bawarshi (*Genre and the Invention of the Writer*), Bawarshi and Reiff (*Genre: an

Introduction to History*), Mary Jo Reiff ("The Spatial Turn"), and Amy Devitt ("Integrating Rhetorical", "Writing

Genres", "Teaching Critical Genre Awareness").

[64] This heuristc, known as *in vivo* coding, or, "in that which is alive," was devloped by ethnographers Strauss

(58) and McCurdy, Spradley, and Shandy (2004) as a means of acknowledging the categories and definitions a

community creates for itself (Saldaña 74). Saldaña also notes that *in vivo* coding is particularly effective for

preserving the integrity of language generated by youth (74).

coding added a dimension for different articulations of personal truth specific to those

publics, including the oft-invoked hip-hop trope of "keeping it real";[65] that dimension

included a range of weighted definitions: refusal (-1), neutral identification of personal

truth (1), use of the imperative towards disciplining others (2), and performance of

personal truth (2). Citing Nigel Fielding (2008), Saldaña observes that the added heuristic

of magnitude allows for seeing not only the intensity of particular thematic concerns over

segments of text with multiple dimensions, but also directional movement of a given

phenomenon (59). Submissions in which no reference to personal truth was made were

weighted at zero; weighting was used in order to locate passages and patterns where

valuation of personal truth was strongest. In the fourth stage, I added the dimension for

emotion, looking for instances in which emotion was expressed, encouraged, or disciplined.

I coded separately for emotion because of *The Beat*'s framing of emotion as the mechanism

making the trajectory from plagiarist to memoirist and proto-citizen possible. Finally, I

coded for connections between dimensions so as to identify what J. Saldaña calls,

"emergent but as yet undetected patterns" (Saldaña 50); this stage focused on identifying

interlocutors' sense of the relationship between writing, personal truth, and emotion as

they relate to both the correctional institution and a public imaginary -- the contours of the

figured worlds[66] in which members of this community operate.

---

[65] African American literacies scholar Elaine Richardson (2005) defines "keepin' it real" as a "phrase

suggesting a commitment to authenticity and honesty" (Richardson 111); linguistic anthropologist Celia

Cutler traces its use in hip hop culture as, "representing yourself for what you are" (Cutler 92).

[66] Gee's conception of figured worlds generates rhetorical *topoi* that constitute not only the community's

discursive investments, but also the intertextual traces linking an utterance to particular genres of address.

However, while my use of figured worlds and their *topoi* suggest a preconceived set of normative values, my

VALIDITY

The study tests for validity in a number of ways, including data-source triangulation,

and internal generalizability. According to sociologists Jane and Nigel Fielding, one can

triangulate for validity by sampling from different temporal, spatial, and person-based,

perspectival points in the same phenomenon (Fielding and Fielding 24-5). I test for

temporal validity by capturing the relationship between Purp and *The Beat* over the course

of 28 exchanges spanning two years, as well as *The Beat's* characterization of Purp's

progress after the fact in the 2009 report. I test for spatial and perspectival validity by

looking at texts that are addressed to different audiences, such as *The Beat's* address of

Purp directly, *The Beat's* address of audiences external to the publication via the report,

and *The Beat's* address of the publicaton's national audience via editor's notes surrounding

the election of Obama. These modes of address allow for identification of discourses across

different sets of social relations, as well as different rhetorical spaces, to include those

inside and outside of the probational institution.

Internal generalizability tests validity within the setting being studied, and tends to

be a key test for qualitative research (Maxwell 115). I test for internal generalizability by

looking at the entire body of exchanges between Purp and *The Beat,* rather than a pre-

selected sampling. Though less a factor for qualitative research than its quantitative

counterpart, I also consider external generalizability. According to Maxwell, because

---

own use of Gee's concept resists forecasting what those normative values might look like. Rather, my use of a

grounded theory-based coding scheme generate the collocational patterns that reveal, rather than anticipate,

the contours of those figured worlds.

generalizability of qualitative research on a given population often focuses on generating a

"theory that can be extended to other cases" (Maxwell 116), it can have something Judith

Singer calls, "face generalizability"; meaning, "there is no obvious reason not to believe that

the results apply more generally (116). Because my inquiry has been designed to

interrogate the discursive investments of those composition and prison studies scholars

who frame prison literacy efforts in particular terms, there is a way in which the figured

worlds of the literacy community around *The Beat* constitute a test of external

generalizability, as well.

PORTRAIT of a COMMUNITY

Before sharing my findings, however, it's important to provide background and

institutional context for *The Beat Within* as a program, as it conducts its work at the

pleasure of the correctional system. As prison literacy scholar Tobi Jacobi notes,

organizations involved in literacy programming enter an alliance with an institution as

soon as one enters the facility, regardless of objective (Jacobi 2011 47), becoming one of

many competing sponsors of literacy for the writers inside; for the writers of *The Beat,*

other sponsors include detention education instructors, religious and motivational

programs brought in from the outside, and rehabilitative counsel from the institution,

either framed as character development, or psychological counsel. However, as with any

literacy community, these participants face competing sponsors and conceptions of literacy

even outside of the correctional institution, a complexity equal to the diverse backgrounds

and objectives that *Beat* volunteers bring with them to both the workshop setting, and

editorial domain. This rhizomatic network of influences enriches understanding of the

figured worlds that shape *Purp's* exchanges with *The Beat.* Such a portrait is also helpful for

understanding the extent to which this prison literacy effort coincides with and diverges from those represented in other prison literacy publications; though there are countless publications generated by prison writing workshops around the country, *The Beat Within* is unique in that it initiates dialogue with its writers through the publication, as opposed to a unidirectional curation of individual texts for a silent readership.

    The Beat Within was created from a partnership between David Inocencio, former assistant director of Detention Diversion Advocacy Program, and Pacific News Service, a Bay Area-based nonprofit communications organization, to serve youth in a local San Francisco detention facility (*The Beat Within,* "About Us"). The first publication of workshop writing came out of a profound outpouring of emotion over the death of Tupac Shakur; since then, what was once a six-page newsletter brought weekly to a handful of youth is now an eighty-page, two-volume publication printed bi-weekly for an audience of five-thousand youth every year. The organization operates under this mission: "to provide incarcerated youth with consistent opportunity to share their ideas and life experiences in a safe space that encourages literacy, self-expression, some critical thinking skills, and healthy, supportive relationships with adults and their community" ("About Us"). *The Beat's* sustained sponsorship of self expression, health and relationships in addition to literacy make its connection to Brandt's patronage-based model apparent, if not exceeding the reach of that model altogether. *The Beat's* regular exhortations to write with emotional honesty, renounce violence, and consider thoughtfully one's relationship to self and others blurs the distinction between literacy education and the psychosocial support typical of mentorship. Nevertheless, *The Beat's* role as an outlet for literate practice becomes a critical intervention for a population which struggles significantly with poverty and

correlating low levels of school-based literacy, since nearly half (49%) of youth in

California live in low-income households that lack the support necessary to be able to read

at grade-level in secondary school (Annie E. Casey Foundation).[67]

The program operates in thirteen juvenile detention facilities in California alone, as

well as in another six states nation-wide (*The Beat Within,* "Data"). Because of its impact on

the youth who participate in the program, however, *The Beat* also receives submissions

from those who have moved on to adult prison facilities for long-term confinement,

thereby forging a stronger sense of continuum between youth and adult detention facilities.

Though *The Beat* does not conduct workshops or distribute the publication in those

facilities, prisoners nevertheless submit work on a regular basis; many of those adult

prisoners know about *The Beat* from having participated in workshops while in juvenile

hall. While *The Beat* directs content for the workshops and publication from its San

Francisco headquarters, each workshop site is negotiated and run locally by volunteer

facilitators. This means that the terms of access, and the frequency and duration of the

workshops themselves, depend on the rapport volunteers cultivate with staff and

administration for each individual institution. Most of these detention facilities operate at

the behest of the superior court, as a division of Probation. In the state of California,

Probation is one component of the CDCR, or the California Department of Corrections and

Rehabilitation. The facilities where *The Beat* operates are not formally "correctional"

institutions, because they act as a holding facility until sentencing takes place, rather than

being a site of what penologists call "criminal sanction" (McShane and Williams 12-13).

---

[67] This outcome corresponds to criminological research reporting that low levels of educational attainment

appear to predict an increased likelihood of incarceration (Uggen and Manza. "Democratic Contraction").

That said, they remain part of the corrections system, and continue to participate in the correction, treatment and supervision of detainees, as all corrections institutions do (Stohr, Walsh, and Hemmens 1); that many juvenile institutions emphasize social reintegration speaks to just how vague a distinction there is between these institutions, given that "correction" itself has, in the last ten years or so, become increasingly defined by rhetorics of rehabilitation rather than incapacitation.

At the same time, however, like penal institutions, juvenile detention facilities also function as sites of incapacitation for repeat offenders and those for whom the community is unable to provide psychiatric treatment for mental illness (Shoemaker 371). They also serve as way-stations for an increasingly entrenched school-to-prison pipeline; as Joanna Wald of Harvard's Houston Institute for Race and Justice observes, all but five U.S. states have passed laws making it easier to try youth as adults, resulting in an increased number of youth detained for nonviolent offenses, many of which stem from widespread adoption of "zero-tolerance" policies in public schools (Wald and Losen 10). For these reasons, juvenile facilities should be included in broader discussions about penology, whether initiated by prison literacy advocates, or by those such as Wilderson and Rodríguez, who understand prison as an instrument of subjugation and white supremacy -- especially since their populations reflect the culture of surveillance and mass incarceration of people of color in adult institutions: ninety-two percent of *Beat* workshop participants are people of color, with the largest segments being African-American (thirty percent), and Latino (thirty-three percent) ("Data").

Despite the institution's role in long-term structural confinement, however, the duration of a workshop participant's stay at a detention facility is relatively short. About

sixty percent are incarcerated between one week and three months at a given facility; those

awaiting hearing and sentencing for adult offenses tend to stay longer, anywhere from six

months to over a year ("Data"). This figure does not account for repeat offenders who

return to the facility anywhere from a few days to a few years in between. Participation in

the program is, by law, voluntary for those incarcerated in the state of California, and varies

significantly from facility to facility in terms of attendance and workshop structure. For

some, the ratio of facilitator to writer can be as small as one to two; in others, it can be as

large as one to twenty-five, creating more of a classroom setting. However, every workshop

receives the same three writing prompts from *The Beat* in San Francisco every week, which

are then thematized in each bi-weekly editor's note. This means that in spite of wide

variance in population, geography, and pedagogical setting, *The Beat Within* retains a

unitary *ēthos* through the framing of topic choice in the publication itself; that *ēthos* is

reinforced by *The Beat's* asynchronous response to each published submission as a single

voice, in spite of the fact that any number of volunteers might take up the persona of *The

Beat* to respond to the hundreds of submissions that stream in every week. That *ēthos* has

been taken up by a variety of volunteers who have written organizational reports on *The

Beat's* behalf -- some who identify themselves by name, such as Alan Tinker ("Four Writers

Represent Themselves Through the Beat Within Program" 2005), and other works

subsumed under a unitary "we," such as the point of departure for this study, "Writing for

their Lives" (2009).

Assumption of that unitary *ēthos* becomes a compelling example of imagined

community, insofar as this nation-wide group, like Benedict Anderson's concept of a nation

based on kinship, "never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson 6). Moreover, volunteers for the organization vary widely in education, background, and motivation; some were troubled youth themselves, and want to give back; some are teachers looking for a stop-gap between jobs, or college students looking for community service opportunities to put on their resumes; and still others are mental health workers, or those who simply want to actualize their beliefs in social justice. Founder and director David Inocencio welcomes this diversity, believing that, regardless of motivation, it's critical for the publication to maintain a steady presence in writers' lives for the duration of their detention, and even beyond. *The Beat's* grassroots organizational structure, then, differs from the vast majority of literacy programs represented by teacher-scholars in the 2004 special issue of *Reflections*, in that it is not, with the exception of one satellite facility in San Bernardino, affiliated with service-learning or community literacy-based projects anchored in a post-secondary institution. As my findings will show, however, *The Beat* as an organization nevertheless shares key discursive assumptions with those university-based prison projects: namely, an emphasis on literate practice as a process of subjectivization and empowerment towards participation in a civic imaginary.

Workshops typically run an hour long; following introduction of the topics and brief discussion, youth are given anywhere from fifteen to thirty minutes of that time to write on the week's chosen topics, after which facilitators invite them to read their work aloud. Should writers not like any of the three topics presented, they are encouraged to write or draw on their own. Writers are also encouraged to continue writing over the course of the week, and submit those writings during the following workshop, though that writing must

take place in plain sight of probation staff, with a facility-issued pencil. Once the hour is up,

volunteers collect everything writers have produced, promising them that, should the

content meet the standards of the editorial rubric,[68] they will see their work in the

following publication. Volunteers wait until the very end to distribute copies of the

publication itself to assure workshop participation, since having a copy of *The Beat* to read

is the only reasons some participants attend at all.

FINDINGS

Genre Performance as Counterpublic: Meeting and Refusing Purp's Flow

Like many of the writings submitted since *The Beat's* inaugural response to Tupac's

death, the style and phrasing of Purp's writings are influenced by the musical forms that he

and other detained youth draw upon as the most authentic reflection of their lives on the

streets. The editorial responses to Purp's work, on the other hand, occupy a range of

stylistic choices, at times mirroring his phrasing as a means of building identification and

trust, as they do in entries 14, 19, and 29,[69] but more often disregarding that style, adopting

a disciplinary mode of address instead. This range of responses to Purp's efforts, from

identification to refusal, mirrors Brandt's observations about a literacy sponsorship that

occupies a range of relationships, from benign sharing to euphemistic coercion (Brandt

2001). The heft of that coercion, however, registers more clearly when *The Beat's*

---

[68] Pieces that merit printing as "Piece of the Week," the Beat's highest honor, must be descriptive, emotional,

honest, have a clear theme, demonstrate hard work, be creative, or "blow you away with their thoughts,

imagery, or effort." Pieces not permitted lack a story, theme, and meaning, are plagiarized, or are merely

"shout-outs". The rubric given by *The Beat* to the volunteers who type, edit, and recommend particular works

for publication can be found in Appendix B.

[69] The complete series of exchanges between Purp and *The Beat* can be found in Appendix A.

organizational report privileges Purp's progress towards emotional authenticity over formal efforts inspired by literacies outside of the program,[70] framing his progress in terms of an originality defined by emotion from "his own viewpoint," without acknowledging the extent to which Purp's formal exercises in the rap genre also move towards innovation in an alternative literacy narrative. When the report lauds Purp as "one of our best poets" (13), it is not a recognition of his poetics so much as a testament to his performance of authentic feeling for an external audience -- in other words, a celebration of a confession -- revealing a generically expressed conflict zone with divergent notions of writing as participation in a public space.

That generic mismatch appears in the exchange printed in the opening of this chapter, the third such exchange between Purp and *The Beat,*[71] segmented differently here to reveal Purp's sense of rhyme. This segmentation shows not only Purp's attentiveness to cross rhyme by alternating sets of end rhymes (now/out/time/out, out/fight/out/right),

---

[70] It's important to note that while *Writing for Their Lives* assumes *The Beat's* unitary *ethos,* the organization has not directed its findings at any particular group. The organization does, however, keep *Writing for Their Lives* and other volunteer-generated reports on hand for future funding and publicity opportunities (informal interview, David Inocencio). In this way, the discursive audience for *The Beat* across time, individual volunteers, and geography becomes even more pronounced.

[71] *The Beat* cites Purp's first efforts as examples of plagiarism - a practice that *The Beat* will not publish. "In Purp's case, he was using famous rappers' style and lyrics: Lil Wayne, Tupac, and Lil Webby. Each week, he'd give us a new, immaculately copied rap.... And each week, he'd take us to task for not printing 'his' work" ("From Imitation to Innovation" 12). Those not published may or may not be typed or archived electronically, and for that reason, may no longer exist. The only texts available, then, are the report's account of his plagiarism, and those texts deemed worthy of publication.

but also a movement towards chain rhyme, in which end rhymes alternate and, at times, appear internally and continuously throughout the extended phrase (found/out, 'bout, stressed out/get out); sociolinguist H. Samy Alim (*Roc the Mic*) and hip-hop scholar Adam Bradley (*Book of Rhymes*) note that this more fluid use of chain rhyme is a common feature of rap poetics.[72] Purp also attempts the more complex mosaic rhyme (understand/grown man), which features internal and end rhymes that mix different parts of speech - another poetic device rap performers use to demonstrate their skill (Alim 148). These rhymes, in turn, inform the "flow" of Purp's piece, or what Alim describes as "the temporal relationship between the beats and the rhymes" (Alim 15).[73]

<div align="right">

Mad as hell right now A

wish I was out A

probably gotta do time B

is what I found out, A

</div>

---

[72] Though the genre of rap is often conflated with "hip hop," many scholars, rappers, and critics talk about rap as vocal performance within a larger hip hop culture associated with youth culture that historically also includes breakdancing, DJing, and graffiti (Bradley, Flava Flav, Pough, Shaw).

[73] Alim provides numerous examples of flow; rapper Raekwon describes flow as a means of "building a bridge with your rhymes. You want to be able to let everybody know that, 'yo, I could rhyme like this, but off of this type of beat'" (15). Raekwon's statement suggests that flow is closely connected to a particular rhythm that a rapper adopts to both demonstrate skill, and provide the audience with a recognizable framework for the content of a particular piece. For this reason, "flow" is also a verb used to describe performance in a "battle" setting in front of an audience (63).

But I'm going through some thangs   C

people don't understand   D

on my way to Santa Rita   F

'bout to be a grown man,   D

Partner just died   G

so my head on spin   H

Everything twisted   H

so my case I'm tryin' to win,   H

So stressed out   A

that the kid wants to fight   B

I need to get out   A

I swear Juvenile Hall ain't right.   B

BW Vol. 13.48 (2008) 29

While the organizational report praises Purp for his move away from plagiarism towards innovation -- from copying Lil Wayne to writing that is "heartfelt, and, most importantly, original" ("From Imitation to Innovation" 12), the editor's response to Purp avoids addressing his formal efforts, and answers him in an authoritative prose that passes positive judgment: "It's good to see that instead of going off on staff, getting locked up, or hurting yourself somehow, you just put your rage and disappointment on a piece of paper" (*BW* Vol. 13.48 (2008) 29). Here, *The Beat* asserts disciplinary discourse over Purp's flow in terms of form and content, even as it attempts to maintain a "safe space" for his literate practice by lauding his turn away from violence. This move echoes what Brodkey saw as

the urging of basic writing students away from talking about their class struggles towards more "appropriate" topics (1989). In the case of *The Beat,* appropriate topics are ones that are original and emotionally honest, but also resist glorifying violence or gang activity; every issue includes an editor's note that says, "we go through a lot of trouble to censor inappropriate sexual remarks, foul language, and gang references. There is enough tension in our communities already–we don't aim to bolster it. It is in *The Beat*'s interest to promote peace and unity" (*The Beat Within,* 13.01 - 19.07/08). By virtue of Purp's very use of a poetics associated with gang violence, he valorizes a corresponding genre of activity that *The Beat* is working to prevent.

That discursive struggle, however, extends beyond the class-based conflicts formulated by Brodkey, or even Brandt's more comprehensive understanding of literacy as a conduit for various kinds of capital. While their Bourdieuean lens would assuredly be useful for discussing sponsorship of a population marked by poverty and low educational attainment, the discursive struggle between sponsor and recipient here extends beyond a material instrumentality -- the use of literacy for "the opportunities and protections that it potentially grants its seekers" (*Literacy in American Lives*) -- to ritual performance for a transcendent public imaginary. Nowhere is this more evident than where *The Beat* exhorts Purp to register his expression as a statement for "the world" -- saying, "That's what great artists do – they turn their emotions into a message for the world to feel" (3). Here, *The Beat* directs Purp's efforts away from a genre of activity focused on street life and towards expression of emotion for the benefit of a unitary public -- a world in which Purp's audience and the organizational report's audience are both gratified by a performance of emotional honesty. Calling that process "great artistry" deemphasizes the disciplinary,

confessional mechanism at work in *The Beat's* exhortation by framing Purp as an agentive subject who imposes his vision on a generalized audience from above, rather than one which permits or exhorts him to speak from outside or below, even as *The Beat* avoids recognition of "the world" of which Purp is already a part. The naming of emotional artistry also illustrates the extent to which the accomplishment of "innovation" voiced in the organizational report stands as much for emotional truth as it does for innovation of form.

Yet, even as *The Beat* attempts to redirect him to more appropriate topics, Purp's use of rap poetics constitutes participation in a genre of activity that does, in fact, fulfill *The Beat's* mission -- though not in the manner *The Beat* expects. If, as Chuck D of Public Enemy has said, "Rap is CNN for black people" (Chuck D. qtd. in Chang 2014) -- a conduit of civil society along a Black-diasporic axis that serves, according to Elaine Richardson, as a means of authenticity, resistance, and critique against mechanisms of power (Richardson), then Purp's formal choices for his lament constitute participation in an important counterpublic. Gwendolyn Pough has helped Rhetoric and Composition understand hip hop culture as a critical component of the Black public sphere, a space that expands the Habermasian public sphere to a politics and critical practice "in which intellectuals can join with the energies of the street, the school, the church and the city to constitute a challenge to the exclusionary violence of much public space in the United States" (Pough 16). In particular, Pough offers the hip hop concept of "wreck," which she connects to talking back, re-creation, and a posture of bravado[74] toward one's lyrical skill, something Blacks have had to use in order

---

[74] Jonathan Munby (*Under a Bad Sign*) links braggadocio in gangsta rap to the "badman-pimp-hustler-trickster of black folklore," whose ludic persona is as much about the dynamics of performance as it is about the deliberately transgressive, divisive content (Munby 9). Munby traces this figure from Anansi and Legba in

to assert personhood in the larger public sphere (15-17). Pough, too, shows how Purp's formal exercise already constitutes a literate practice that thinks critically about his situation and his relationship to his community -- key aspects of *The Beat's* mission, even without an editorial exhortation. Purp's use of rap poetics, then, articulates a counterpublic to *The Beat's* conception of appropriate relationships to one's community by asserting his membership in a Black public sphere that finds dominant structures lacking - importantly, not expressing resistance to dominant paradigms per se, but rather focusing energies where he gains greater traction.

While *The Beat's* disciplinary orientation to Purp's literacy practice ultimately outweighs the moments of identification, there are instances in which editorial responses mirror Purp's performance of genre, embracing Purp's flow, and even responding in kind, as they do in exchanges 14, 15, 18, 28. In each instance, Purp has written in couplets; *The Beat* returns his use of form:

> This farewell to Tony is full of heart and skill,
>
> your future success will depend on your will,
>
> read his biography and hear that it's true
>
> the last three grafs could have been written for you.

West African mythology, through gangster-bluesmen of the 1930s such as Peetie Wheatstraw, to "ghetto realist" writers like Iceberg Slim, whose influence led a generation of rappers in the 1980s and 1990s to adopt "Ice" for themselves. This genre constitutes something like a hush harbor in which members of the black community challenge the discourse of racial unity and uplift adopted by those pushing for greater inclusion in the public sphere.

When you first started doing your crime,

you still came at it with a juvenile mind

heart broken mind bruised

didn't even know you were confused

but now you know more about how you got stuck

and maybe lockdown is really good luck

if it gives you time to rethink your plan

that juvenile will grow to be a wiser man.

Keep it lit for *The Beat* when you head to Rita

Keep it lit for peace put down the heata

Keep it lit for the lives that been put on a shelf

Most of all Lil' Purp keep it lit for yourself.

Nevertheless, despite the appearance of *The Beat's* shift towards recognition of Purp's

participation in alternate publics and their corresponding genres, the dominant arc of

Purp's sponsorship skews towards Brandt's euphemistic coercion. Though the final

editorial response mirrors Purp's use of form -- echoing not only his rhyme scheme, but his

repetition of the imperative to "keep it lit" on every line, such that call and response merge

seamlessly together, as if with one voice -- the parameters of that arc are defined by chance,

since neither the editors nor the recipient in detention have any way of knowing exactly

when someone will be released or transferred out of the facility. That does not mean,

however, that the editors reading his work -- possibly the very volunteers who meet with

Purp each week in workshop -- haven't developed a sustained relationship across the two

years he has been in the program, such that they have a reasonable sense of his legal status.

Other entries suggest a deepening familiarity with Purp's development, as shown in

exchanges 2, 4, 11, and 20, such as when *The Beat* lauds Purp for pushing himself to

innovate: "It's good to see that each week you experiment with a new form and a new style"

(*The Beat* 11B).

At the same time, *The Beat's* praise of Purp's improvement as early as the second

issue verges on the hyperbolic: "It's a real joy to see how good you've become at laying out

your life in rhyme, also it seems like you're becoming a true teacher -- taking your pain and

understanding of the violence of the streets so readers can begin to understand what

you're going through" (*The Beat Within* 4B). Such a response to some extent undermines

the dramatic narrative of progress *The Beat* paints in the organizational report for its own

external audience, but nevertheless demonstrates an insistent interest in Purp's

performance of emotion for an audience of citizen-readers not familiar with his world -- an

interest made more apparent by the editors' emphasis on emotion in eighteen of the

twenty-nine exchanges with Purp over the course of his detention. *The Beat's* comments

primarily center around anger and emotional pain (1-4B, 10B, 12B, 18B, 19B, 26B), but also

posit emotion as the means by which Purp's work acquires value for an external audience

(2B, 3B, 4B, 10B, 18B) -- the means by which the otherwise incommensurable experience of detention becomes legible (and edifying) to outsiders: "This is another great piece, Lil Purp, because you really break down the stress of being in the hall. Even those of us who haven't ever been locked up for a long time can feel what it's like" (*The Beat* 2B). That this public performance of emotion must be "heartfelt," or honest -- qualifications articulated for volunteer editors in the rubric, and for readers of the organizational report -- suggests a heavy investment in the (bio)power of the confessional genre, animated by an economy of emotion in which acceptable kinds of emotion register as *topoi* for rhetorics of the correctional institution. Even as the editor's note to every issue reminds its writers not to talk about their crimes: "Your words have consequences, and could be used to incriminate you. Try to illuminate your feelings and viewpoints without running the risk of providing ammunition for those who might use your words against you" (*The Beat Within,* 13.01 - 19.07/08), this advisory serves as a reminder that, in the context of the detention facility, even those submissions that avoid discussing criminal acts constitute a body of evidence towards a production of truth. Moreover, it indicates the extent to which the literacy narrative and confession in these spaces are inextricably bound, thereby returning literacy sponsorship to a burden of spiritual patronage; writing becomes the apparatus for confession of authentic feeling, a necessary process in Purp's conversion to obedient civic personhood, in accordance with the sacralized rule of law described by Habermas (*Theory of Communicative Action* 87). As I will show, however, this pursuit of true feeling exceeds the typical contours of a spiritual-rehabilitative practice, to take on a distinctly philosophical orientation, operating less on a register of conversion, and more as a practice that urges the writer to perform authentic feeling as a means of approaching an accord

between word and deed, towards an ethical relationality that might prepare Purp for participation in public life post-release. In other words, this literacy community appears to be drawing on a genealogy of thought and practice neither fully defined by the Christian underpinnings of the penitentiary, nor the capitalist superstructure identified by Brodkey and Brandt. While engagement with a civic imaginary remains a critical end point for *The Beat's* sponsorship on the page, the mechanism by which this transformation occurs more closely recalls the pre-Christian practice of personal *parrhêsia,* for the benefit of a public audience.

Confession of True Feeling: Writing Care of the Self towards the POLITICAL

The confession is a well-worn genre in correctional institutions, a significant component of the therapeutic and progressive-educational discourses that have pervaded the American penitentiary since the establishment of the Walnut Street Prison by Quakers in the late eighteenth century. As H. Bruce Franklin observes in his survey of writings in the American prison, various strands of the criminal confessional were widespread in the nineteenth century (132-133, 285), with such notable examples as the *Confessions of Nat Turner . . . As fully and voluntarily made to Thomas R. Gray* (1831), and *The Autobiography of Gerald Toole* (1862), distributed by the institution to the public as cautionary tales against crime and insurrection. The confessional genre saw narrative control shift from the institution to the prisoner in the twentieth century, courtesy of outsiders, as with Jack Henry Abbott's letters to Norman Mailer (*In The Belly of the Beast*), and Mumia Abu-Jamal's memoir, *Live from Death Row*. The production of such texts independently of the penal or judicial institutions allowed for a muddying of genre between criminal confession, autobiography, and critique of the system, echoing the sponsorship and attendant

authentication of escaped slave narratives by those sympathetic to abolitionism. A more

recent text, Jimmy Santiago Baca's *A Place to Stand*, performs the work of not only

confessional, but also literacy narrative; amidst recollections of his criminal past, Baca's

account of an extended correspondence with a religiously motivated pen pal named Harry

traces his transformation from an illiterate prisoner to a writer of labored, misspelled

confessions, culminating in more eloquent reflections that would become his poetry (183-

9). Baca's confessional literacy narrative and its acknowledged debt to this sponsorship

gestures to again to the literacy sponsorship of slaves, particularly that of Frederick

Douglass, who would "take an ell" (Douglass 146) from his master by learning to read on

the sly, but acknowledged the role a variety of sources played in his literate development,

including Mrs. Auld, and boys in the streets whom Douglass would pay "tuition" in bread

(155). In this mode of confession, literacy sponsorship facilitates both the admission of

guilt, and creation of an autobiographical text that gestures to the way in which writing

enables formation of the truth-telling subject; [75] at the same time, it voices the tacit relation

between literacy and ethical instruction, fleshing out the contours of a broader social

paideia.

In the context of the communities that emerge in writing workshops located in

prisons and other detention facilities, there is a way in which confession also functions as a

[75] Early autobiographical theorist Georges Gusdorf argued that autobiography necessarily contains an

admission of guilt, saying that it "appeases the more or less anguished uneasiness of an aging man who

wonders if his life has not been lived in vain.... In order to be reassured, he undertakes his own apologia"

(Gusdorf 39). The primacy of guilt and fear indicates the import of emotion in processing the aims of life

writing; calling attention to the *graphic* element of autobiography -- a *techne* -- the literacy narrative

undertakes an analogous mode of self-formation.

means of social induction -- a marker of *ēthos,* a guarantor of trust. San Quentin prisoner

Leonard Gonzalez illustrates the power of this practice by writing about how the

confession of a fellow inmate, Bill, allays the doubts and fears of a group of inmates whose

initial response to the workshop is anxious (90): "When we first filed slowly, languidly into

the class, the silence was deafening. That's when Bill stood up, AA style, and said, "I have a

confession to make. My name is Bill and I'm a poet." It broke the ice and relaxed everyone"

("Each One, Teach One" 90). Here, Bill coopts the genre of confession adopted by Alcoholics

Anonymous to paint poetry as his addiction, a rhetorical move that signals his playful

conversancy in genres of activity already familiar to his audience, while simultaneously

exposing his vulnerability as a lover of language.

The thread of the spiritual, however, remains, particularly as so much of the non-

institutional programming permitted in prisons and other detention facilities is religious.

While Bill's performance of the AA genre is meant to invoke irony, the fact remains that

Alcoholics Anonymous was founded as a means of "spiritual" improvement. Brandt notes

the prominence of the "spiritual redemption through literacy" discourse in her study of

Johnny Ames and his encounter with a teacher-nun, flanked by books on inner growth and

courses that require writing as part of therapeutic programming (*Literacy in American*

Lives 68). In his study of Baca, Simon Rolston writes about the presence of this discourse in

the corresponding "conversion narrative," in which one transforms from an unenlightened,

sinful self to a repentant, enlightened self -- a "bifurcation of selfhood" equally present in

religious and secular settings (Rolston, "Conversion" 103).[76] It's important to acknowledge

---

[76] Rolston also provides a useful account of how these secular and religious discourses combined with the

emergence of social contract, which "required the figurative sacrifice of natural (or animal) life as a

that *The Beat* does repeat the disciplinary function of the confession in its framing of Purp's

work as a grim cautionary tale" in the organizational report (12), demonstrating, despite its

position outside the institution, a shared investment in the corrective aims of the detention

facility, particularly for the benefit of audiences who might provide the organization with

funding. And there is consistency between this externally-focused message and the tough

talk directed at Purp: "You need to put that violent BS to rest if you want to live to love

another day" (26B), serving a dual purpose as cautionary tale for the youth and imprisoned

adults reading the publication week to week. However, while the conversion narrative is a

trenchant concern of rehabilitative discourse[77] -- naming the before-and-after sequence of

a writer's subject formation, *The Beat's* interest in emotion suggests that declaring

authentic feeling constitutes the means by which that formation takes place. And while

confession in the rehabilitative context takes on a Christian valence -- producing truth-

telling subjects in the tradition of the Inquisition described in Foucault's *Scientia Sexualis,*[78]

---

precondition for the acquisition of the citizen's spiritual (or human) subjectivity.... This was the new political

myth that was to be played out in the rituals of the new institution of punishment" (Rolston, *Narratives of

Conversion* 13-14). Rolston echoes Colin Dayan's account of the way in which the law reconstitutes the flesh

for civic discourse: "Nature must be killed off, disguised, and reproduced in the sacraments of law" ("Legal

Slaves" 4).

[77] Criminologist Mona Lynch uses transformation and rehabilitation interchangeably in her discussion of

rehabilitative rhetoric in criminal justice (Lynch 2000, 44).

[78] Foucault names the adoption of the confession by church and state a critical development in the creation of

biopolitical power (*"Scientia Sexualis"*), which transferred the process of discipline and punition away from

the spectacle of the body towards an intervention that relies on the "studied manipulation" of the individual

soul, an affect pursued by the Quaker penitentiary (*Discipline and Punish* 128).

The Beat's advisory against self-incrimination also serves as a means of understanding the extent to which their mobilization of the confessional genre participates in subject formation not solely predicated on the judgment of sin. While it does invoke the language of the Miranda warning given to suspects in custody -- i.e., "Anything you say can and will be held against you in a court of law" (*Miranda v. Arizona* 1966), the editor's oblique reference to "those who might use your words against you" carries an *ēthos* of protection against sinister and unnamed forces clearly aligned with correctional institution. It even suggests a complicity, where *The Beat* serves as an advocate, but outside of the law -- a mentor who educates writers to bring their feelings and perceptions to light so that they might examine them with greater clarity and focus, even as *The Beat* urges them to perform these feelings for the public. If anything, this dynamic approximates a truth-telling practice or genre of activity that predates its Christian iteration -- the pursuit of personal truth in classical Greek and Roman care of the self that Foucault recounts in his later lectures (*Ethics*, *Fearless Speech*, *Courage of Truth*), beginning with the variant known as Socratic *parrhêsia.*

Foucault explores the modality of Socratic *parrhêsia* through Plato's *Laches* dialogues, which take up the project of defining courage. There, Socrates advises Lysimachus and Melesias on how to educate their sons so that they can both appreciate their education, and improve their lot in society, focusing on *epimeleia heautou,* or, "care of the self" (*Fearless Speech* 92). A vital mechanism for this genre of activity is the *hupomnēmata,* or the written record of everyday things (*Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 209-210). While the *hupomnēmata* functioned as a memory aid for activities as mundane as bookkeeping, it also served as a means of pulling together the "fragmentary *logos*"

encountered in daily life through school, meditation, reading, or engaging in conversation (210-211); moreover, it was a notebook the writer should keep *prokheiron, ad manum, in promptu,* or, "near at hand" -- such that one might not only remember those fragments, but "be able to use them, whenever the need was felt, in action" (210). In other words, literate practice as equipment for agentive action. However, the *hupomnēmata* is more than a "to do" list. While at one point Foucault warns that these notebooks should not be seen as "intimate journals" or accounts of spiritual awakening that constitute a "narrative of oneself" uncovering what is hidden (210), elsewhere he points out that they serve to "capture the already-said . . . for a purpose that is nothing less than the shaping of the self" (211) -- a shaping that connects word and life, *logos* to *bios* (*Fearless Speech* 97-103)*,* in such a way as to orient the writer towards what Socrates in the *Laches* sees as a life lived in "the best possible way" (97-98). The touchstone, or *basanos,* for this accord between word and deed, is Socrates's practice of insistent questioning (97). This life lived in the best possible way is not merely self-knowledge towards brute advantage; while Socrates does suggest that a failure to be well-educated makes it difficult to "improve your position in society"(93), it also gestures to a kind of philosophical virtue, wherein the interlocutor orients the self towards a virtuous, courageous relationship to other human beings (101).

That Socratic *parrhêsia* interrogates one's relationship to self and others serves to illustrate how *The Beat's* call for expression of emotion is not simply a call for singular testimony[79] on Purp's emotional state, with the impartiality of a third-person observer towards judgment by some outside body. Rather, it suggests interest in a habit of truth-

---

[79] The Latin root for both "testimony" and "testify," *testis,* indicates a third-person witness providing evidence.

telling expressly bound to social responsibility, where regular, written confession of personal emotion makes possible judgment towards ethical action by and for the self.[80] Foucault cordons off this activity as somewhat unique to ancient culture in its dependence upon a *parrhêsia*st whose role is not institutionally defined -- "this other who is necessary for me to be able to tell the truth about myself might be a professional philosopher, but he could be anybody" (*Care of the Self* 3-4). Much easier to spot, he argues, is the Christian-inspired confessor or spiritual director in the person of the psychologist or doctor, admittedly an onerous presence in the rehabilitative discourse that pervades the correctional institution (4). And yet, *The Beat's ēthos* as a lay support system --comprised of disparate volunteers distinctly outside the institutional bounds observed by the medical, educational, correctional, and psychiatric experts employed by either the court or the detention facility -- suggests that a Socratic-*parrhêsiatic* genre of activity is alive and well in the pages of *The Beat,* marking it as a mode of literacy sponsorship in which conversancy in a given discourse community has both rhetorical and ethical dimensions.

Of the twenty-nine editorial responses to Purp's writing, seventeen of them challenge Purp to turn his critical gaze inward and hold himself accountable to the standards and demands he makes of others. In almost every instance that Purp laments the dysfunction in his community that comes from youth embracing drugs, sex, and violence

---

[80] This mode of truth-telling might be a conduit for Aristotle's conception of *thumos,* or the passion that accompanies and also precedes rational thought (*Politics* 7.1334b, 20) and, as such, becomes a condition for the political for the citizen. Eugene Garver translates *thumos* as being closest to the word, "spirited" in English, and solidifies its political connotations by paraphrasing its use in the *Politics* as, "the natural capacity that makes possible the 'power to command and the love of freedom'" (Garver 237).

too young (4, 5, 17, 18, 20, 25), *The Beat* responds by first acknowledging his critique, and then calling him out for his hypocrisy. Where Purp decries the streets that produce "Lil' ninjas bustin' guns at like eight years old," and "Mommas got babies up in pampers on tha' block drug dealin'" (18), *The Beat* acknowledges his skill in "mak[ing] us feel the horrors and the pain of the children," (18B), but calls him to task for perpetuating those horrors by glorifying and participating in that criminality: "If you're not part of the solution you are part of the problem" (18B). More to the point of a Socratic-*parrhêsiatic* practice is the fact that *The Beat* follows that critique in nearly every instance with a question, challenging Purp to live in accordance with his own convictions: "You have gifts -- of intelligence, skill, observation -- are you going to use those gifts to be a part of the solution?" (18B). Where Purp proclaims his loyalty to his peers on the streets that they cannot escape: "My block real cold I just want to warm it up, / And post on the block with my lil' young thugs" (5), *The Beat* replies, "You say you love your block, but you only show love to one part of it. What about some love for the old folks who can't sleep because the cars play the music so loud?" (5B). It's a formula that seems unremarkable, except for its dogged insistence at the kind of personal truth *The Beat* is attempting to produce in a public forum, emphasized by the fact that the organization asks its editors to respond to submissions with open-ended questions in their editorial guidelines, echoing Socratic examination.[81] Furthermore, just

---

[81] The Style Sheet that *The Beat* provides to its volunteer editors says, "we like to be though [*sic*] provoking, so many of our responding editors will ask the writer follow-up or thought provoking questions about the piece.... Ask questions that require thought and reflecting, rather than a written response." (Appendix C 5). This clarification is noteworthy in that it posits literacy practice as the means by which Purp might achieve better relationships, but as an iterative process.

as the editors guide Purp to more appropriate topics, so do they guide him to more appropriate emotions -- ones that recognize Purp's role in a field of relations as the cause of others' pain, and not a lone recipient of injustice.

This critique of Purp's hypocrisy directs him not inward, but outwards, towards the social; whether Purp idealizes the block or condemns its dysfunction, *The Beat* consistently reminds him of the explicit social consequences of his life choices, even as it encourages him to write his emotions for the benefit of an abstract, unitary public. Here the philosophical practice becomes fundamentally rhetorical; that this sponsorship is staged in the pages of a nationwide publication rather than relegated to the private workshop setting of the detention facility -- to be read by not only by outsiders unfamiliar with Purp's plight, but also hundreds of youth and adult prisoners -- gestures to a pedagogy in which the personal and the public are deeply connected. To scholars of rhetoric and emotion, the interrogation of negative emotion in the context of the social comes as no surprise; Daniel Gross reminds us that anger is deeply social, grounded in asymmetrical power relations presumed by the individual who feels that "their entitlement is directly threatened" by those they see as inferior (*Secret History of Emotion* 2-3). Gross's framework takes as a point of departure Aristotle's thoughts on power relations in the *Iliad,* notably the "rage of Zeus-nurtured kings" who believe they should be accorded an exceptional level of respect (2). Purp is worlds away from Homer's kings -- in fact, occupying a position of criminal attainder that society's "technologies of social recognition and blindness" (4) might refuse to accord such emotional complexity, and an operation that *The Beat* itself inadvertently reproduces as it attempts to manage Purp's emotional complexity by recasting more subtle expressions of negative emotion towards his surroundings, in the more dramatic terms of

rage and pain. Recall that elsewhere *The Beat* counsels Purp to write his emotions because

"that's what great artists do" (3), thereby casting the performance of authentic emotion as

an activity that one imposes on an audience of equals or inferiors from above, so as to grant

Purp a greater sense of power. Nevertheless, *The Beat's* challenge to Purp's privileging of

that emotion over the comfort of others, even as he expresses negative emotion about his

detention, suggests that the nature of that asymmetrical relation informs emotion

rhetorically across disjunctures of class, legal status, geography, and history. If anger does

indicate an assumption of power, *The Beat's* attempt to redirect and redefine Purp's

negative emotion serves as one more instance in which *The Beat's* pedagogy reinscribes the

power differential between itself and its program recipients, as it effectively disciplines

Purp for granting himself entitlement over others in a way deemed inappropriate for his

position of social transgression.

The fact that *The Beat* dedicates six editions to discussion of the 2008 presidential

election and its aftermath (Volumes 13.05, 13.09, 13.37, 13.44, 13.47, 13.49), and identifies

Purp's ode to Obama as the culmination of his program experience, however, marks not

just the social, but also the political as a significant aim of their efforts, even as the mission

statement steers clear of political language in favor of promoting healthy relationships in

the context of the more politically neutral category of "community." Nowhere is this more

apparent than when *The Beat* responds directly to Purps celebration of Obama's election,

abolishing any distinction between the more localized community of Purp's streets and the

broader civic ideal. Where Purp exclaims, "We made it. You did it. Your journey was

relevant / . . . / Martin Luther King said I have a dream / You are the dream . . . help us that

struggle that are trying to succeed" (16), *The Beat* reminds Purp that "YOU are Dr. King's

dream too - if you step up and live it. A dream that you will be a part of uplifting all people, wherever they are, whoever they are - starting with yourself. It's not just your 'hood, it's all of us: We all we got" (16B). Here, "we" is the 'hood and a unitary public both; that Purp narrates Obama's election as a transition to his own adulthood -- "Yes we can Obama, yes we can. / No more am I called a boy because I am a man" (16), appears to reinforce a narrative movement towards civic personhood, linking Obama's political ascendance to his own. While is the only instance over the course of Purp's correspondence that he gestures to the political, it does serve to return *The Beat's* emphasis on the election's import over the course of six editions, and reinforce the logic of the organizational report.

This notion of personal truth as a precondition for political participation evokes an another aspect of *parrhêsiatic* activity. While there are instances over the course of Foucault's later lectures in which he positions this personal *parrhêsia* opposed to its earlier political counterpart -- particularly for Plato, for whom *parrhêsia* is fundamentally problematic for democratic pluralism, entailing a freedom of speech and action that anticipate the anarchy stemming from a lack of common *logos* (*Fearless Speech* 84) -- Foucault elsewhere suggests that the *hupomnēmata's* use as an instrument of personal truth outside of Plato[82] made it a critical component of participation in civic life, as it functioned the same whether the subject was private soul, or public figure. In an interview given during his lectures on care of the self at the Collège de France, he names this writing practice as analogous across spheres of activity: "one must manage oneself as a governor

---

[82] Foucault writes about the use of the *hupomnēmata* throughout classical Greece and Rome by drawing together writings from figures such as later Greek historian and middle Platonist Plutarch, and Stoicists such as Seneca and Epictetus (*Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*).

manages the governed, as a head of an enterprise manages his enterprise, a head of household manages his household" ("Genealogy of Ethics" 50-51) -- a practice in which power becomes relativized by linking the self to political action through judgment and choice (*Care of the Self* 87). What this suggests is that cultivation of a relationship to self and others through writing participates in a genre of governmentality that primes the proto-citizen for public life (86) -- a personal process that, contrary to Plato's indication of an inward turn, is "constituted *not* [as] an exercise in solitude, but [as] a true social practice" (*Care of the Self* 51, emphasis mine). That social practice applied to people in correctional settings suggests a *parrhêsiatic* regime that participates in rehabilitative discourse, thereby recognizing, at least in part, state as a normalized institution.

That this genre of activity requires a "sustained effort [to remind the self] not to let oneself become angry at others, at provident, or at things" (50-51) -- a Stoicist variant on the production of personal truth -- returns care of the self to regulation of the emotions. The mechanism of the *hupomnēmata,* then, in gathering together that fragmentary *logos* of things heard, read, and experienced, also serves to render the fragmentary and potentially unruly *pathē* responding to the social relations embedded in those instances of communicative exchange. And while Foucault points out that this development marks personal *parrhêsia's* progress on a path to the kind of *"*Epictetan severity" that constitutes a pre-Christian spiritual direction (39-49) evoking a turn away from the political, it remains a precondition for public life, as it works towards an ethics of conduct and understanding of personal power: "It is in knowing how to properly conduct himself that he will be able to lead others properly" (88). That *The Beat* urges Purp not only to perform his emotions for the public, but to do so truthfully and in such a way as to appropriately acknowledge his

relationality to others, reveals a figured world in which literacy sponsorship constitutes a distinct technology for self-governance in the context of the political; the primary mechanism of that technology is the *hupomnēmata* constituted by the publication itself*.* Here, *The Beat* operates in synch with the aims of correctional education sponsored by the institutions themselves; correctional education scholars Randall Wright and Thom Gehring note that, "Ethical forms of communication—authentic dialogue—creates the social and psychological conditions for political participation: schools prepare students for citizenship in democracies because schools are often dialogic "spheres of civility" in institutions characterized by monologic and strategic forms of communication" ("From Spheres of Civility" 323). In this way, *The Beat* operates less as *parrhêsia*st than ideological state apparatus, demonstrating the extent to which even the "virtuous" activity of truth-telling encouraged by those outside institutional authority risks extending a governmentality. Yet, Purp's address of *The Beat*, or rather his non-address, suggests that performing personal truth through a public cataloguing of emotion might be governed by a different logic from that of a civic imaginary where "we" and the 'hood might march hand in hand toward democratic empowerment.

     Before I continue with an analysis of Purp's relationship to authenticity, however, there are two points to clarify in using Foucault's variant of Socratic *parrhêsia* as a precondition for the political and, as such, rhetorical activity: one on the asymptomatic nature of a public-oriented reading of personal *parrhêsia* in the context of Foucault's larger project, and the other on that anomaly's irrelevance to the *parrhêsiatic* practices examined in the present study. First, Foucault's comments on the *hupomnēmata* and relativization of power are rare in the context of his study of personal and political *parrhêsia*, as well as a

departure from his other work on governmentality. The wedge created here for a kind of

rhetorical agency may be uncharacteristic in part due to what Arthur E. Walzer sees as

Foucault's complete opposition of *parrhêsia* to rhetoric (Walzer 2), or, as Susan Jarratt

reminds us, his lack of interest in a tradition concerned with political expediencies extrinsic

to the concerns of philosophy (Jarratt 363).[83] For that reason, one should not take my

tracing of *parrhêsiatic* sponsorship in *The Beat* as a strict application of Foucauldian

thought.

Second, as Walzer points out, a number of Hellenic and Second-Sophistic texts not

included in Foucault's account illustrate personal-*parrhêsiatic* practices amenable to public

discourse -- texts that view *parrhêsia* and rhetoric as valuable partners. In particular,

Walzer calls Foucault out for a selective assemblage of *parrhêsiatic* scenarios that fail to

acknowledge *parrhêsia's* status as an instrument of interpersonal relations, which Walzer

addresses by tracing its usage in the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* (90-80 BCE). In that text, even

the political variant of *parrhêsia* operates rhetorically, particularly where interpersonal

relationships are concerned, "insist[ing] that an artful, rhetorical *parrhêsia* that cultivates

friendship is more effective than a bold, unvarnished one" (3); as such, Walzer continues,

such a practice becomes a part of the prudential reasoning of *phronēsis* (3). Here, in its

---

[83] Bradford Vivian, on the other hand, sees *parrēsia* neither as rhetoric nor as philosophy, but rather as a form

and problematic of speech that resists rhetorical codification, since "it reveals an episteme in which the

ability to speak truth constitutes an ethical problem *independent* of whether or not one has learned how to

disseminate that truth in artful address (Vivian 372, emphasis mine). This reading of parrēsia is useful in

showing the insufficiencies of either philosophy or rhetoric's attempt to define parrēsia as one kind of

practice or the other, but doesn't alter my conclusion that the parrēsiatic practices evident in *The Beat*

nevertheless prime participants for other kinds of social or political activity, including rhetorical activity.

orientation towards the circumstances of a particular interpersonal relation, the terms of

parrhêsia's success mirror the ethical-methodological disposition of this study. Important

to the psychosocial sponsorship of *The Beat,* however, is Walzer's finding that *parrhêsia* as

a mode of prudential reasoning also plays a key part in the psychagogic instruction of

Epicurean schools (15). Reading Philodemus's *Peri Parrēsia* (*On Frank Criticism*)*,* Walzer

notes that *parrhêsia* in the pedagogical setting had to be tactful and rhetorically adjusted to

suit the disposition of the listener (15)[84], a mode of rhetorical instruction noteworthy not

so much because it existed in Epicurean schools devoted to spiritual practice, but because

Philodemus, though an expert on Epicurean philosophical doctrine, was also a celebrated

stylist an avowed rhetorician in the epideictic tradition (Hubbell 250-251). While this

inclusion does not attempt to argue that all of Philodemus's philosophical activity was

necessarily rhetorical, Walzer's discussion of a rhetorical *parrhêsia* that solidifies

interpersonal relations nevertheless demonstrates an affinity with an ethically-oriented

epideictic tradition in African-American culture that, as Mark Bernard White argues, builds

character, consensus, and identity, while performing the "reconstructive and remedial

work to counteract the effects of oppression" (127). This type of activity has a discursive

function in "public discourse in identifying, promulgating, and adjudicating values and,

thus, in constituting and sustaining social groups" (Graff and Wynn, 2006). Here, then,

parrhêsia becomes not just an ethical practice, but an ethical-rhetorical practice ideally

---

[84] Walzer notes that Foucault does tacitly acknowledge the value of such a tactical-rhetorical disposition in

the *Hermeneutics of the Subject,* when he says that a parrēsiast can use rhetoric if necessary (Walzer 6).

suited to political work in counterpublic space.[85] These points suggest that while Foucault's

reading of personal *parrhêsia* should not be applied in slap-dash fashion to sites historically

and culturally distant from the elite Hellenic and Second-Sophistic contexts defining its

origins, the event-practices of personal *parrhêsia* themselves, by virtue of their usage in

settings explicitly concerned with public-facing, rhetorical pedagogies, may nevertheless

become available to analysis of the publics and sponsorship dynamics in the pages of *The*

Beat.

      The affinity between *Beat* literacy practices and *parrhêsia* becomes clearer after

examining Purp's frequent references to authenticity, demonstrating a preoccupation with

personal truth that is not imposed, but shared -- and potentially even operant

independently of sponsor mandate. Though Purp never responds directly to *The Beat's*

questions, nearly half of his twenty-nine submissions either acknowledge, perform, or

exhort others to personal truth, while three submissions resist or reject the imperative

altogether. In his first published piece, he vows to "keep it real with [his ninjas] tell the

truth 'cause [he] love[s] em" as long as he is alive (1); in the next piece, he directs the

reader to witness the honesty of his feelings: "These just some lil' things that I'm gettin' off

my chest / Free Doug just left to the Four / I'm a miss that ninja / Man all BS to the side"

---

[85] This epideictic orientation is a *function,* however, and not a category of rhetorical activity. In *Rhetoric and*

Poetics in Antiquity, Jeffrey Walker helps us understand the *epideiktikon* as a generically diverse mode of

address intended for praise or blame in a ceremonial rather than an explicitly forensic or deliberative setting,

at times dealing with timeless, philosophical questions of large cultural and political import (Walker 7-8),

rather than the "pragmatic" rhetoric used to influence the casting of votes in an institutional setting (8).

Insofar as Purp's use of an interpersonally-oriented *parrēsia* operates in a space and temporality apart and

even resistant to the deliberative logics underlying *The Beat's* civil-institutional mandate, he

(2), even voicing an oath as a means of confirming the authenticity of how he feels: "I hate Juvenile Hall / I swear this shhh ain't cool" (2). Notably, these gestures to honesty precede any written feedback *The Beat* provides, suggesting that Purp already recognizes the utility of the publication as a vehicle for collecting the fragmentary *pathē* bound to his experiences - a vehicle echoing the *hupomnēmata*. Moreover, it demonstrates a rhetorical awareness of audience that exists independently of *The Beat's* encouragements to write for "the world" to feel. Yet, coding for magnitude reveals that, in spite of this awareness and *The Beat's* consistent messaging over the course of two years, his avowal of a *parrhêsia*tic practice is in no way consistent, or directional. In subsequent submissions, Purp both resists and embraces *parrhêsia*tic activity; in one instance, he feels "reckless since life ain't fair" (12), and expressly shuts down the possibility of dialogue or counsel, saying, "Don't tell me nothin' / to keep it real, I don't care" (12). But in the following edition, Purp assumes the role of *parrhêsia*st, as he reflects on the loss of a fellow detainee to another facility, sentimentalizing their time together by listing all of the things they will no longer share: "No more classroom talk no more game shows wins, / No more reality checks no more Beat Withins / . . . I know you got knowledge use your head to see the light man" (14). What is more, Purp's pairing of "reality checks" with "Beat Withins" suggests not just recognition of *The Beat's parrhêsia*tic function, but a positive valuation of that experience.

His final missive, however, urges honesty within a set of relations that exist in spite of *The Beat's* influence, by addressing the audience of peers he'll be leaving as he transfers to Santa Rita -- those who might respond to a fraternity indicated by his use of "bra," and a plea that he'll "be back in a minute" (29). While Purp and other writers will occasionally mention *The Beat* by name, and even address the publication as the primary recipient of

their submissions, as Purp does in an early apocryphal submission quoted in the organizational report:[86] "I appreciate the state of mind that you put me I [*sic*] / This for *The Beat* I'ma write to you every week" ("Writing for Their Lives" 12), Purp's final submission does not mention or address the unitary entity of *The Beat* at all. His farewell begins with an invocation of the "real," but spends the remainder of the piece asking the audience to "keep it lit," a San Francisco Bay Area expression meaning, "to be honest" (Golfizzang), but also used as an imperative to preserve the essence and vitality of a relation to an individual or a community, as illustrated by its usage in the "Keep It Lit" campaign to save the historic San Francisco-based Marcus Bookstore from closure, the oldest Black bookstore in the country (Ray).

> Keep it lit for me keep it lit for the real,
>
> Keep it lit for the thugs and the ones that got killed,
>
> Keep it lit for my ninja who still up in jail,
>
> Keep it lit for Wooda he mobbin' in his cell,
>
> Keep it lit for my ninjas who got thirty or better,
>
> Keep it lit for the ninjas who slide any weather,
>
> Keep it lit for me I be back in a minute,
>
> Keep it lit for Laron I love that man,
>
> Keep it lit bra, that's the most I can,
>
> Keep it lit
>
> *BW* Vol. 14.29 (2009) 26

---

[86] The organizational report places this submission one month after Purp's sixth submission, no more than three issues into his detention ("Writing for Their Lives" 12).

The final two lines of Purp's plea suggest that his audience's ability to maintain honest relations is intimately connected with his own, entangled in the love he feels for Laron - a tacit recognition of his position as both subject and agent, ruler and ruled; while the preceding lines function as an imperative to others from one independent and assured, "that's the most I can" reads more as a plea for compassion and understanding from an audience Purp needs to go on living. This audience of peers includes not only those located at his detention facility, but also for the broader *Beat* readership located at facilities across the country, readers from both juvenile and adult institutions -- those that identify with the *topos* of Black men facing thirty years in prison, or the trope of fallen comrades in the streets. That this formalized farewell is unrelenting in its urging towards an authentic relationality with others suggests not only an avowal of *parrhêsiatic* instruments, but a sense of responsibility towards his larger audience -- not "the world" of outsiders identified by the editors of *The Beat,* but a public defined by the common experience of the streets and incarceration. Here, then, Purp's *parrhêsia* exhibits the African-American-epideictic sensibility observed by Mark Bernard White, consolidating community where existing structures prove insufficient. This culminating effort is neither the "innovative" memoir, nor the ode to Obama described in the organizational report, reading against the grain of the hopeful trajectory toward a positive civic engagement, once again eschewing *The Beat's* imagined, unitary audience for an alternate public -- the same discourse community Purp professed loyalty to from the beginning of his detention. In other words, Purp has solidified a care of the self that fulfills *The Beat's* mission to encourage "literacy, self-expression, some critical thinking skills, and healthy, supportive relationships with adults and their

139

community" ("About Us"), but not necessarily with the broader community envisioned by the organization; as illustrated in the conflict over genre, the public most important to Purp is one *The Beat* is trying to curtail: street culture that retains social ties to gang or other criminal activity. Here, Purp demonstrates the capriciousness of literacy sponsorship described by Brandt, using the publication in ways not fully concordant with *The Beat's* hopes for its recipients, though in some ways Purp deviates far less from the program's intended aims than some; a look at the style sheet shows just how vigilant *Beat* editors must be to prevent writers from communicating gang identifications. A full three pages of the five page document are devoted to identifying, modifying, and even removing certain markers of gang affiliation (Appendix C), to be constantly updated when writers devise new ways of using the publication for gang communications. Nevertheless, Purp's targeted farewell reveals a discursive conflict between the figured world he lives in and the one envisioned by the editors of *The Beat.*

CONCLUSION

It is important to remember that *The Beat* does conduct its work at the pleasure of the probation institution, and that its efforts to cultivate technologies of the self coincide neatly with both the rehabilitative discourse that pathologizes criminality, and medicalizes the "cure" of writing, even as they seek to establish an *ēthos* of trust as outsiders. As Foucault note in *Care of the Self*, medical metaphors pervade care of the self; "The improvement, the perfecting of the soul that one seeks in philosophy, the *paideia* of the latter is supposed to ensure, increasingly assumes a medical coloration" (55). This mechanism, wherein the detained subject is disciplined both as the recipient of distributive power and punishment, and also as a patient receiving mandated care, becomes especially

140

onerous for detained youth, insofar as the theories animate both scholarship and rehabilitative practice around juvenile delinquency derive from the "risk-protection" framework (Howell 2003) that eyes youth with an actuarial gaze that depersonalizes individual circumstance and reduces people to statistics.[87]

The irony of *The Beat's* sponsorship, then, consists in an effort that risks reinforcing the subjection of Purp and his peers, even as it labors passionately to facilitate a means to personal and eventual political empowerment. Furthermore, *The Beat's* insistent messaging around "innovative" emotional truth for the benefit of an external audience -- presumably, including the editors of *The Beat* themselves, anticipates a desire to experience Purp's subject formation by proxy -- a prosthetic[88] emotional experience as a means of rehearsing, iteratively, production of an ethical, agentive subject towards participation in a civic imaginary.

This desire speaks to the relational dialogue between confessor and confessant, but rather than operating as a fixed dyad of knowledge-power relations, imbricates both

---

[87] Penologists Malcolm Feeley and Jonathan Simon note that the actuarial model of prison administration, concerned with classification of large groups according to their "dangerousness" to the public (Feeley and Simon 452-456), has combined with the "tough on crime" rhetoric of politicians to effectively devastate the possibility of successful reintegration with either family, economy, or community.

[88] My use of "prosthetic" avoids the binary logics of what Cherney describes as ableist rhetoric's equation of ability with the physical, and disability with deformity ("Rhetoric of Ableism"). Rather, I reframe the prosthetic apparatus as a tool equally accessible to interlocutors across difference and power differentials, yet nevertheless informed by social context and ideological orientation.

positions in a way that exceeds their organizing principles.[89] And even though the editors

occasionally admit that likelihood for engagement is modest -- stating, in their preface to

one volume on the presidential election, that, "[i]n the end we hope at least half of you will

use your right to vote when the opportunity is there" (13.09 2), the dogged emphasis on

the election topic and narrative logic of the organizational report suggests that full voter

participation remains the ideal.

There is good reason for caution in using "prosthetic" to describe this exchange. As a

prosthetics scholar and wearer, Vivian Sobchack argues that the metaphor of the prosthetic

has, over the course of its heavy usage dating from interest in cybernetics, become both

fetishized and unmoored from its origins, more restrictive and less dynamic than its

material reality (Sobchack 18-21). Sobchack's analysis gives me double pause, insofar as

this dissertation has already noted the injury posed by scholars metaphorizing darkness,

light, and border-crossing, even as their usage by individual prison literacy practitioners

reflects the kind of embodied persuasive practice of the somatic metaphor.[90] Nevertheless,

the extent to which *The Beat's* practice places ethical truth-demands on both prisoner and

civil subject in ways not always congruous to correctional aims suggests that the

prosthetic-emotional labor occurring at *The Beat's* scenes of writing exceeds the totalizing

---

[89] In this way, *The Beat* sponsors a kind of emotional intimacy that echoes the reorganizing impulses of love

Lauren Berlant describes in her critique of Foucault's account of (sexual) confession along an axis of

normality and pathology ("Love, a Queer Feeling" 440). This revision paves the way for a conception of public

relation in which affect becomes constitutive of the political.

[90] Jennifer LeMesurier defines somatic metaphors as, "metaphors crafted to revive remembered embodied

experience in the mover's consciousness, allows access to the ideological, political, and affective ties formed

in the original embodied performance" (362).

logics of a political ontology in which the prison-slave is always already "some suffering thing." In this way, perhaps the prosthetic becomes a useful means of articulating a set of practices that have both discursive and material implications for interlocutors facing incommensurable difference, even as *Beat* sponsors desire something that Purp does not.

Are there consequences to that desire, and the attendant dissonance with Purp's own use of the publication? While Brandt's sponsorship model recognizes that such conflicts have implications for a recipient's use of literacy as capital, Lauren Berlant helps understand how this dissonance might also constitute a relation of "cruel optimism." Berlant explains this relation as a kind of "attachment to compromised conditions of possibility" that becomes cruel when "something you desire is actually an obstacle to your flourishing", and when the object that draws your attachment actively impedes the [thing] that brought you to it initially" (*Cruel Optimism* 1). With Berlant's concept in mind, then, does *The Beat's* investment in the directional logic of its sponsorship, governed by the spectral presence of a civic *mythos,* ultimately impede the their ability to facilitate practical realization of its mission -- cultivation of personal relationships with adults and community via live encounter, post-release -- by urging Purp towards (and naming him an exemplar of) an abstract political subjectivity that he cannot (or chooses not to) claim? Given that Purp closes his *Beat* correspondence with the understanding that he continues not on to the community understood by *The Beat*, but to the Santa Rita jail, the imperative to "keep it lit for me I be back in a minute" (29) suggests that the affective structure of Purp's world remains centered in a community defined by shared experience as criminal and carceral subjects.

Yet, it would be reductive to suggest that Purp's redirection of *Beat* sponsorship functions solely along a planar continuum defined by resistance on one end, and embrace of institutional biopower on the other. Scholarship on literate activity in prisons from a variety of disciplines often valorizes the writing practiced there as a struggle against the dehumanizing force of the prison-industrial complex, thereby playing into a set of discursive orientations that manage to reduce these writers to tropes of resiliency and resistance, bravery, and suffering. Tobi Jacobi offers a thoughtful consideration of how literacy practitioners interested in social justice might be more critical of their efforts ("Speaking Out for Social Justice"), but ultimately providing a "how-to" for critical literacy practitioners who may have prison abolition in their sights. She acknowledges the varied motivations and usages of literate activity in carceral spaces, noting, in her own work with the SpeakOut! workshop with incarcerated women, that only some participants reflect on power relations on their own, others being motivated by emotional release and boredom ("Speaking Out for Social Justice" 45-6). Yet, the very project of a program design geared towards abolition anticipates a modality of sponsorship with an ideal of resistance in mind -- invested in an alternate but clearly future-oriented possibility in which literacy has a causal relationship with a politically agentive future.

Anne Plemons, working with the CAP project at an adult facility in Sacramento, acknowledges the tropes at play, mindful of the tug-of-war between parties who either "talk about (re)discovering humanity[, or] argue that a discovery of humanity without the material gain of physical freedom is at best a sham and at worst a deep violence" ("Literacy as an Act" 10). She also reiterates Brandt's observations about the competing interests of hope and exploitation always present in spaces of literate activity (39). However, as a

144

sponsor herself, she retains an attitude of care towards the recipients of sponsorship, arguing for viewing "literacy as acts of creative resistance scaffolded by small, organic, tactical moves" (39), towards a possibility of "bring[ing] a bit of a silenced soul to the surface" (48). While she also acknowledges that, "Teachers, in any institution, who continue to show up day after day cannot escape some belief in individual agency. Branch claims, and I agree, that all classrooms where literacy practices are taught (or supported) ascribe some agency to those literacy practices" (50), there is a sense in which this "creative resistance," however tactical in the sense offered by Paula Mathieu,[91] is still deeply invested in assumption of agency predicated on futurity.

Writing from a less hopeful end of the spectrum is radical critical prison studies scholar Dylan Rodríguez, who frames textual production by prisoners in terms of "counterhegemonic prison praxis" (*Forced Passages* 83) and "imprisoned resistance workers" ("Against Prison Writing" 413), effectively coding prisoner literacy efforts as Marxist-intellectual and political heroism. Rodríguez offers Jose Solis Jordan as an example of a "captive radical intellectual" that embraces political-ontological subjection from the space of solitary confinement, but nevertheless constitutes a model of "philosophy of praxis for the incarcerated activist or liberationist" (*Forced Passages* 76). Admittedly, Purp is not Solis, not only because of difference in culture, geography, and carceral status, but because Purp is a teen on the cusp of adulthood, with marked differences in psychosocial maturity -

---

[91] Plemons employs Paula Mathieu's definition of the tactical from *Tactics of Hope* as, "critical, active, dialectical engagement between the insufficient present and possible, alternative futures" (Mathieu xv, qtd. in Plemons 49).

- a proto-citizen, and not a professor imprisoned for a Puerto Rican independence bombing, convicted on testimony that framed the crime as an act of rebellion on par with the Boston Tea Party (Puente).

Yet, Rodríguez's project casts prisoner literacy in leveling, discursive terms, failing to qualify the way in which Solis's writing in solitary confinement constitutes a very specific literate practice among prisoners more broadly. Even as he attempts to be more expansive in his account -- inviting "a broader political understanding of the abject categorization of 'commonly' imprisoned people" (*Forced Passages* 5), he still renders this group tropologically, in opposition to a prison-industrial complex that "operationalizes our living apocalypse of unfreedom" (2). And while elsewhere Rodríguez is acutely critical of scholars and activists who participate in and extend the genre of prison writing -- going beyond Brandt's charge of euphemistic coercion to suggest a voyeurism[92] that takes gratification from the spectacle of suffering ("Against Prison Writing" 411) -- his use of Jordan as an exemplar for radical intellectual practice towards liberation also presumes a future in which the world might be radically otherwise, reinscribing a narrow, dyadic

---

[92] The kind of reciprocal prosthetic experience extended by both *Beat* sponsors and recipients suggests that perhaps Rodríguez's characterization of prison writing's witnesses -- a characterization that itself becomes a prosthetic persuasive technology in a manner not dissimilar to metaphor -- errs more on the side of the rigid, unimaginative use of prosthesis that Sobchack cautions against. "Voyeurism" is itself a prosthetic practice, relying on technologies of vision at a distance to provide sexual gratification. Insofar as voyeurism is yoked to not only depravity, but also criminality, Rodríguez obliterates the possibility of ethical intervention by any who would bear witness to both the power and the toll of writing in carceral space; this is zero-sum rhetoric at its most unrelenting.

vision of how literate practice in confinement functions, almost always, it seems, with a heavy burden of significance for the civic imaginary.

This burden frames detained writers as spectacular subjects, emptying them of agency and singularity, even as the trope of the prisoner is mobilized to express the discursive heroisms. Here too, then, in representations of literacy communities situated in carceral spaces, Berlant's cruel optimism rears its head, where an attachment to a logic of futurity -- whether inscribed in terms of positive engagement with civil society, as with Plemons and Jacobi, or in terms of radical rupture, as with Rodríguez -- constitutes an obstacle to seeing the full significance of the discursive mismatch within the literacy community of *The Beat.* Rodríguez is right to suggest that language use in these spaces "inaugurates . . . new languages of agency, politics, freedom, identity, community, sovereignty, and struggle . . . [that] constantly exceed and slip from the grasp of conventional modes of political, academic, and activist discourse" (75-6). However, even with his incisive critique of the genre, his mode of critical-activist discourse nevertheless forecloses on the possibility of an agentive literate practice in which radical, future-focused liberation is *not* the ultimate goal. As Cedric Robinson argues, there are different kinds of power -- "always something beyond the reach of dominating systems, no matter how deeply they saturate society" (Robinson xii). Here Robinson critiques race-based scholarship that tends "to mass around explicit or inferred explanatory models which are derivative of Marx or insinuated from Foucault's notion that 'power establishes a particular regime of truth'" (xii), such that "simply different relations of power are left unexamined, or insubstantiated" (xii). The insufficiency of the resistance-complicity paradigm, then, brings us back to the capriciousness of Brandt's model, and the wide variance in how

detained writers themselves make use of the capital accumulated over the course of their

sponsorship. That Purp ultimately declines to either avow *The Beat's* civic vision*,* or reject

the implements of governmentality, suggests the need to look elsewhere to understand the

contours of his figured world.

One way to do so might be to look at what Berlant calls, "the affect of feeling political

together" (*Cruel Optimism* 223), a modality focused on transmitting "not the *message* but

the *noise"*(223, emphasis author's). This effect she likens to the "maiuetic listening" Charles

Hirschkind identifies in Egypt's intimate political publics, where the "feeling tones of the

affective soundscape produce attachments to and investments in a sense of political and

social mutuality performed in the moments of collective audition" (223). In other words,

"feeling political together" turns away from eventual political outcomes in favor of the

affective structure of immediate experience -- a transitive state that echoes Berlant's

reorganizing excesses of love, and a sound rejoinder to both *The Beat's* institutional

mandates, and early Foucauldian logics of power. Key to understanding Purp's relation to

his audience is the way in which this process "tak[es] on listening together as itself an

object/scene of desire" (223), since his final plea to "keep it lit" effectively rehearses the

same sentiment he expresses in the very first printed submission: "Tell my ninjas that I

love 'em I never ever leave 'em" (1). Purp's expression of emotion, then, as non-linear and

focused on its immediate transmission and reception, becomes an ethical relation with a

community of fellow detainees constituted in the pages of the publication, week after week,

providing what Berlant sees as the "visceral transmission" of an avowed effort towards the

good life (225). Even as Purp transmits via asynchronous page rather than auditory

synchrony, the effects of his writing endure in the sonic and visual repetitions of his rhyme

-- a pleasure and sense of togetherness that his peer readership returns, illustrated by shout-outs to Purp for his work, as adult subscriber Cain does from a facility in Soledad (*BW* Vol. 14.27, 62), and shared use of rap poetics.

The maieutic[93] aspect Berlant assigns this affective togetherness has special significance for care of the self in the context of detention, as it gestures to questioning-as-midwifery in the *Meno,* used by Socrates to make the argument that even a slave can acquire knowledge and virtue if asked the right questions (Scott 144-5). Maieutic transmission, then, facilitates a unique space of personhood for Purp and his fellow detainees, insofar as it asserts claims of a shared emotional subjectivity in the midst of a condition of civil death. The political nature of this shared personhood is emphasized by the shared refrain, "we all we got" -- across time and different juvenile and adult facilities (*BW* Vols. 13.05 30; 13.23; 13.29; 13.48; 14.14; 14.03). This refrain, by virtue of its transmission to multiple publics, to be read by outsiders but directed at peers in a public

---

[93] "Maieutic" comes from the Greek, *maieuesthai, meaning, to* 'act as a midwife' by "eliciting ideas by questioning" ("maieutic method"). Hirschkind actually borrows the idea of "maieutic listening" from Peter Wilburg, who coins the term as a means of thinking about listening as an embodied experience connected to "touch therapies and body work" (Wilburg 61), borrowing the metaphor of midwifery so as to "bear with others in pregnant silence in such a way as to help them listen more deeply to themselves and allow this silence to bear fruit ... and embody a new *inner bearing"* (51). This definition suggests that Berlant's usage wanders from Wilburg's original use of the term, as Berlant focuses on immediate collective feeling, while Wilburg frames it as a directional intersubjective experience in which the Socratic midwife facilitates the truth of others. Wilburg's definition, then, looks more like Socratic *parrēsia,* while Berlant's focuses more on affect as a political end in and of itself.

forum, transforms a space of merely feeling together into one with political significance, as its transmission broadcasts difference, shared purpose, and personhood in the midst of the social death conferred by detention, if not in spite of -- a counter-public focused on the immediate present, made more distinct by Purp and his peers' performance of rap poetics.

In the face of Purp's presentist attitude, it's important to acknowledge that countless individual submissions to *The Beat* are forward-thinking, using the pages of the publication to anticipate what will happen post-release or post-transfer. And Purp's ode to Obama, which somewhat resembles a prayer, does indicate that he may not have abandoned an orientation of futurity entirely, even though its isolation suggests that such post-election euphoria is fleeting. However, there is a way in which Purp's use of *The Beat's* literacy sponsorship as a vehicle for emotional truth towards togetherness behind bars serves as a corrective to *The Beat's* insistence on a futurity bound to assumption of a civic *mythos* on the outside; moreover, it calls attention to the fact that the incarcerated writers for *The Beat* have distinctly different notions of time and citizenship from their editor-sponsors. In this way, Purp's figured world urges thinking about affect not as a process that moves *towards* political action, but rather *as* action in the immediate space of its utterance and reception; such a shift deemphasizes rhetorical engagement that focuses primarily on a deliberative, or future-oriented register, in favor of an expressive, non-instrumental modality, delivering constitutive rhetorics in a distinct temporal space. The expressive nature of the "affect of being together" returns this literacy community to both the hip-hop genre as an expression of African-American rhetoric, and *The Beat's* investment in the confessional.

One analogue to Berlant's variant of maieutics available to not just literacy studies

but also African-American literacies is Rhea Estelle Lathan's account of the literacy

auxiliary practice of "testifying," which, she argues, encompasses sacred and secular ways

of knowing towards the political (Lathan 32), offering Bernice Robinson's Civil Rights

movement activism as an example. Lathan reiterates the common understanding of

testifying as, "simple commentary but dramatic narration requiring a communal

reenactment of one's feelings and experiences" (31), but uses it to redefine literacy by

observing that it "illuminates visions-ways of knowing-that include a continual

interchange" (34). But while Lathan's testifying-as-literacy is posited as tools of resistance

in the context of civil rights, the continual interchange that Lathan describes suggests a

non-linear relation that subverts the stranglehold of futurity. Drawing on this tradition,

then, is one more example of the way in which Purp quite successfully maintains a

relationship with adults and his community -- but accessed through a different genealogy,

with different publics and different outcomes in mind.

What do Lathan and Berlant help us understand, then, about not only Purp, but

about the nature of the relationship between philosophy, literacy, and rhetoric? What

Berlant's and Lathan's formulations help show is that literacy events of reciprocal affect

like those around Purp might help teachers and scholars not only reconsider assigning

sponsorship paradigms focused on a continuum of resistance and complicity, but also

reimagine the way in which a *parrhêsiatic* practice focusing on writing the emotions -- via

the *hupomnēmata* -- constitutes a literacy practice with distinct rhetorical implications in

spaces of public writing. Specifically, they provide ways to think about the ways in which

constitutive rhetorics participate in the political in ways not linked to futurity, thereby

possibly restructuring what potentiality in literacy and rhetoric look like. It may, for

example, move the concept of literacy-as-instrumental in a social or political context

towards a notion of literacy acquisition as something closer to what educational theorist

King Beach calls, "consequential transfer," in which knowledge acquisition translates as, "a

developmental change in the relation between an individual and one or more social

activities" toward something new (Beach 113).[94] Here Lathan and Berlant may provide an

opportunity to reestablish a relationship between Socratic *parrhêsia* as a mode of ethical

relation and a rhetorical modality in which, to return to Walzer and Mark Bernard White,

becomes a space to solidify interpersonal relations in the face of structural antagonisms

against Black and incarcerated people. Doing so marks out more resolutely a counterpublic

space that flourishes in spite of the strictures and expectations of the correctional and civil

discourses sponsoring *Beat* activity, rendered all the more nimble by a truth-practice with

ethical-rhetorical sensibilities.

Such a discussion might also constitute another point of entry to public writing

pedagogies that operate in spaces of contingency, while still adopting an orientation of

hope, as Paula Mathieu does in looking at community publishing on the street (Mathieu).

While Mathieu's hope is a "critical, active, dialectical engagement between the insufficient

present and the possible, alternative futures" (*Tactics* xiv), Purp's cultivation of affective

[94] In contrast to the dialogic description of maieutics above, King positions his "consequential transfer" as

opposed to what he sees as the *Meno's* narrow, individualistic concept of knowledge-transfer. King argues

instead for a learning model based on the Buddhist concept of "dependent origination," in which knowledge

transfer embraces "the recursive nature of changing persons and social organizations" (130). A Berlantian

reading of the *Meno,* however, supported with instances of dialogic pedagogy from Purp and *The Beat,*

suggests that such midwifery is entirely consistent with his theory of transfer as a mode of social becoming.

solidarity through a truth-practice resistant to the official discourses of civic rehabilitation

suggests that the hope-futurity paradigm might be revised toward a disposition that

focuses on hope as bound to recognition of intersubjective experience, as Dale Jacobs

suggests in his invocation of Gabriel Marcel, for whom hope is "a horizontal relationship of

mutuality that looks toward a shared future" (Jacobs 786). Rather than an emphasis on that

hope-futurity relation as diachronic, however, Purp's affective solidarity invites us to see

that relation as synchrony -- an event-practice that recognizes potential for change not in

directional force, but in horizontal resonance at a given moment, consolidating toward

futurity only through repetition, week to week. Such a model demonstrates the extent to

which Purp's conception of the public more accurately represents the essence of

democratic publics described by Cintron's storehouse of energy, making futurity less a

foregone conclusion, and more a desire to be named and located by a given community.

Hope becomes the thread that binds speakers and hearers of truth-practice together as a

condition of that repetition -- one that may be directed, but that may also operate as an

unruly rhetoric, accruing a life of its own.

...

These possible applications aside, however, I must return to the limits of the

archive, and acknowledge the extent to which this analysis operates on presumption; even

as *The Beat* appears to suffer the burden of cruel desire towards civic engagement, the

pedagogy printed in these twenty-nine responses cannot fully capture the organization's

own metadiscursive moves. Though the organizational report and editorial responses to

Purp demonstrate an insistent optimism and logic of futurity predicated on a civic

imaginary, they do not capture the extent to which volunteers for *The Beat* understand

153

their participation as a humbling, truth-producing mechanism for themselves, or the diversity of motivations and discursive orientations behind their workshop and publication pedagogy. To shore up this lack, I turn to the experiential mode of *phronēsis* available through fieldwork, supplementing theory and archival analysis with the knowledge that only embedded knowledge can provide -- both the situated knowledge of program participants, and my embedded experience as a rhetorical field-worker. Chapter Three narrates the pursuit of this wisdom through a field-based qualitative study set in the halls of the detention-based workshops and organization headquarters where *Beat* conducts their work.

CHAPTER III

Writing Their Way to Someone Else:
The Beat's *Askēsis* as Event-Practice in the Field

I move to embodied inquiry -- the moment when I most perceptibly feel the plummeting of my gut to the ground, having parachuted from theory-craft in search of a more granular view of the role writing plays for imprisoned writers and those who sponsor and chronicle that work. Even as Chapters One and Two have explored auxiliaries to the curatorial methods of community literacy scholarship and radical-critical theory, there is a way in which those analyses remain tufts in the air -- as-yet-disembodied moments of pause on the way to the vivid, entangled, emotional place that grounds this project in my own activist and care-ridden impulses: my volunteer work with *The Beat* Within. As suggested in the introduction, the insufficiencies of the hope-doom paradigm around the prison-slave call for an ethical-methodological disposition informed by *phronēsis*, such that inquiry might capture writers' granular, situated experiences in a way that the broad strokes of theory cannot. A key part of that methodological disposition, however, rests in the prudential wisdom of embodied knowledge, and a reflexive account of that experience, particularly where progressive impulses shape both inquiry and rhetorical appeal. As Robert Hariman reminds us, prudence facilitates reasoning by "emphasiz[ing] situational constraints [and] social knowledge" (Hariman 27); in other words, moving from the disembodied space of the archive to the social, material complexities of the field better captures the vernacular rhetorics[95] and lived experience of community members in their

---

[95] Gerard Hauser's coining of the term, "vernacular rhetorics" to describe field-based observations of Greek political campaigning (85) and American polling places (190) comes closest to characterizing the situated

own words, as they occur. The embeddedness of field methods gives researchers a clearer view of the tactical role writing plays for any given *ethnos* in constructing public and counter-public space. However, the move to the field requires thinking about not just the embodied experiences of community members, but also the researcher as an instrument. Qualitative communications scholars Lindlof and Taylor remind us that, for "participant-observation, the researcher *is* the instrument" (Lindlof and Taylor 123), an insight that rhetorical field scholar Aaron Hess links directly to *phronēsis* (147). Hess expands the notion of self-as-instrument to one in which the researcher not only participates and observes as part of a performative modality,[96] but enacts, in keeping with Barry Brummett's call for a moral rhetorical heuristic that exceeds the "store of scholarly knowledge" through action (Brummett 105), a kind of advocacy alongside the communities

communicative practices described in community literacy scholarship; Hauser follows Ono and Sloop's discussion of vernacular discourse (1997). For these reasons, I adopt the "vernacular" to interpret *Beat* literacy practices that cohere around particular conceptions of public writing, notwithstanding the fact that its Latin root, "*verna,"* refers to "home-born slaves" (Howard 174).

[96] Robert Hariman observes that prudence (*phronēsis*) is "a full-bodied conception of the rational actor" (27), a performative, aesthetic grounding to Eugene Garver's discussion of prudence as the movement in political judgment from principles to consequences (31). Rhetorical field researchers Middleton, Sendak-Cook, and Endres draw on Hariman's aesthetic framing to explore how vernacular-based aesthetic rhetorics aid different groups in constructing social fictions (398) thereby delimiting critical interpretations that rely on an abstracted sense of aesthetic rhetorical influence. Here they reiterate the field as a conduit between principle and real-world effects, particularly for the critic (399). This aesthetic grounding makes researcher-based *phronēsis* useful for not only conducting deliberative work of public concern, but also for parsing my own practices as I interpret a set of epimeleian writing practices that Foucault sees constitutive of an "aesthetics of existence" (*Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* 207).

one observes (Hess 147). This turn towards advocacy brings field-based writing research back to the notion of "care" Mieke Bal sees operant in curation (Bal 181); because the framing staged by the curator creates an event of public encounter with a distinct configuration of objects, a kind of responsibility ensues (180). Embedded in Bal's articulation of responsibility is both Hariman's attention to political consequence, and Hess's orientation towards advocacy, both dispositions that resonate with the burden of care that inform the sponsorship of and scholarship on community literacy in prisons.

Yet, a phronetic self-as-instrument must also necessarily inhabit a self-reflexivity about how she comes to the vernacular spaces she encounters, and how her preexisting subjectivities and concurrent participation affects the final rendering. My analysis in Chapter One resolves by asking prison literacy scholars trafficking in tropes of darkness and light to exercise a greater degree of critical reflexivity about their participation in rhetorical economies that reify discourses of whiteness; this chapter attempts to heed that call, while also attempting to avoid a move that recenters my experience or confession of discursive whiteness[97] at the expense of *The Beat* community itself. That effort becomes part of a curatorial practice that attempts to satisfy the ethical and methodological challenges posed by Wilderson's prison-slave in two ways: one, by narrating my experience as a phronetic instrument in a field study for *The Beat,* and two, by performing a qualitative analysis of the responses gathered that triangulate findings from Chapter Two.

---

[97] Wendy Ryden and Ian Marshall caution against the inadvertent reinvigoration of discursive whiteness that can emerge from performance of the liberal antiracist subject, advocating for "more dynamic, interactive forms of literacy that focus less on performing subjectivity and more on the to-ing and fro-ing of sustained interaction between and among subjects (Ryden and Marshall 134).

Drawing on participant observations and interview data from three types of

program participants -- including detainees, volunteers, and facility staff at three different

program locations, this chapter traces how the literacy sponsorship of *The Beat* exceeds the

economic- and coercion-based logics of sponsorship conceived by Brandt, namely by

exhorting both sponsor and recipient to ethical social action in publics not necessarily

defined by the correctional institution (and by extension, the state). While *Beat*

sponsorship does gesture to a Brandtian patronage[98] anticipating some degree of coercion

through legal-ontological difference,[99] the community's regime of solitary and dialogic

writing through the publication -- a regime resembling modes of Stoic *askēsis* and Socratic

parrhêsia described by Foucault, illustrate the extent to which *The Beat*'s attentiveness to

emotion and the "real" cultivates an *ethopoietics* that reactivate both detained writers and

sponsors towards a kind of philosophical virtue not defined by criminal conviction. That

disposition primes writers for social and even political action in spaces not necessarily

defined by hegemonic discourse, while exhorting sponsors to interrogate their own roles in

---

[98] In "Sponsors of Literacy," Brandt uses historical models of European patronage and Spanish-colonial *compradrazgo* to flesh out literacy sponsorship's affinity with practices wherein "otherwise antagonistic social classes [entered] into relationships of mutual, albeit unequal dependencies ... to extend their influence and justify their exploitation of clients" ("Sponsors of Literacy" 168). *Compradrazgo* often took up the project of acculturation between indigenous peoples and Catholic religious patrons.

[99] Although Beat volunteers come to the program from a variety of class, ethnic, race, cultural, and educational backgrounds, their legal status as civil subjects is significantly different from the writers who, by virtue of their detention -- often awaiting adjudication resulting in long-term incarceration -- write for *The Beat* as subjects marked by civil death, incapacitated by a total institution that significantly inflects their lives if and when they leave.

extending institutional discipline; it also urges both sponsors and recipients to understand themselves as ethical agents in what Plutarch saw as, "a field of complex relations where [one] occupies a transition point" (Plutarch, qtd. in *CoTS* 88).

The extent to which all three sets of participants value writing as a rerouting of emotion away from violent action and toward ethical social encounter, however, serves to illustrate how narratives around the prison -- including scholarly and activist accounts of correctional discourse as necessarily antagonistic, overlook the possibility of shared practices and investments around social ethics. I say this not to insist on a logic of consensus or shared sense of political or social purpose as the best possible outcome; doing so flattens important layers of difference between these community members, most importantly for the detained and imprisoned writers themselves, as the participants most vulnerable to the effects of institutional discourse. That difference is heightened by the potential disconnect between writers' use of *The Beat* cultivates a sense of social action in publics not necessarily aligned with correctional aims, thereby fulfilling the capriciousness[100] of literacy sponsorship that Brandt talks about in sponsors using their acquired literacies for purposes outside of what sponsors intend, whether overtly, accidentally, or on the sly (*Literacy in American Lives* 42-3).

At the same time, however, the perspectives of facility staff, detainees, and *Beat* volunteers nevertheless intersect in notable ways around the writing of emotion, thereby giving scholars and participants the opportunity to rethink intersections between discipline, emotion, literacy, and engagement among different publics. That project

---

[100] Brandt illustrates that capricious mobility in her case study of Oneida tribe member Carol White (*Literacy in American Lives* 42-3).

provides not just a richer sense of literacy sponsorship as a precondition for public engagement; it also has implications for teacher-scholars of rhetoric and writing, insofar as *The Beat's* practices of *askēsis* remind us of rhetoric and composition's classical-philosophical genealogy, writing's capacity to articulate and mobilize emotion in social practice, and its role as a conduit for "discipline" conceived in different ways. Moreover, it provides an opportunity to parse the significant overlap between rhetoric and literacy, while recognizing the methodological advantages of literacy studies' emphasis on situated communicative practice. The complexity of *Beat* sponsorship serves as a reminder, as prudential wisdom does, to resist to foregrounding classical-rhetorical taxonomies and official rhetorical genealogies at the expense of logics and practices situated in a particular place and time -- practices that may or may not cohere to Aristotelian, Ciceronian, or Burkean conceptions of communicative activity.[101]

CHARTING FIELD METHODS across FIELDS of STUDY

---

[101] Despite a rich body of rhetorical research capturing rhetorics at every conceivable moment of time and place, Brenda Glascott's survey of fifteen nineteenth-century American rhetorical histories suggest that some rhetorical scholarship continues to privilege audience-driven and classical-rhetorical readings of communicative activity ("Constricting Key Words"). Glascott observes that these scholars not only deemphasize compositional and literacy-focused content, but, as in the case of Nan Johnson's reading of Royster's *Traces of a Stream,* avoid the term, "literacy" entirely - even as Royster uses the term, again and again (21). Acknowledging the significant overlap between and even synonymous usage of "literacy" and "rhetoric" in the field (19), Glascott points out that this taxonomic preference may stem from the entrenched circuitry of rhetoric's long and unified tradition of scholarship, in contrast to literacy scholarship "not compelled to demonstrate how the practices they want to add to the tradition conform to the wisdom of ancient scholars " (23).

Field methods have made their way into rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies much along the same pathways. Hess's pairing of *phronēsis* and ethnographic fieldwork follows a tradition of field-based inquiry for rhetoric and communications studies[102] influenced by anthropology (Marcus 1980; Tyler 1987; Geertz 1983 and 1988; Conquergood, "Rethinking Ethnography"); it constitutes a moment of cross-pollination that coincides with composition's social turn, and the rise of literacy studies as a field-based mode of inquiry in the 1980s and 1990s. George Marcus used Northrop Frye's rhetorical theory of genre to consider how ethnography's mode of "reportage and exposition" builds *ēthos* and assures "the credibility of ethnographic claims" ("Rhetoric and the Ethnographic Genre" 507-8), while Stephen A. Tyler called for a "postmodern" ethnography that was attentive to its status as a genre of mediation, to rhetorical purpose, and to audience (Tyler 64). Anthropologist Clifford Geertz rendered more explicit Marcus's rhetorical reading of ethnography, emphasizing the audience-focused and performative aspect of fieldwork, as well as anthropology's dependence on "the imaginative construction of a common ground between the Written At and the Written About" as constitutive of anthropology's claims to knowledge and disciplinary authority (Geertz 133-134). These developments were part of what has been called, the "narrative turn" in the social sciences toward greater reflexivity. Dwight Conquergood, drawing on Tyler and Geertz, viewed anthropological field practices rhetorically, naming ethnography's ability to think about bodies in time and space

---

[102] Communications studies, the oral and performative limb of rhetorical studies that began branching off in 1914 and solidified around World War II,[102] has long since adopted fieldwork as part of inquiry. For a more complete survey of the division between communication studies and rhetoric, see Foss, Foss, and Trapp's *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric: 30th Anniversary Edition* (2014).

("Rethinking Ethnography" 187) and articulate borderlands (185-6) as well-suited for

rhetorical inquiry. Conquergood framed such affordances as ideal for conducting critical-

rhetorical work (179), and even saw an affinity between the Sophists and ethnography's

adaptiveness as performance ("Ethnography, Rhetoric, and Performance" 80). Middleton *et*

al. (2011) have recently built on Conquergood's field orientation and critical-rhetorical

orientation, coining the term, "rhetorical field methods" to capture "the rhetorical spaces

and action in which we engage when we describe and interpret insights gained through in

situ rhetorical study" (Middleton *et al.* 387). S. Scott Graham's forthcoming *Politics of Pain*

Medicine (2015), on the other hand, develops a practice of rhetorical-ontological

"praxiography" that makes use of a variety of ethnographic methods to emphasize "the

study of practices as opposed to the study of cultures" (Graham 86) and shore up the

limitations of new-materialist rhetoric. Hess and Middleton, *et al.,* both acknowledge

influence by Hauser's conception of vernacular rhetoric, while Graham has collaborated

with Hauser in the recent "Rhetorical Field Methods" seminar at the RSA Summer Institute

to articulate a shared set of best rhetorical field practices.[103] Unlike the relatively robust

---

[103] Though many of these scholars do conduct field work that would fit into the parameters of ethnography,

the term, "rhetorical field methods" allows for field-based inquiries that do not cohere to the "six months or

longer" embeddedness that traditional ethnographers in anthropology recognize as legitimate. Given what we

know about the fleetingness of public space, traditional ethnography is not necessarily the appropriate

instrument for all vernacular-rhetorical activity, or for all community literacy practice. A useful analogue to

this discussion for rhetoric is the appropriation of ethnographic method by Education in the 1980s;

educational anthropologist Harry F. Wolcott provides a useful summary of the limitations of ethnography for

education, and the extent to which qualitative field methods very effectively incorporate interviews, moments

tradition of fieldwork in communications studies, rhetoric has only recently begun to articulate its field orientation in explicit terms, even as the field at large has valued rhetorics in vernacular spaces, most often in the form of archival work.

Literacy studies, on the other hand, has long acknowledged the utility of field methods for mapping the practices and experiences or events that construct various speech communities, channeling the sociolinguistic methods of Dell Hymes and post-structural accounts of discourse (Foucault, Bourdieu) to examine phenomena *Within* and outside traditional educational settings (Luke *Norton anthology*, Street 2011). Chapter Two provides a brief history of the New Literacy Studies movement, and the extent to which that movement drew significantly on the field-based methods of anthropology to conduct its work. Occurring somewhat in tandem with the advances of literacy studies, compositionists such as Paula Mathieu continue that work by employing field-based methods in community engagement settings and other "place-based" writing, recognizing the streets as critical spaces for understanding the social consequences of rhetorical practice (4, 11, 92); this movement brings literacy studies and composition back to the ephemeral storehouses of Cintron's democratic public activity (Cintron 100-102), and Hauser's conception of vernacular rhetoric as the space of (public) emergence (Hauser 14).

Yet, as Taylor and Lindlof's self-instrument reminds us, the field researcher is always already embedded in the discourses she studies, particularly where she relies on the resources and permissions of the institution in order to conduct that research. Chapter One's look at the rhetorical and representational challenges faced by prison literacy

---

of thick description, and different degrees of rapport-building without the immersive experience of what ethnography does in anthropology ("On Ethnographic Intent").

scholarship serves as a reminder that complicity with dominant-discursive and institutional forces are in many ways the condition of possibility for access. As Ming Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner argue in their look at the affinity between ethnography and composition, "critical ethnography and pedagogy ... reject the possibility of a politically neutral stance or practice before, during, and after contact between researchers and informants, or teachers and students" (Lu and Horner 257). Lu and Horner's piece not only harkens back to Conquergood's call for applying ethnography to perform critical cultural work for rhetorical studies, but also contributes to a broader conversation in composition studies during the social turn, in which Linda Brodkey framed "writing on the bias" as a productive recognition of one's ideological and experiential situatedness as constitutive of narrative (Brodkey "Bias"). Whereas Brodkey had emphasized the inescapably repressive capacities of bias ("Literacy Letters") and her challenge to critical education ethnographers who fail to acknowledge the tension between scholarly disinterest and their impulses toward counter-hegemonic change ("Writing Critical Ethnographic Narratives"), she now lauded the way in which "following the bias" allowed writers to "[recognize] the third dimension of seemingly two-dimensional material" (Brodkey "Bias" 547) -- an orientation that has continued to inform both research methodology and classroom pedagogy.[104] What these observations suggest, then, is that the situatedness and reflexivity of field-based inquiry, particularly in the critical-rhetorical tradition across rhetoric, literacy,

---

[104] Brodkey's contribution, however, was by no means singular in developing a practice of critical reflexivity; Shirley Brice-Heath significantly shaped this orientation with her ethnography of children's narratives in the South, "The Book as Narrative Prop in Language Acquisition" (1986), and her reflections on the challenges of bias in that project ("The Madness(es) of Reading and Writing Ethnography").

communication, and composition fields, constitutes a methodology that both recognizes the value of systematicity in describing the experiences of a given literacy community or vernacular rhetorical space, and challenges the writing researcher to interrogate the power relations operant in how the researcher herself enacts that descriptive process -- particularly as a field researcher conducts that work as a participant-observer. My study of *The Beat* draws on a set of affective experiences colored not only by a disciplinary investment in the rhetorical capacities of writing pedagogy, but also by my historical avowal of prison reform and prisoner advocacy, informed by progressive values; it stands to reason that the observations drawn from my participation are influenced by my own set of institutional-discursive investments. Here, my sense of care as an advocate for social change becomes part of the phronetic instrument.

I. GETTING DOWN with *THE BEAT*

I first encountered *The Beat* in my time with prisoner advocacy organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area; though many publications I worked on featured diverse genres of prisoner writings - from summaries of 602 complaints against prison administration to poetry, manifestoes, and letters to the editor, *The Beat* was unique in its dialogic editorial approach, taking the time to respond to each and every one of the submissions it published. In this publication, there was a particular kind of care - a degree of engagement that differed significantly from the publications which served as a kind of way-station for prisoner writings; *The Beat* laid bare the investments of its literacy sponsorship with every editorial response. The local nature of the workshops and publication's national reach made it an intriguing expression of multiple publics, and its significant California concentration meant it would be geographically accessible to me as a graduate student

living and working between Los Angeles and the Bay Area. What was most appealing, however, was the prospect of finally being able to take my knowledge of public rhetoric, community engagement, critical prison studies, and qualitative method back to where I started, working with the organization in such a way as to cultivate research that would ultimately support their ongoing work -- a wholly pragmatic (and maybe even existential) response to the jarring dissonances of Wilderson and Rodríguez's bleak ontological framework. Whether or not *The Beat* measured up to the critical exigencies of radical theory, it nevertheless constituted a popular vehicle for address and exchange among hundreds of otherwise isolated writers in prison and detention nation-wide, and as such, performed vital literacy-based and rhetorical work. My work with *The Beat* would attempt to channel my progressive impulses in ways consistent with best practices in the field of community-based research.

In July of 2012, I contacted *The Beat's* founder and program director, David Inocencio and Lisa Lavaysse, to see if I might secure permission to interview program participants and write about *The Beat* for scholarly audiences, with the intent that *The Beat* be able to use whatever data I collect for purposes of program evaluation. It was important to me that I convey my appreciation for *The Beat's* efforts to help detained youth cultivate a sense of social and political community through writing, and my hope to conduct research that might enhance understanding of the relationship between that important psychosocial work and the more critically-oriented writing pedagogy and research that happens at the university. David emailed to say he was "honored and flattered" by the request, and we set up a call to chat about the possibilities later that week.

David has the kind of baritone over the phone that tells you everything is going to be okay while hinting that he's up for trying just about anything -- no doubt part of why youth and volunteers have responded so positively to his workshop presence for the last nineteen years. And I'm not immune; by conversation's end, I had agreed to fly up to San Francisco for a few days to meet the staff, attend a volunteer orientation, help edit publication submissions, and carpool to Fairfield an hour outside of town to help run workshops at the Solano detention facility with a handful of other volunteers. Of course, I was pretty easy to convince, since taking the trip meant returning to the voluble community advocacy settings I had loved and left behind in the Bay Area to sit quietly behind my stanchion of books and *JSTOR* PDFs. This time, however, I carried my Bourdieu and Berlin, Fraser and Foucault in my back pocket, wondering what I might see this time around, wondering how things (and how I) might be different. In preparation for the trip, David sent me a host of organization materials, including the volunteer application and manual, editorial style guide, a fact sheet, and a logic model they'd developed the year before to court funders. He also sent along a number of documents that previous volunteers had written for *The Beat* with external audiences in mind, including a qualitative study from a Stanford grad student in Education (Velez-Young), and a set of youth profiles from an Alameda volunteer. There was no hesitation, no qualifier about these documents' proprietary or provisional nature -- David sent me everything he could think of, saying again and again, "Whatever helps get the word out. Anything we can do to get these kids writing -- let's do it." Whatever happened, whatever I found, I wanted it to be worthy of that trust, in spite of the academic culture of radical disbelief that now informed my readings of literacy sponsorship in correction- and detention-based settings.

Thomas Newkirk writes of the seduction and betrayal that happens when literacy researchers acquire consent and then conduct "bad news" critique, citing Brodkey's blunt-force assessment of dominant ideology in the "Literacy Letters" as a project that set students up for failure ("Seduction" 9) by privileging her own reading, wrapped in the raiments of the educational institution, while refusing her writing subjects "any interpretive scope" of their own (11). Though I conveyed to David and Lisa that I'd use the same data set to craft two documents -- one adhering to a report genre more readily useful to *The Beat* for purposes of program evaluation and grant writing, and one that theorized that material for academic audiences, I wanted to heed Newkirk's call to cultivate "rights of co-interpretation" and "responsibility of intervention" (13-14). Newkirk argues for granting those studied access to the researcher's data and interpretations, such that subjects' "counterinterpretations" of that material might ultimately shape the final document (13), thereby enhancing the polyvocality of research findings, and ultimately the agency of participants. "Responsibility of intervention" suggests that the researcher has an ethical obligation to identify problems in a way that enables the subjects to address those problems (14), rather than serve prepackaged indictments. Crafting a program evaluation report in a genre more accessible to participants and development staff would enable Beat community members to address problems in ways meaningful to them; soliciting feedback on that report's accuracy and utility would give me the ability to frame my own writing in terms responsive to community interpretation.

Though *The Beat* currently runs out of David's house, at the time (and for many years previous), the organization camped out in one corner of the Pacific News Service[105] office, a large open space in The Mission clustered with the desks and servers of at least twenty other alternative news and publishing groups based in communities of color. *The Beat*'s volunteers typed and responded to Bay Area submissions on four aging Macs, to be archived in boxes in David's garage until room runs out or they figure out a better solution. I was fortunate to be able to visit during one of *The Beat*'s periodic volunteer orientations; attendees ran the gamut, from college kids looking for resume builders and bachelor professionals seeking meaning to adults who had been touched by violence in the streets as kids; David sees this last group as having "a community-based mission for the next generation." He welcomes this diversity of backgrounds and aims in their volunteers; whatever the volunteers got out of the experience, providing the youth with an outlet for their words was the only thing that mattered. In this, *The Beat* is very "fruits, not roots"[106] in their organizational philosophy -- a pragmatic orientation that has kept *The Beat* afloat financially by inspiring volunteers to donate money after they are no longer able to volunteer their time, regardless of how those volunteer narratives are framed.

EDITING

After orientation, Lisa and her interns from CSUSF had me get acquainted with the editorial process, taking a few example submissions to work through the editorial requirements, emphasizing the need for constant vigilance over hidden messages and gang

---

[105] Pacific New Service is now New America Media, a "national collaboration and advocate of 2000 ethnic news organizations" ("Pacific News Service/New America Media").

[106] William James ("What Pragmatism Means" 27-30).

signs that writers embedded, often ingeniously, in their writings and illustrations. We also

spent a great deal of time talking about the challenge of preserving the writers' integrity of

style, since colloquial grammatical choices often reflected writers' cultural identifications

Within street and hip-hop culture. Lisa feels that providing some grammatical instruction is

part of the pedagogical role that *The Beat* plays in the lives of youth otherwise outside the

traditional educational setting, arguing that "improving language" provides clarity enabling

writers better communication with their audience. The texts we were working with that

day came from a workshop in San Francisco where Lisa and the interns were regular

facilitators; as such, they were already quite familiar with the writers submitting under

various aliases. When I sat down and tried to put *The Beat*'s editorial guidelines to work, it

was extremely difficult; not only was I peripheral to the discourse communities these

writers come from, but I'd yet to work with them face to face. Though I had worked with

detained youth through other writing programs in Los Angeles, I nevertheless struggled to

adopt the collective voice of *The Beat*, caught between my more formal pedagogical

orientations, marked by the syntax and diction of my white, middle-class education, and the

exigencies of an editorial *ēthos* that be sufficiently authentic and accessible so as to be

persuasive -- no small rhetorical task. As youth participants would tell me later on,

worthwhile responses are ones that show that *The Beat* cares, but it's up in the air as to

whether those responses register as advice worth thinking about. More than one said they

dismissed responses for being empty platitudes, or comic failures for attempting to use

slang from the streets. Many said they didn't read Beat responses at all. I found myself

recreating the very ideological tensions I'd seen at work in the archive between Lil Purp

and editors of his work, both feeling helpless to intervene, and willing to participate in this ritual exchange to understand it better.

CLEARANCE

The level of trust that David and Lisa had established with each of the Bay Area facilities over the last eighteen years meant that they could request temporary access for a visiting volunteer without doing a full background check; the superintendant at the Solano facility granted access without hesitation, and I rode hump-seat between boxes of the latest Beat all the way to Fairfield. Serving "pods" of detained youth from truant twelve year-olds to max-unit teens charged with rape and murder awaiting adjudication, every workshop opened with a statement about the mission of the program, the necessity of mutual respect, and the potential for writings generated during workshop to be published across the country the following week. Some of these groups were as intimate as ten, while the max units hosted at least twice that number; and though under California law these workshops cannot be compulsory, the vast majority of each pod came out to write, if only to wait out the writing itself so that they could get their hands on a fresh copy of the publication.

Each workshop had a seasoned lead volunteer who would introduce the week's two topics and invite discussion before sitting everyone down to free-write for the remaining workshop time; about half the regular volunteers lived in the Fairfield area, and the other half traveled from San Francisco and Oakland. As a new volunteer, I was invited to sit and chat with writers, and encourage them to reflect on whether the topic was interesting to them, and how they might begin; I would then circulate among other writers to check in if they seemed stumped or uninterested. Though this activity looked a lot like what I might do during a free-write or group work exercise in a composition classroom, I felt awkward

as a stranger conducting what amounted to surveillance in a space where youth were

already under the steady gaze of armed, uniformed counselors twenty-four hours a day. I

had passed through a metal detector and security checkpoints accompanied by a guard,

just as I would for any adult facility, though the antiseptic smell, lab-coated nurses, and

quiet, cordiality of staff had the feel of a hospital. That institutional space shifted once again

as we entered the common areas used for programs, papered with colorful posters[107] to

look like classrooms; the guard with a high-and-tight behind a desk in the corner, however

-- even with his friendly disposition -- reminded me that the facility nevertheless

functioned as a carceral space, particularly for the max-unit detainees wearing identical

blue jumpsuits.

ENTERING the WORKSHOP

Some greeted returning and long-term volunteers with smiles, others with only

nods of recognition. As an unknown, I elicited looks of curiosity, and a few goofy greetings

looking for a laugh; others kept to themselves, or barricaded themselves in with polite,

closed response. When a volunteer posed the prompt question, the youth turned them

around and asked us how we would answer. I answer truthfully, revealing some of my

background as a teacher. One responded, "Yeah, you seem like an English teacher."

---

[107] The posters on the wall, featuring "Citizenship" and "Character," come from the Josephson Institute, a

nonpartisan, nonsectarian nonprofit that seeks to "increase ethical commitment, competence, and practice in

all segments of society" ("About Josephson Institute"). The institute outlines six pillars of ethical behavior for

youth, sports, business, public service, and policing: trustworthiness, fairness, responsibility, caring,,

citizenship, and respect "charactercounts.org/sixpillars.html). The institute generates funding from a

combination of private donations, public grants, and sale of educational materials like the posters at the

Solano facility ("About").

Once free-write time was up, the lead volunteers would ask participants if anyone had written something they wanted to share with the rest of the group; more often than not, volunteers would identify writers based on pieces they found particularly well-written or moving. At the very end, volunteers collected everyone's papers and golf pencils, and distributed copies of the latest edition of *The Beat*; giving them out beforehand meant that participants would forget about writing altogether, and scan the publication for the work of friends or themselves instead. Some writers asked if they could hold on to their p aper and continue to write over the course of the week; some turned in nothing at all. Everyone, however, eagerly grabbed a copy of *The Beat* on the way back to their cells. After our hour was up, volunteers from various pods assembled in the parking lot, exchanging greetings, sharing noteworthy workshop developments, and divvying up paper texts to be typed, edited, and selected for publication the following week. Some left to eat together afterward and continue their conversations, but most did not; this was a community forged in the activity of *The Beat* alone.

FUNDING and the CHALLENGE to QUANTIFY THE BEAT

As we drove back to the city through pastureland and wind turbines, David and Lisa spoke frankly about their biggest challenge: funding. Manen Pau, the resident graphic designer and computer guy, had mentioned earlier that the publication used to be weekly, but lack of money pushed it to every other week; they now faced the threat of either cutting workshops, or making it only once a month. Given that most workshops generate material every week, cuts to publication frequency creates a significant backlog of material that undermines faith the writers have in *The Beat* to make their voices heard. While most funding comes from private foundations and a few public grants, they rely increasingly on

sustained donations from former volunteers to fill in the cracks, many from former

volunteers who participated in *The Beat* during college.[108] With funds they've been able to

raise from these sources, they've been able to hire a part-time development coordinator,

enabling access to grants they wouldn't otherwise have; at the same time, Lisa observes

that most funders "want to see tangible numbers that arts programs work, but if you don't

have funds to begin with, you can't show how big an impact it has." They also deal with the

vagaries of philanthropic culture; once "sexy" direct service programs had fallen out of

vogue, and "mental health" was the new focus of much community funding, and *The Beat*

had to repackage their services accordingly. I proposed that a qualitative study on multiple

sites of Beat activity among youth, volunteers, and facility staff might give them the

tangible portrait they needed. While the Stanford positive outcomes study had provided a

useful set of testimonials from the Santa Clara program, my study would capture a broader

swathe of participants with a more critical range of questions, thereby generating material

the organization could present to a variety of funding audiences.

I returned with Lisa and David to San Francisco, where we discussed the basic

parameters for an MOU (memorandum of understanding); I would create a Google Doc

with interview questions for each group of interviewees, and Lisa and David would add

questions or amendments for things they wanted to know. I then took BART to the airport,

and headed home.

---

[108] Some of these are students in Professor Jennifer Tilton's REACH program in the department of

Anthropology at the University of Redlands, where they volunteer and write ethnographies based on their

experiences. Professor Tilton, however, never responded to inquiries about her program, or possible

collaboration.

II. METHODS

INTERVIEW ACCESS and IRB APPROVAL

Before any of this could take place, however, I needed IRB approval for any work I

would use for academic purposes, a process complicated both by my request to record

interviews with incarcerated populations and minors. While securing the consent,

confidentiality, and anonymity of volunteers and staff was straightforward, acquiring

consent to interview detained youth and adults was another matter entirely. David and Lisa

patiently agreed to wait for that process to run its course, in the meantime providing

contact information for some of the detention facilities with whom they had the longest

rapport: San Francisco, Solano, and Santa Clara. Other California programs failed to

respond to inquiries, and the Los Angeles program, a partnership between *The Beat*, LA

County Probation, and LA County schools, refused access of any kind.[109] In addition to

university approval, however, I needed permission from the California Superior Court

judges overseeing each of the individual facilities, and permission of the facilities

themselves. I submitted Letters of Intent and Petitions for Research to the courts, while

David sent personal requests to the superintendants of each program, vouching for my

affiliation with *The Beat* and the potential benefits for both the program and the institution.

Letters of approval from each judge were included in the IRB application, along with

---

[109] Recent controversies around detention counselor negligence and probation officer arrests due to

falsification of records, attempted murder, and off-duty identity theft (Villacorte 2012, Palta 2013) have led

LA County administration to restrict outside access as part of an effort to get the department back under

control.

protocols approved by facility psychological staff to prevent any trauma detained interviewees might experience during or after the interview process.

The stickiest part of the IRB review process, however, was the matter of detained minor assent.[110] While adults were able to offer their informed consent to the interview process freely, the IRB requested that I acquire both verbal informed assent from detained minors, and verbal informed consent from the legal parent or guardian. After amending the protocol to incorporate this stipulation, the application was approved and I could proceed to the interviews themselves. That process took six months. Each of the facility superintendents conveyed via email and phone that I would be provided access to phone numbers for each of the minor's parents or guardians during my visit to the institution; we started making plans for week-long visits at each of the three facilities to accommodate interviews with youth, detention staff, and Beat volunteers. However, when I arrived at each of the facilities, none of the staff or administration were able to provide that contact information. Some insisted that the county judge granted local superintendents blanket *in loco parentis*[111] for all youth at the facility; others said that they simply weren't authorized to release that information. Correspondence with each of the superintendents and Superior Court judges revealed dissonant understandings of their own authority to grant *in loco parentis* with respect to federal requirements of institutional research; none had

---

[110] The FDA-directed IRB defines the difference between informed consent and assent as the difference between adults who are legally authorized to make decisions about their participation in research based on their understanding of the circumstances and consequences of participation, and legal minors who may understand those circumstances and consequences, but require the informed consent of a parent or guardian to participate (U.S. FDA).

[111] *In loco parentis* is a legal term denoting permission "in place of the parent" (Garner and Black).

considered that their authority over the detained youth in their respective jurisdictions would require additional federal oversight. Moments like these reminded me of just how localized the discourse communities around *The Beat* really were, pushing back hard on conceptions of shared publics either legally or socially conceived on every level. As David says, "Each institution has a different dance." Each satellite program, however unified by a coordinated protocol and set of topics week to week, had its own unique rapport between judges, superintendents, counselors, youth, and volunteers, framed by distinct standpoints on their roles in that relationship. Faced with a limited window of access granted by each of the Superior Court judges, then, I resolved to interpret two sets of data: one including minors and adults for *The Beat*'s own internal program evaluation, and one including only adults for my own academic research.

INTERVIEWS

However incompetent I had felt as a facilitator and editor for the short time I spent with *The Beat*, that cursory knowledge nevertheless facilitated an easier rapport with all three groups of participants: youth, volunteers, and detention staff. As the shifting vowels and pacing of my audio recordings would later remind me, each interview became an exercise in code-switching within different subsets of the community, adapting to the vocabularies and postures of each set of participants as I asked similar sets of questions. Doing so achieved a level of identification that inspired greater trust than a boiler-plate performance; tempering the researcher *ēthos* made it possible for both interviewees and myself to inhabit a different rhetorical relation than what might otherwise be implied by an encounter between interviewer/outsider and informant. Because I framed participation as an opportunity for participants at all levels to not only share observations, but voice their

opinions about how *The Beat* might better suit their needs, respondents felt empowered to offer frank pronouncements of what works -- and what doesn't.[112] This approach to interviewing follows the spirit of "conversational" interview used in qualitative research (Fontana and Frey 369, Kvale) and adopted by rhetorical ethnographers such as Hess and Rai; it also follows a mode of flexibility adopted by institutional ethnographers De Vault and McCoy for "accommodating some degree of standardization, but otherwise ... adapting interview sequence to preserve the narrative sequence of the activities participants describe" (De Vault and McCoy 23). These accommodations proved useful, as I found myself skipping around my set of questions regularly to retain the narrative thread of participant experiences with *The Beat*.

Setting

This study focuses on three groups of Beat *Within* participants at three distinct program satellites in California detention facilities: youth, volunteers, and detention staff in

---

[112] Here, the notion of "work" registers in triplicate: first as a methodological orientation that frames questions around "work" to register institutional activity, as Institutional Ethnography does; second, as "work" in the pragmatic sense, as the study crafts an heuristic for making the practices of this literacy community more meaningful and effective to participants; and third, as the written *askēsis,* or training of oneself by oneself (Foucault, *Ethics* 209)[112] that *The Beat* cultivates among sponsors and recipients alike. This third modality, important to *The Beat*'s distinctive variant of sponsorship, resembles the self-regulatory practice Foucault identifies as part of *epimeleia heautou,* or care of the self (50-51). This practice is one Foucault frequently emphasizes as a kind of labor, whether a labor of the soul ("Self-Writing" 214), a labor of thought and a labor through writing (209), or a labor more broadly as something that, "takes time" (*CoTS* 50). This chapter will not, however, be examining "labor" as interpreted through the lens of Marxian political economy that already characterizes much of critical prison studies scholarship.

Santa Clara, San Francisco, and Solano. Interviews of detainees and facility counselors took

place *Within* the facilities themselves; I met with youth in interview rooms designated for

probation officers and mental health workers, and counselors wherever I could catch them

- at the surveillance booth, in private offices, or during the lunch hour in common areas. I

interviewed volunteers coming and going to workshops on site, sometimes in facility wait

rooms, often at a Starbucks or McDonald's nearby.

Data Collection

Because this study was designed to triangulate findings from the archival analysis

generated by Chapter Two, interview questions for all three groups were initially informed

by the categories that emerged from my analysis of *The Beat's* textual correspondence with

Purp; additional questions asking what participants would change were provided by Beat

program manager, Lisa Lavaysse. Those categories included personal truth/authenticity,

connections between writing and emotion, and the idea of participation in a public

imaginary. The questions around truth/authenticity included perceptions of volunteer and

counselor *ēthos;* questions designed to capture attitudes about writing and emotion

included questions about occasions when participants most need to write, and whether

that process helps them become functioning members of society. The questions around

publics were designed to capture participants' sense of audience, whether as perceptions of

the publication's reach, or as expression of desired audiences *Within*, across, or outside the

institution; they also include a question asking participants to reflect on what it "does" to

someone when they get published (a question also applicable to the category of writing and

emotion).

Following a four-day visit to *The Beat* headquarters and surrounding workshops as a participant-observer, I collected data from each of the three sites over a two-month period, each visit taking one week. During that time, I conducted semi-structured face-to-face interviews; interviews with adults were one-on-one, while youth interviews were either in small groups of two to four or one-on-one, depending on the security requirements of the unit in each institution. Max-unit, adult-charged participants in Santa Clara, for example, were required to interview one-on-one, while max unit participants at Solano and San Francisco were allowed to interview in small groups. Interviewees were de-identified and assigned a numeric code and voice-recorded in keeping with IRB requirements; those recordings were then transcribed to electronic documents and kept in a locked storage unit to protect the confidentiality and privacy of detained participants.

Participants

While the data generated by this study emerged from a program evaluation encompassing 60 adult detainees, 13 volunteers, and 10 staff, logistical restrictions based on IRB requirements reduced the number of detained participants to 19: 6 from Solano, 8 from Santa Clara, and 5 from San Francisco. Of the nineteen detainees who participated in interviews, all were male. While there is a small number of female detainees at each facility, none was old enough to provide legal consent. None were white; eleven were Black, seven were Latino, and one was Samoan. All participants approved by the IRB were over eighteen. Participation was voluntary; participating youth had to have experienced at least one cycle of workshop and publication, while volunteers needed to have participated in or observed the program for at least three months. Many of the youth had experienced Beat workshops during previous periods of detention. Volunteers came from all over the San

Francisco Bay Area, and had run Beat workshops in juvenile hall anywhere from three months to seven years. Counselors had observed Beat workshops anywhere from seven years to eighteen years, having witnessed effects of the program since its inception. While a significant number of youth eagerly agreed to participate in interviews, only a few volunteers and counselors agreed to speak, creating a significant selection bias.[113] Nevertheless, the three groups provide a useful snapshot of attitudes and perspectives about what *The Beat* does in this space.

Data Analysis

Data was collected from the interview responses of the 19 adult detainees, 13 volunteers, and 10 detention staff (counselors), and narrowed to responses to thirteen of nineteen questions. As argued in Chapter Two, the kind of coding made available through qualitative analysis enables inductive discovery of patterns across geographic specificity, individual circumstance, and local institutional culture to demonstrate how unique responses inhabit shared discursive terrain. Deidentified participant responses were first grouped according to role across institutions (detainees, volunteers, counselors). Those responses were then segmented by simple phrases or sentences, what discourse analyst James Gee calls, "idea units" (Gee 134) *within* individual responses, registering as unique only when new ideas are introduced. My first round of analysis, in keeping with grounded

---

[113] For volunteers, it was largely a matter of coordinating schedules. For the counselors, it was a matter of coordinating with those facility staff who believed *Beat* programming was a vital auxiliary to their own rehabilitative efforts; most of these were long-term employees (at least seven years) who identified strongly with the counseling aspect of their work, in contrast to those who tended to be, according to my observations and those of volunteers at least, more withdrawn and paycheck-oriented.

theory, coded inductively for recurrent themes across responses for each set of

respondents. My second round of coding served to triangulate findings from Chapter Two

by used three dimensions revealed in the archival analysis: truth/authenticity, emotion,

and sense of audience or public imaginary. In keeping with the institutional-ethnographic

approach, a third round coded for the *topos* of discipline in the context of the correctional

institution.

FINDINGS: DETAINEES

Writing It Out to Invite Them In

Over three-quarters (15) of the 19 respondents stated that writing for *The Beat*

helped them manage negative emotions such as anger, frustration, and sadness in a way

that suggested a removal from the body, using phrases such as "get out," "let out," "sort

out," "release," and "express." However, that removal was explicitly a displacement of

negative emotion to paper in lieu of action; five (26%) believed that writing about their

emotions keeps them from committing acts of violence against others. This position

resonates with what one-third of counselors and volunteers see as one of the biggest

problems that these writers face: self-discipline and impulse control. Fourteen (74%) of

youth believed this process was a positive one that changed how they did time at the

facility, with four recognizing but not disavowing its concordance with the agenda of the

correctional institution. Just three respondents rejected the rehabilitative-institutional

mechanism of *The Beat* outright, one arguing that that it was a "cop-out" and a "cover-up"

for a racist institution, with another stating that *The Beat* was nothing more than a way for

him to "close [his] eyes and pretend" in the face of a system that is racist and corrupt -- a

place where he could express his rage, but not face legal consequences. This writer, calling

himself "Pancho" after Pancho Villa, has been in for five years, and doesn't like to reflect on the future, because he can't change where he's going (most likely an adult facility). Yet, for Pancho and others, the transmission of negative emotion to paper becomes an opportunity interrupt the trajectory from negative emotion to violence by moving through negative emotion reflectively towards other kinds of action; as one three-year veteran of the Santa Clara program exclaims, "When I write it down, it makes me feel different, you know? Like I'm somebody else; I'm not that angry person, you know what I mean?" Even the respondents who rejected *The Beat* as a valuable medium for socialization use it to divide anger from any physical, legally actionable performance, if only to withdraw into writing's protective arms.

On the surface, the violence of this subjectivation might appear to be nothing more than an extension of the disciplinary discourse of the correctional institution, imposed from above. Yet, while it interrupts the movement from negative emotion to action, respondents don't feel debilitated by that interruption; rather, many of them see that written externalization of emotion as a means of cultivating an understanding and connection with others, even when their only imagined audience is themselves, as was the case for nearly half (10) of respondents. Even for those who typically write just for themselves (12), there remains a sense that the practice of writing one's emotions enables a kind of ethical relation with other people; in addition to seeing their writing as a mechanism for preventing violence against others, they understand that writing as constructive of particular audiences. Most telling about the nature of the audiences they claim as their own is their sense of who *reads* what they write. Just as writers often look first at submissions from their own facilities and counties where peers and family members are being held (9),

183

so do they imagine those peers reading their work (8). One detainee, "Matt," thinks it's cool to read other people's work, but likes to feel noticed, and likes to write dedications to both family and other detainees because he thinks it can influence people. In other words, while youth frame the mechanism of writing out their emotions as a private one, they understand the effects of that practice as fundamentally public, and even towards a public good: ten said they hoped that their own writing might help others, whether that be their peers in detention across the country (5), or external audiences that might get a better understanding of the human beings behind the criminal stereotype and what it feels like to be locked up (9). This says nothing of the value writers place on editorial responses directly to their own work; eleven (57%) either read regularly and appreciate editors' responses, or express a desire for them to engage with their writing more fully.

There is a way in which this movement from negative emotion to public good recreates the ethical accounting for oneself Judith Butler describes in her discussion of the "ethically demanded confession," even as *The Beat* does not fit the genre confession so much as a confessional modality. In a brief genealogy of thought on self-other relations, she considers the desire to impose coherent narrative on the lives of self and others, and the extent to which a self-induced confessional practice in the presence of others might create a repeated violence or "interruption" that induces nonviolence by virtue of a process that undertakes "living the persistent challenge to mastery that our obligations to others require" ("Giving an Account" 34-5). For Butler, human beings are already "interrupted by alterity and not fully recoverable to ourselves, indicat[ing] the way in which we are, from the start, ethically implicated in the lives of others" (35). For *Beat* writers like the ones above, interruption of negative emotions through writing not only prevents violent action,

but allows them to recover other parts of themselves through the reception of those emotions by other readers.

And yet, because writing is the explicit conduit for this interruption, the practices around *The Beat* start to look a lot more like the self-regulatory writing practices of the Stoics[114] recounted by Foucault in his later lectures on *epimeleia heauton,* or care of the self (*Care of the Self*, "Self-Writing")*.* Those practices are significantly defined by *askēsis*, or, "the training of oneself by oneself" ("Self-Writing" 209, "Genealogy of Ethics" 247) through the use of *hupomnēmata,* or private notebooks used to "gather the fragmentary *logos"* ("Genealogy" 247) of material one has experienced or read for individual reflection, and its corollary in written correspondence -- a practice requiring an interlocutor, though not necessarily an advisor. To emphasize the "training" aspect of this work[115] -- the extent to which writers of *The Beat* understand their writing as an ongoing preoccupation, sixteen (84%) speak of the need to release their emotions on paper week to week in the present tense; only three writers characterized their writing for *The Beat* as a one-off activity (1),

---

[114] The Stoics' forebears -- the Pythagoreans, Socratics, and Cynics -- all valued *askēsis* as an exercise that accomplished two tasks: a linear-focused exercise that moved from reflection to writing to real-life situations ("Self-Writing" 209), and a circular exercise meditating on previous writings, for purposes of generating new readings, and more reflection (209).

[115] Important to writing in a correctional context is the fact that the *hupomnēmata* was not a site of confession or testimony, merely to be archived for some later day; rather, it was intended to be written in often, and kept "[n]ear at hand," [so that] one should be able to use them, whenever the need was felt, in action ("Self-Writing 210)*.*

or a last resort in the face of boredom, stuck in their room with no other distraction[116] (2).

At the same time, because *The Beat Within* functions simultaneously as an assemblage of

private reflections, dialogues with sponsor-editors, and public declarations, it encompasses

both the self-directed regime and the audience-dependent "intensification of social

relations" that Foucault identifies as training critical to the care of the self (*CoTS* 53). The

aim of this regime was both internal meditation -- to "establish as adequate and as perfect a

relationship to oneself as possible" ("Genealogy of Ethics" 247), and external dialogue, such

that the writer would experience a kind of recognition in his or her audience, and through

that correspondence "the subjectivation of true discourse, its assimilation and its

transformation as a personal asset [as well as] an objectification of the soul" ("Self-Writing"

216-17). Here, *askēsis* becomes a means of subject formation in which the writer makes

discourse his or her own -- providing not just a means of recognition in the face of others,

but an appearance of the self to the self ("Self-Writing" 216, 221).

That *Beat* writers feel gratified by being read by an audience of peers, and recognize

the solitary writing of emotion as an opportunity to step outside the self, fulfills the aims of

askēsis as a tool of critical self-knowledge towards participation in social life, whether

constituted in the more private interpersonal spaces, the public spaces defined by *The

Beat's* national readership, or a broader civic imaginary. One relatively new participant, a

budding poet who sees *The Beat* as a place to refine his skills, felt that "being published

makes you feel *real*; like somebody's seen it. I never seen anything that I write in a

newspaper, it gives you hope. Well, what else can I do now?" Here, the material mark of

---

[116] The facilities strictly forbid possession of any writing implement in detainees' cells so as to protect them

from injury to self and others; all writing takes place in common areas, using golf pencils.

their emotions on pages shared cross-country not only solidifies a sense of audience and even community, but actualizes the writers as "real" people to themselves -- a mode of subjectivation that helps mitigate writers' sense of the civil and social death they experience as subjects of the correctional institution by creating a space for both personal and public encounter with a self that, while safe from criminal judgment,[117] nevertheless allows writers to examine past actions, future plans, and social relationships. That same writer imagines "making something out of [him]self, maybe go to college" if he gets out; even though he reminisces about his past on the streets, his vision of the future isn't tied to those relationships, but rather to what you can do with writing in the context of a broader audience - even as a kid: "It's all like for voting and stuff like that, but like, us saying something? They'll probably do something. The gun control happened because of kids." Six of the nineteen youth (32%) mentioned the law specifically when explaining how writing for *The Beat* helps someone become a part of society; four talked about following "rules," and all other accounts (47%) focused on self-understanding, injury to others, and enhanced communication with others. In other words, the *topos* of institutional discipline recedes, supplanted by a regime in which social relations operate not just for, or against, but also in spite of the institution that surrounds them and regulates most of their waking hours. *Askesis* for *The Beat,* then, constitutes a set of ruling relations that intersect with but do not necessarily mirror the disciplinary objectives of the institution.

Although the *hupomnēmata* functions to gather fragmentary *logoi, askēsis* is by no means restricted to logic. The fact that these writings significantly center around emotion

---

[117] Every issue of *The Beat* begins with a note from the editor that reminds writers not to speak about their crimes, as they might be used as evidence against them.

resonates with another important facet of Stoic practice: the management of emotions such as grief, anger, or envy, either as personal weakness, or in the event of difficult circumstances (*Care of the Self* 39-67). This *askēsis* prefigures the kind of mind-body dichotomy adopted by Christian ascetics to discipline and even remove the passions, as Foucault observes of the first- and second-century philosophers wary of any pleasures or passions that might corrupt the soul (CoTS 39). Despite the gesture to dichotomic accounts of the body and Christian abnegation, however, this regime operates not as a means of emotional exorcism, confession, or withdrawal from the world; even as *askēsis* through correspondence constitutes a kind of health management and accounting of bodily sensation ("Self-Writing" 216) that anticipates the ritual of Christian confession (*Scientia Sexualis*), *askēsis* through correspondence invigorates both the writer and the recipient for future action, not by suppressing or correcting negative emotion, but rather by working through it as a means of preparedness toward the future. Foucault illustrates this process of *praemeditatio* by recounting Letter 99 from Seneca to Lucilius, in which Seneca repeats consolations offered to Marullus for the death of his son ("Self-Writing" 214-15). What is noteworthy to Foucault is that the letter functions not just as a means of comfort, but also "as a principle of reactivation -- a reactivation of all the reasons that make it possible to overcome grief, to persuade oneself that death is not a misfortune.... And, with the help of what is reading for the one, writing for the other, Lucilius and Seneca will have increased their readiness for the case in which this type of event befalls them" (*"Self-Writing"* 215). *Beat* writers reflect this movement from consolation to preparedness in spades; one long-term max unit detainee in San Francisco said that, "practicing putting your heart on paper helps to cope with the depression of being here; helps deal with tragic events, but helps you

188

with goals."[118] Again, however, correspondence, not just solitary reflection, is the conduit

for this reactivation, and operates reciprocally - a mode that serves as a peer-pedagogical

encounter. As Seneca remarks elsewhere in the same letter, "The process is mutual; for

men learn while they teach" (Seneca, qtd. in "Self-Writing" 215). Just as the writers of *The*

Beat feel more "real" knowing that they're being read by peers and editors in a space that

values their voices and experience, so do they feel edified knowing that others in that space

might be helped by their own reflections.

Moving towards Socratic-Parrēsiatic Sponsorship

The "realness" constructed by this appearance to and exchange with an audience,

however, is in some ways overshadowed by respondents' colloquial usage of the "real" as a

particular disposition of truth. While one respondent sees this writing of the emotions as a

refuge from reality, more than half (10) value it as a space of truth or authenticity, where

they can either expect to be gratified by authentic expressions of their peers' emotions, or

counseled honestly by Beat volunteers untainted by corrupting power differentials or

institutional obligation. Five (26%) said they know that a submission is "good enough to be

published" based on whether or not the writer is being "real," a qualifier often linked to

how a text makes them feel. One writer observed, "Something good is something that's

written and can be felt -- that the person who wrote it actually valued -- actually *felt*....

Sometimes you read something and you can probably tell that they haven't experienced it."

Here, the writer makes a direct correlation between his own affective response and the

---

[118] This writer had been incarcerated for four years, but nevertheless envisioned writing as cultivating a

preparedness for public life once he gets out: "It can help me express my belief why something is wrong, so

people can hear my opinion; want to do something for the community."

authenticity of what they've read - emotion as an affirmation of virtue, even when that

emotion is negative. Another writer we'll call "Robert" -- a max unit detainee in San

Francisco held for four years and slated for prison, declared, "You got to be yourself; not

dumb gang-related stuff. Being real." Interestingly, Robert follows this dismissal of

posturing with a sophisticated understanding of the expectations of the publication as a

genre tied to the rehabilitative agenda of the institution: "[It] needs to be appropriate to the

audience of the magazine to appeal to their subscribers." Even as he envisions those

subscribers going beyond his peers to such institutional bodies as the California Youth

Authority and community zine distributors, he nevertheless adopts wholesale the idea that

writing for *The Beat* is a valuable tool of "self-evaluation to help you," whether by "[making

you] be aware of your surroundings," or "help[ing] you analyze the past from different

angles." This observation gestures to the backward-facing orientation of the *hupomnēmata,*

typically used as a tool for making sense of the already-said.[119]

Writers' valuation of truth extends to the sponsors themselves. As for the role of

Beat volunteers in this cultivation of truth, roughly half (9) value volunteers precisely

because they lay outside the power lines and disciplinary professionalism of teachers or

detention counselors, approaching a kind of equality through their "realness" and

willingness to suspend judgment, even as they challenge them. One Santa Clara participant,

who uses *The Beat* to express emotions he can't share with his family, observes, "They're

really into what we've been through. Way different from teachers; they're doing it out of

---

[119] Foucault notes that the *hupomnēmata* was not intended to be a site of recollection for recollection's sake

or an archive fashioned to enshrine the wisdom of the past, even as *askēsis* occurred in a culture in which

citation of ancient texts served as a regular source of authority ("Self-Writing" 211).

free time. They give us insight into what they're thinking." Among those nine, three place

primacy on the fact that that volunteers are not compensated monetarily for their time;[120]

five emphasize the fact that volunteers share their own opinions and experiences as part of

an ongoing dialogue, rather than subjecting youth to what they see as the lecture-driven

ēthos of school or the detention facility: "[Volunteers are] different from the counselors;

give you a little advice though. They not tryna teach; they tryna *talk* to you about

something." That sensitivity to truth extends to *Beat* editorial responses; while roughly half

(9) value editorial responses for being either positive, productively challenging, or both,

four dismiss them for being ignorant or inattentive; one describes them as "fortune

cookies," while another says, "they don't know what they're talking about." Two wish "they

could be more honest, but it's not just you, they need to think about other readers as well."

These appraisals of *The Beat's* editorial responses suggest writers understand the

complexities and limits of the sponsorship provided in the printed version -- a rhetorical

address directed simultaneously to individuals, the detained writers in aggregate, and

audiences external to the correctional institution.

Taken together, the emphasis on personal truth, cultivated in dialogue with a lay

practitioner to "give you tips about how to live in society," affirms what the archival

analysis of Purp's exchange indicated in Chapter Two: that *The Beat's* mode of literacy

sponsorship echoes the Socratic-*parrhêsia*tic practice of striving for accord between *bios*

---

[120] Here, writers articulate what it is about *Beat* volunteers that diverges significantly from Brandt's

characterization of sponsors as gaining economic advantage through degrees of exploitation ("Sponsors"

168). They recognize that teachers' and counselors' livelihoods depends on their detention, where

volunteers' livelihoods do not.

and *logos,* or life and word, as a condition of philosophical virtue and ethical relation towards others. Foucault details this accord as part of his account of an *epimeleia heautou* (care of the self) in the *Laches* dialogue, in which written record of everyday things *(hupomnēmata)* serves to pull together the fragmentary *logos* of everyday life, and orient the writer's actions (*Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* 209-210). In the *Laches,* Socrates emphasizes that this *parrhêsia* is neither about persuasion in the political arena, as political *parrhêsia* is, nor about giving an autobiographical account of one's sins, but about showing "whether you are able to show that there is a relation between the rational discourse, the *logos* you are able to use, and the way that you live" (*Fearless Speech* 97). This accord is reached not through address of the *demos* or the king, but through personal relationships with human beings (101). The written practices of *askēsis* constitute a mechanism by which that accord might emerge. Though some youth (38%) refute the idea that what *The Beat* does is anything like the literacy education they receive from their teachers, there is still a recurrent sense that writing for *The Beat* cultivates a kind of emotional, communicative, and language literacy that enables youth to participate more authentically in the publics they choose, whether or not they overlap with the unitary civic imaginary envisioned by volunteers and facility staff. Cultivation of the proto-citizen apart from but mindful of public engagement echoes the distinctly non-political *parrhêsia*tic practice Foucault identifies in Socrates' *Apology,* in which fearless political speech risks being dismissed or misjudged, thereby becoming a less useful means of cultivating relations with fellow Athenians (*Courage of Truth* 76-79).[121] However, because this truth-telling nevertheless

---

[121] Interestingly, Pancho's sense of *The Beat* as a safe emotional refuge from a racist and corrupt system reproduces Socrates' rationale in the *Apology* for turning away from political speech, thereby echoing Plato's

"enables good decisions to be taken and false opinions to be driven out" (*Courage of Truth* 86), Socrates argues that,

> "this *parrhêsia* which must be kept from the political risk is nonetheless useful to the city .... [I]t is precisely in the city's interest . . . to protect the true discourse, the courageous veridiction which encourages citizens to take care of themselves.... [P]hilosophy - as courageous veridiction, as non-political parrhesia . . . will be deployed throughout what could be called the great chain of cares and concerns" (*Courage of Truth* 90).

This disposition of truth towards a sense of shared public concern suggests that, while these writers' investment in the "real" might be taken as a purely philosophical turn away from publics in which writing might spur others to social or political action, youth substantially believe (15, or 79%) that publication of their emotional writings can "motivate people to do something" towards change in the world. Importantly, this motivation is not spiritual, but philosophical, orienting *Beat* practices away from the spiritually-tinged confessionals commonly associated with rehabilitative discourse.

Writing Emotion towards the PUBLIC

The Beat's turn towards social action brings us back to the practices of *askēsis* that make up the care of the self. While grief from the death of Marullus' child in Seneca's letter to Lucilius cannot be used as a stand-in for the suite of emotions expressed towards the unequal power relations or acts of violence shared in the pages of *The Beat Within*, *askēsis* nevertheless becomes a personal practice with political implications -- a practice that takes on what Foucault calls an ethopoietic function that moves a writer from reflection to

---

critiques on the failures of democracy.

gumnazein, or, "training and trial in a real situation" (*Ethics* 209). Locating this instance of

ethopoietics in Plutarch, Foucault argues that *askēsis* is "an agent of the transformation of

truth into *ēthos*" ("Self-Writing" 209). Truth here is the "fashioning of accepted discourses"

(209); however, beyond simple acceptance of dominant discourse, ethopoietics here

transforms dominant discourse into a "personal asset" (216) to be mobilized in future

action, suggesting how written *askēsis* becomes a *technê* that might also include rhetorical

capacity. Edward F. McGushin paraphrases this phenomenon as one in which the discourse

"comes *to be* the very subjectivity of the subject" (*Foucault's* Askēsis 53, emphasis original),

demonstrating the extent to which this ethopoietics might enable the writer to recast the

imaginings of written reflection as themselves a becoming towards a more fulfilling social

relation.

     This move from imagining to becoming starts to sound a bit like rhetorical

invention. Though in Foucault's example ethopoietics is part of a self-directed life-writing

practice realized in correspondence, *ēthopoein* as a shaping of *ēthos* (209) was previously

cultivated in classical Greece through the progymnasmatic exercise of the ethopoietic

speech, in which "students wrote and delivered speeches in the voice of a fictitious, literary,

or historical persona, capturing their very essence"(Arthur-Montagne 170).[122] Classicist

Jacqueline Arthur-Montagne notes that this rhetorical exercise had become by the Second

Sophistic not just a letter-writing exercise, but a high literary art (170). Even as the

---

[122] In his *New History of Classical Rhetoric,* George Kennedy notes that the Apthonius *Progymnasmata* defines

êthopoeia as personification "in the narrow sense of personification of a historical character" (*A New History*

206); the Hermogenes definition, however, overlaps with *prosopopoeia* as something "freely made up"

(Kennedy, *Progymnasmata* 165).

ethopoietic exercise recounted by Kennedy and Arthur-Montagne imagines the self as

other, recall that, for *Beat* writers, part of their satisfaction lies in writing through their

anger to not only step outside the self, but render those emotions accessible to readers of

The Beat. To the extent that a significant variant of *ēthopoeia* known as *pathopoeia* focused

on a character's emotion (Ziolkowski 130-131), the ethopoietic functions of *askēsis* and

ēthopoeia appear to share empathy as a condition for both effective rhetorical delivery and

care of the self.

Moreover, while the "real situation" of Foucault's ethopoietics might very well take

place in private interpersonal space, this *ethopoietic* training nevertheless gestures to

mutual benefit and future action in a way that anticipates attentiveness to audience, while

also cultivating a peer-pedagogical dynamic that exceeds the unequal power relations

inscribed in the "sponsorship" model. Combined with the *technê* of transforming dominant

discourse into a "personal asset" to be mobilized at will, I argue this *ethopoietic* training

serves as a precondition for public engagement, whether that space follow the contours of

civil society avowed by volunteer and institution, or the counter-public space writers

create for themselves in the pages of *The Beat.* In this way, it models the "poetic world-

making" that Michael Warner describes in *Publics and Counterpublics* (114).

Yet, while it has been argued that this Stoic practice remains a means of consolation

designed to soothe the passenger, but not rock the boat -- as Arendt does when she reduces

Stoic practice to one that "rests on the illusion of freedom when one is enslaved" (*Human

Condition* 235), Foucault's account of *askēsis* troubles the notion of this disciplinary

practice as merely a means of keeping detained writers in their place.[123] Important to this

practice's counter-hegemonic potential is the way in which *askēsis* toward care of the self is

designed not for use by the obedient slave, but rather for head of household, and even the

"ruler who looks after his subjects" (*CoTS* 50-51), to be supported by what Foucault sees as

"the whole bundle of customary relations of kinship, friendship, and obligation" (51) in

excess of the ideological apparati of the state. In this way, *askēsis* not only prepares its

writers for action in the social world, but for ethical governance of self and others -- in

other words, ethical use of power, in a political setting, by a moral agent. Because many of

the detainees interviewed were incarcerated for acts of violence against others - acts of

violence that, to read *The Beat,* code as exercises in power over others, there is a way in

which *askēsis* even in spaces of incapacitation facilitates a kind of pedagogy of power.

Foucault makes the ethical implications of this practice clear in his summary of Plutarch's

Praecepta gerendae reipublicae: "[a]nyone who exercises power has to place himself in a

field of complex relations where he occupies a transition point. His status may have placed

him here; it is not this status, however, that determines the rules to follow and the limits to

---

[123] The earlier *Discipline-and-Punish* Foucault, however, might take this practice towards "betterment" as

subsuming the meritocratic implements of self-discipline as subsuming the work of the modern institution,

where the voluntary regulation of the self falls in line with the very arts of distribution that have created mass

incarceration (*DP* 138-147). While some may argue that Foucault's "ethical turn" in later lectures loses the

critical edge of earlier work, there is a way in which the sociality of these techniques exceed the efficiency-

focused narrative Foucault recounts around prisons, hospitals, the military, and schools - a mode of ethical

obligation that has the capacity to create friction within institutional machinery, and not just ease its

operation. That mode is the political *parrhêsiatic* discourse Foucault recounts in the Berkeley lectures

(*Fearless Speech*).

observe" (*CoTS* 88). The process of publication for a wider *Beat* audience affirms writing's

role in cultivating this sense of ethical responsibility. Where *Beat* writers feel gratified by

the knowledge that other writers read their work nation-wide, they also feel transformed

by the possibility that their writings and the responses they generate might help others

find their way, as did Matt. That work, however, is at times explicitly political; as one writer

considered the potential power of writing for *The Beat,* he suggested that, "if the people

who are making the law read it, it may have someone change their mind."

Moreover, writers have a sophisticated sense of how publication becomes a conduit

for political action; Robert from San Francisco argues, "media is a powerful weapon if you

know how to use it; you can get more people to support your idea and create change."

When asked, "Do you think writing in a publication like *The Beat* can change the world?",

three explicitly connect that power with the ability to change the law, while five others

suggest that it cultivates consensus or agreement toward some broader social change. An

additional three argue for the value of "raising awareness." Even for those youth

pessimistic about their writing's ability to effect change in the world (2), there is a sense

that public writing has rhetorical power, whether or not corrupt, racist institutions are able

to shut that power down. Pancho argues for cultivating public "awarene[ss] of our

environment, and what's affecting their environment" among audiences beyond the

incarcerated readers of *The Beat,* even though "the world is corrupt; don't know if you

change it. MLK and them, they killed them because of it." The exigency to cultivate

awareness reproduces what Foucault frames as Socrates' concerns about the necessity of

challenging and investigating self and surroundings (*Courage of Truth* 83-4), even as

fearless political speech has become a futile effort (76). Though Pancho sees the racism and

corruption infecting the institutions around them, he nevertheless believes that people outside the prison system need to know what goes on behind bars, since it affects them, too. He also criticizes *The Beat* for censoring writing that reveals gang affiliation, arguing that, "a gang is like a religion," revealing the ways in which alternate formations of community provide a sense of affective solidarity and social support that institutions do not. Pancho's statement reflects what Shirley Brice-Heath observed in her ethnography of Tracton's African-American community, where the "survival strategies, ... symbols, and language" of gang membership helped mitigate the poverty, unemployment, and erosion of community ("Ethnography in Communities" 117-122). Brice-Heath's discussion of the survival practices of gangs (122) does not reflect the ways in which gang affiliation elicits affective response around loyalty, solidarity, and sense of place -- a mode of response that echoes the kind of affective solidarity *Beat* writers cultivate by sharing emotions in print, and one that operates *because* of systemic failures - though not necessarily *against* that system, operating, rather, in spite of. This finding affirms the observations about Purp's cultivation of affective solidarity in spite of editor-publishers' desire for Purp to participate in a unitary civic imaginary.

Another long-term, max-unit detainee, with eyes wide open about the public's willful ignorance around "what their taxes are paying for," nevertheless approaches the possibilities of public writing with a cautious pragmatism, rhetorically oriented: "You would need a good amount of persuasive skills, and then you could make some minor changes, but you have to crawl before you walk." All of this goes to suggest that many of these writers believe a disposition of truth, made possible by managing emotion through an *askēsis*-like written practice, facilitates not only an ethical relation to members of

various publics, but makes possible a kind of ethical rhetorical action toward critical

consensus and social change. In this way, the philosophical becomes a conduit for the

political -- even as that disposition places them in opposition to the very institutions that

they recognize as wanting to help them by allowing *The Beat* to operate (13, or 68%). At

the same time, these responses might be taken as examples of the capriciousness of

Brandt's model of sponsorship in which the sponsoring correctional institution that

permits *The Beat* to operate -- despite its investment in the disciplinary practices, takes the

surface literacy skills and modes of critical reflection *The Beat* affords and turns that

critical eye on the structural antagonisms of the institution itself.

FINDINGS: VOLUNTEERS (13)

Mirroring Writers' Parrhêsiatic Practice

　　　Just as Foucault's model of *askēsis* helps frame writers' sense of *The Beat* as

exceeding traditional notions of literacy sponsorship, so do many volunteers understand

their participation in terms that go beyond the role of either teacher or counselor in the

traditional sense, to include a kind of reciprocal psychosocial dynamic with the writers

they encounter in workshop and in print -- the kind of reactivation that Foucault identifies

in Seneca's letters. Just as youth describe an externalization of emotion on paper, so do

many volunteers (38%) characterize writing emotions as a "cathartic" process; nine of the

thirteen (69%) see it as a means of improving communication and self-knowledge, while

four see it as a means of re moving a "mask," or locating an authentic self; in the words of

one Santa Clara empty-nester who enjoys being called "Mom," writing one's emotions

"helps them get a hold of who they are." Despite the program's mission to create a safe

space of expression that places literacy first and foremost on a list of positive outcomes

(*About Us*), only two volunteers used the term, "literacy" to describe that process. Like the youth, volunteer standpoints reflect the idea that writing their emotions helps youth take part in society by instilling a kind of discipline that prevents violence (4, or 31%), while also facilitating interpersonal relationships, compassion, and forgiveness (4). Moreover, many see *The Beat's* role as helping youth locate that authenticity by challenging and provoking them, often by asking questions in the editorial responses (69%). In this way, the questioning that *The Beat* provides to detained youth resembles the exetastic[124] process Socrates describes as the searching (*zetesis*) and verification through discussion (*elegkhos*) necessary to establishing personal truth (*Courage of Truth* 84). At the same time, there were a three volunteers who thought that *The Beat's* questioning in the editorial responses wasn't necessary to youth reflection, highlighting the way in which volunteers understand the publication of youth writing alone as a vast archive of *hupomnēmata,* to be kept "[n]ear at hand," such that it might be used to either silence the passions, or help constitute a *logos bioethikos* for the self ("Self-Writing" 209-210). Among these, one volunteer suggested that the writing's reception by peers at other facilities was enough to keep them honest.

Yet, however effective the publication itself, three volunteers note that their rapport with youth and the success of Beat sponsorship depends on their own profession of authenticity. When asked whether they thought sharing their own experiences made a difference in their rapport with youth, one long-term volunteer with San Francisco observes, "[I]t's better to be yourself... they're like dogs; they can smell fear and lies." Two

---

[124] Foucault translates *exetazein* as, "to subject to examination," and the process by which one can test whether an oracle has told the truth (*Courage of Truth* 84).

others argue that honesty fosters trust; five liken their relationship to youth as friendship, and five define it as mentorship, albeit one marked by continual difficulty in adequately addressing youth submissions. A seven-year veteran of the program who sees her work with *The Beat* as a political rejoinder to punitive legislation characterizes the volunteer *ēthos* in this way: "we're not the man, but we're *tough*." Eight of the thirteen (62%) explicitly state that they do not teach, and five differentiate what they do from what the facility counselors do, often emphasizing the disciplinary and even punitive role that counselors play; in defiance of the institutional practice of rehabilitation as a whole, a number of volunteers (5) expressed hostility to the discourse of "change;" three characterize it as something being "rammed down their throats," while also being a product of privilege. One young volunteer who self-identifies as a poet-activist exclaims: "There's like six white people being like, 'You can change!' You can't just like *say* that! And that's the race complication, obviously. I think when it's not offered for them to write about change, then they write about it. Because they already know." Here, the dialogue of *The Beat* exhorts volunteers to their own ascetic practice of self-examination, one that reactivates volunteers on a weekly basis; some find it an important reminder about their own self-absorption, privilege, and ingratitude (5), while others say it encourages them to write more on their own (2).

While several define themselves in contradistinction to other professionals directing youth activity, three characterize their role as explicitly undefined: "we're floaters in a place of restriction;" and, as another observes, "low on the totem pole." This valorization of *The Beat*'s outsider status echoes what Foucault describes as the *ēthos* of the *parrhêsia*st, someone explicitly outside the strictures of educational-institutional discourse: unlike

"[t]he technician [who] is someone obliged to speak the truth, or at any rate to formulate what he knows and pass it on to others; ... [they] do not take any risk in the truth-telling he has received and must pass on" (*Courage of Truth* 23). That *parrhêsia*st moreover does not profess technical expertise; rather, he "does not speak, he does not deliver speeches, he does not say spontaneously what he knows. On the contrary, he claims to be someone who does not know" (27). Just as the Socratic *parrhêsia*st resides outside institutions and traditions of knowledge, so do the volunteers of *The Beat* feel empowered to conduct their work based on a freedom from the conventions of professional or educational discourse. One volunteer pares away any professional exigencies in this way: "Our job is to help them help themselves."

Yet, beyond that reliance on authenticity to foster trust, there is a way in which working with the youth of *The Beat* becomes a test of personal truth for volunteers, as well. Seven volunteers (58%) see their work with youth as a humbling reality check for their own lives, often on their privilege. As one San Francisco volunteer notes, "For me, it's a wake-up call, to, like, get out of my own head worrying about minutiae like buying Trader Joe's roasted Marcona almonds. Six million people in the criminal justice system and mostly people of color; many for pretty stupid infractions that I as a white kid would not be locked up for." Another volunteer conducting workshops in both San Francisco and Solano sees working with *The Beat* as an opportunity to interrogate her charitable impulses; when asked by a writer, "Why would you come here?", she asks herself: "What *are* we doing here in the first place? ... is this, like, white savior complex? ... Because I don't know, I have to check my savior complex often, and um, I don't know - I tell him often that it's just because, I like to write, to hear what other people have to say." In this way, volunteers are reminded

that the integrity of their exhortations to personal truth for youth depends on their willingness to interrogate their own truth-claims; for Socrates in the *Apology,* that *exetasis* was the only way that he was able to establish the depth and limits of his own knowledge about the world, and as such, the only way that he could legitimately become a touchstone for the integrity of others (*Courage of Truth* 84). At the same time, this *exetasis* becomes a means of interruption similar to what happens to the writers who "let out" their emotions on paper, since volunteers find themselves compelled to acknowledge the structural violence from which they benefit as middle-class, enfranchised civil subjects.

Rendering Experience Commensurable through Emotion

In Chapter Two, analysis of *Beat* editorial responses to Lil' Purp indicated that volunteers were exhorting Purp to write his feelings as a prosthetic benefit to an external public -- specifically, as a means of allowing that audience to experience Purp's subject formation by proxy, towards production of an ethical subject who might participate in "the great chain of cares and concerns" that Foucault recounts from the *Apology,* and as such, successfully join the civic imaginary.[125] For most of the volunteers who participated in these interviews, however, their work with *The Beat* centers on the face-to-face workshop experience in a closed, private setting; only two indicate that they write editorial responses themselves, while five mention having typed submissions up to send on to San Francisco

---

[125] Though the editorial response to Purp's text may not be a comprehensive representation of *The Beat's* editorial *ethos* overall, the program's use of Purp as an exemplar suggests that the attendant editorial dialogue becomes an exemplar in its accomplishment of a desired result - the movement from rap plagiarism to writing that is "heartfelt, and most importantly, original," culminating in an "Ode to Obama" ("From Imitation to Innovation" 12-13).

for editorial review. Moreover, there are no explicit indications that these volunteers believe the performance of negative emotion on paper constitutes a means for outsiders to experience these writers' transformation towards civic engagement. And yet, writers' commission of emotion to paper nevertheless renders their experiences commensurable to the volunteers who urge them to write. One relatively new volunteer (6 months) describes how the process of youth writing their emotions reminds him of their commonality, and inspires him to undertake a similar task: "Sometimes it relates to something in your own life; your situation is not similar, but . . . they can go through all these horrible experiences and take the time to feel differently while writing. It's gotten me to write more on my own." Another -- a late-career social worker from Oakland struggling to dispel criminal stereotypes, said this:

> "He may not have a conscience -- he may be sociopathic, but he does have feelings --
> because everyone does. And that's sort of why I'm here. Because I think everyone
> *does* have feelings. And everyone needs to express them…. Not that [my life's] like
> *theirs,* but at least you understand what it means to be angry, you *understand* what it
> is to be shit on. You know, because feelings are *universal,* you know -- even though
> the content is different, the feeling is the same."

Here, commission of emotion to paper in the pages of *The Beat* does become a way for the upstanding civil subject to establish a commonality with the detained and incarcerated writers who submit their work -- a movement from sympathy to empathy; however, these volunteers do not, as a group, share the *Beat* editors' insistence that these performances of emotion need happen publicly, nor do they cast the process of writing emotion as a spectacle that might affirm their own faith in a civic ideal.

Nevertheless, volunteers express optimism about public emotion's ability to change the world; nine (69%) confidently believe that publishing their emotional writings can change the world in the abstract, either by showing them possibility, or by changing personal behavior, and an additional four (31%) are cautiously hopeful. In the words of the poet-activist, "I think it shows some of the kids that they're already political. I think when we say politics, they think, 'presidency,' but these kids have really awesome politics, and I don't think they know that it's called that.... And I think that as thoughts and questions are raised, they're going to keep thinking about those things." Just two weren't sure, or were relatively pessimistic. In thinking concretely about whether writing for *The Beat* might foster detainee's community engagement or political participation post-release, responses were more measured; seven (54%) considered it a possibility, but recognized multiple obstacles. In the words of a Santa Clara volunteer who began working with *The Beat* in a University of Redlands classroom, "The writing part? ... Slowly something grows inside you; you become passionate about it -- hopefully it translates to real world situations. But it's difficult when *they* change, and the outside communities don't want to change." In the words of a less sanguine volunteer, a man in his mid-twenties who came to *The Beat* to explore a possible teaching career:

> "It's going to be unbelievably rare for anyone to be brought up in that -- those sorts of straits, that level of poverty, and look at the political system as something you can work with. I haven't seen *any* of the kids I've seen write about Obama. Because it was Black History [month], [and] they [were given a prompt to write about] him, but I thought more of them would write about black history than did. I mean I was hoping they would."

This volunteer both acknowledges his hopes about *The Beat* as a conduit towards political empowerment, and concludes that the political system and broader social fabric is irretrievably broken. In this way, he echoes the pessimisms of Wilderson's critique of a structural antagonism "too big to be resolved" (Wilderson, qtd. in Zug),[126] though, to place him in the context of Brandt's sponsorship model, he sees *The Beat* as more naïve than exploitative. Unlike most volunteers, he came to the U.S. from England in his teens, bringing with him an outside sense of the American-democratic *topos* and its relationship to both discipline and race, giving him, perhaps, a critical distance that many of his American counterparts lack. That struggle with hope, the limits of knowledge and power, and ultimate conclusion also replicates the *exetasis* Socrates describes in the *Apology* (*Courage of Truth 84*)*,* establishing the depth and limits of his understanding that gives his sponsorship significant integrity.

Despite the critical distance, however, this volunteer nevertheless believes that *The Beat* helps writers learn to "respond ... as themselves a little more" to their respective communities and the law, they can "change their lives to some extent." This statement recenters volunteer sponsorship in the *parrhêsia*tic mode, even as he recognizes that the end-game for youth and the end-game for volunteers is not necessarily the same. What this array of responses suggests is that the very process of publicizing the work of *The Beat* -- whether the publication managed by the editors, or the organizational reports published for outside audiences -- aligns itself with a disposition of civically-minded futurity that volunteers on the ground don't necessarily convey in their face-to-face encounters, even as

---

[126] Elsewhere Wilderson argues that the gratuitous violence against black slave bodies is the condition of possibility for both the modern bourgeois state and American democracy ("Gramsci's Black Marx" 225-29).

they believe in the power of stories and authentic emotion to change the world. For them, the face-to-face exchange is what matters; it is the seed for getting youth to write about their feelings in a way that is honest and ethical towards others, and the impetus for volunteers to write and live more truthfully for themselves. Part of what makes that game of truth-telling[127] possible, however, is the prosthetic emotional experience that youth create for otherwise insulated volunteers, rendering their experiences commensurable. Moreover, that prosthetic experience goes both ways; as one volunteer notes of writers' conditions for trust, "they want to know we are human. They want to know we had our heart broken and been dumped." This process for both groups cultivates an empathy with rhetorical implications.

Yet, the dynamics of *The Beat* face-to-face differ somewhat from the dynamics of the text itself, showing the way in which crafting and disseminating this public testament to sponsorship activity for different audiences does not capture either the ongoing interactions between writer and volunteer in the hall, or the essence of that *parrhêsia*tic game, even as an *ēthos* of personal truth pervades both site of production and site of distribution. There is a way in which the dual disposition of publication -- addressing writers as individuals, but also in aggregate, with an eye toward institutional bodies

---

[127] Foucault at multiple points in *Courage of Truth* refers to the procedures and conditions of parrēsia as a "game;" Lysimachus in the *Laches* describes Socrates' game as, "whatever the subject you start with, you are forced to let yourself be drawn by the discussion into giving an account of yourself, of the kind of life you lead now and have led in the past" (143). Socrates plays a "game of ironic cross-examination" in the *Apology* (74), while prophetic speech becomes a "game of truth" through the process of *epimeleia,* which includes investigation and testing (87-88). Politics, too, in the context of a democracy, is a game, albeit one mingled with "useful as well as bad opinions" (36).

(detention facilities, superior court judges, public and private grant-making institutions) --

becomes a pedagogical tool for understanding the vagaries, inefficiencies, (im)possibilities

of public writing dependent on games of truth and a sense of emotional connection, both

for detainees and for volunteers. When discussing the relationship between what

volunteers try to do and what the writers want or need, the British volunteer had this to

say: "Maybe it really doesn't matter what [volunteers] write. I think in some ways

everyone's sense of community is imagined.... If you think about it, [the youth] might have a

much stronger sense of community than the rest of us.... With the getting published --

they're writing to be read with hundreds of other kids, the majority of whom can relate to

what they've been through, and who they are as far as their upbringing, and who's ... made

them." Here, there is a sense that the community forged by emotional disclosure across

cities, counties, and states is a more viable public than the one either he, his fellow

volunteers, or the institution encourages them to engage, thereby undermining the

authority of civil society without necessarily organizing its existence deliberately against it.

These vagaries encompass the capriciousness of Brandt's sponsorship model. At the same

time, responses of volunteers suggest a shared perception that the successful rhetorical

subject emerges from an ethically-oriented pedagogy of the emotions, even as literacy,

broadly conceived, continues to inform *The Beat's* mission. To put it differently, volunteers

seem to narrate and promote a movement from sympathy to empathy, even for volunteers

that understand such empathy as meaningful and operative only in the pages of *The Beat,*

among a public defined significantly by the incommensurability of lives marked by street

violence and civil death.

This process, however, operates at the pleasure of the detention facilities where the workshops take place, under surveillance by facility counselors who both perform security and facilitate programming for youth every waking hour of the day -- this changes the rules of rhetorical subject formation significantly, as *The Beat* becomes a conduit for subject formation that proceeds not from ignorance, but across intractable boundaries of civil and social death. For that reason, any comprehensive account of the work of *The Beat* should include the standpoint of the facility counselors who observe workshops and their effects.

FINDINGS - COUNSELORS (10)

Performing the Institution: Blurring the Lines, then Reinstating them

One of the counselors interviewed had overseen the work of *The Beat* since its inception in 1996; all of the ten interviewed had observed workshops for at least seven years. Six of the ten (60%) feel that the counsel offered by *The Beat* volunteers is identical to the counsel they provide youth most of the time. In the words of one respondent, "I think the limited amount of time they spend with the kids is exactly what the staff do -- kind of guide them down a road; you can't tell them how to live, but we can point them in the right direction." However, those same six respondents note that when *The Beat* workshop is in session, their own roles shift from counsel to discipline and security. One San Francisco counselor, who sees free, public education as America's marker of greatness, explains the difference between volunteers and counselors this way:

"Well, obviously there's great similarities. I believe when the program's actually here, there's greater difference, because we have our role to perform as *correctional* officers. We gotta be the *watchers*. But when *The Beat*'s *not* here - I'm like, yeah, here's your pencil and paper. I'll say, listen, why don't you go grab yourself a pencil,

and ah, make sure you're spelling your words, help with their vocabulary. There's

always new words to learn. To be precise, and to the point." That shift is confirmed

by Beat volunteers, one of whom declares, "our role isn't to be disciplinary; it is the

guard's role to make everyone else safe, just like for other programs."

In this account, the counselors assume the role of literacy sponsor in a more traditional

sense, emphasizing the necessity of language correctness; moreover, they emphasize a kind

of written concision and precision that might otherwise be associated with the analytical

writing taught in traditional composition settings. Furthermore, given this counselor's

attitude about the role of education in not just sustaining the state, but assuring its

preeminence, that language correctness signifies as a marker of civic identity. That attitude

echoes in the "Character Counts" posters they attach to the walls of the common areas for

both youth and their visitors to see. Four (40%) share that investment in language

correctness and/or effectiveness and equate it with being able to function in society. Being

published, however, provides a kind of validation that pushes that ability toward a more

confident agency in their own future, though counselors view that agency in different ways.

Three (33%) see that validation as demonstrating to youth that they have the capacity to

accomplish set goals, while two see it as cultivating a pride of ownership that enables them

to think about the future for the first time. In the words of one 11-year veteran of the

Solano facility, getting published is good "for them, for anyone -- if that's your *goal* - so now

you're completing a *goal*. Yeah, for them, they're like, 'This is what my plan was, to write a

paper' -- It's definitely *motivation*." For this counselor, being published is less about

reception by an audience or cultivation of community, and more about devising metrics for

self-improvement and meeting them. Counselors frame themselves as simultaneously

providing therapy, literacy support, and correctional discipline, and their response to

youths' writing practices reflect that range of activity, while also happening in unexpected

ways; for counselors to be coaching youth in skills "critical thinking" appears dissonant

with their role as correctional officers, yet shifts according to the dynamics of the carceral

space: when volunteers bring the vagaries of the world into an otherwise contained space,

counselors like the one from San Francisco shift to a role of containment.[128]

This focus on language correctness clearly gestures to Brandt's genealogy of

sponsorship as a mode of dominant acculturation ("Sponsors" 168) and the kind of

prescriptive discipline that Foucault describes in his account of the "docile bodies" (*DP*

135) emerging from the increasingly mechanized distribution of bodies in modern

educational, military, health, and prison-based institutions (*DP* 136-163). Moreover,

counselors' interest in youth developing and accomplishing set goals, as with the counselor

who imagines a writer producing writing in the legible genre of the "paper," extends the

architecture of meritocratic measures and outcomes Foucault describes in his account of

modern education's adoption of the classificatory rhythms of the military (*DP* 147). This

investment in correctness and discourses of optimization marks counselors as gaining, to

move once again into Brandt's framework, advantage[129] on the level of discourse, if not

---

[128] That shift towards containment, however, focuses on the perceived dangers of contact between inside and

outside *bodies,* despite the fact that the printed publication itself -- the document that transcends institutional

walls, and sustains institutional critique across disparate communities -- facilitates different kinds of

subversion, including anger towards police corruption, drawings that camouflage gang symbols, and "R.I.P"

submissions that eulogize enemy combatants not yet dead.

[129] Brandt channels Bourdieu's "expansive notion of economy" when she characterizes sponsors as, "many

spheres where people labor, invest, and exploit energies - their own and others' - to maximize advantage"

economically in any direct sense. Indeed, "character counts" not just for detainees, but for staff themselves as sponsors of civil rehabilitation.

From Catharsis to Empathy

Yet, however focused on "correctness," a majority of counselors (70%) echo volunteer observations about the need for the kind of emotional-cathartic practice *The Beat* provides, particularly for males; moreover, counselors, too, understand the commission of emotions to paper as a conduit for more ethical relations with others. Most (8 out of 10) observe that it helps with impulse control and a sense of discipline and accountability; five see it as an activity that prepares them for their future in society. Seven believe it cultivates empathy; one narrates that formation in this way:

> "Talking about things that are kinda hard to talk about -- once they get past the things that are difficult - their relationship to their father, their emotions, whatever -- you can talk about *anything* you want. Everything else is *easy....* Maybe he doesn't want to write about that stuff that's personal. Little does he know, everybody else is writing about their personal life too.... His *emotions?* It's not just love and anxiety, it's fear and *anger.* When you talk about *emotions,* you talk about *everything.*"

For this counselor, exploring the full range of emotions through writing is the test by which all other life challenges might be measured, and the means by which a writer establishes

---

("Sponsors" 184). To the extent that the structural antagonisms of the prison-industrial complex are the condition of possibility for counselor compensation, they do gain economic advantage by presiding over programs permitted by facility administration. That advantage, however, is not connected directly to *The Beat,* as counselors oversee a suite of programs geared toward topics as diverse as career planning, spirituality, and team-building.

commonality with others. That sentiment, shared by six other counselors (70%), mirrors volunteers' optimism that writing emotions creates an intimacy and eventual sense of commonality that opens the possibility of social change, broadly conceived; three more or less repeat the dictum, "Let the change you desire to see in the world begin within you." Insofar as writing composed for *The Beat* constitutes the site of that change, one might argue that here counselors are advocating a Socratic-*parrhêsia*tic accord between *bios* and *logos.* One, however, fears the consequences of honest writing in a public space. Even as her office was papered with letters from detainees who had successfully done their time and rejoined society, this thirty-year facility veteran expresses more trepidation: "Nowadays, it's dangerous to be honest. Especially for the *kids.* I'm thinking about that judge that got killed in Colorado. I always speak the truth on the outside. I don't live in fear, but that's a little different for the kids." What this statement suggests is that rendering negative emotions accessible to publics outside the security of the institution creates a vulnerability that she as an adult insulated from the streets doesn't have to fear, even if the anecdote she cites demonstrates the opposite, since it was someone in a position of institutional power -- prisons chief Tom Clements -- who was killed by a member of a white supremacist gang in Colorado allegedly as retribution for having been placed by Clements' administration in solitary confinement (Dukakis).[130] The vulnerability of youth on the streets, however, nevertheless remains, as does the peril of speaking truth to power, as Foucault's account of *parrhêsia* in the *Apology* suggests (*Courage of Truth* 76-79).

---

[130] In a twist of irony, Clements was actually responsible for reforms that reduced the number of inmates in solitary confinement (Dukakis).

Writing Emotion toward Contrition

Nevertheless, the perspectives of various facility counselors converge in a nearly unanimous understanding of the writing process as a means of expressing emotion away from (violent) action, cultivation of empathy towards a kind of ethical relation with other people such that they might wield some kind of power later on that helps them identify and realize personal ambitions. None, however, envision youth cultivating any kind of political relation beyond an attitude of contrition towards their past transgressions. In this way, counselors reflect a non-*parrhêsia*tic practice that more closely resembles the Christian-confessional discourse reliant on the presence of a specialist or pastoral power that Foucault describes in *Courage of Truth* (4) and *Scientia Sexualis* (58-70)*,* affirming, at the same time, a relation of inequality between sponsor and recipient, priest and confessant. This finding suggests that counselors do not register the notion of counter-public critique, much less acknowledge the role of writing emotion in carving out a space of affective solidarity for youth in spite of the model of social integration counselors advocate. Their emphasis on the necessity of writing emotion to help youth cope and relate to others, however, suggests a convergent appreciation of the *means* of that social relation with volunteers and youth, whether or not counselors acknowledge the political legitimacy of ends not dictated by the State, or dominant discourse. Despite this important difference with the sponsorship extended by volunteers, counselors nevertheless see their work as analogous: when asked what they would change to improve the program, half of counselors expressed a desire for closer or more frequent coordination between *The Beat* and institution staff, so that both parties could reinforce what they saw as conducting the same work.

DISCUSSION

So what do we do with this constellation of attitudes around *The Beat*? It appears that all three groups of participants avow *askēsis* as a mechanism of disciplinary discourse that helps writers cultivate empathy and establish greater accord between *bios* and *logos*, but differ in their imaginings of how writers might employ that mechanism to address different audiences, and enact social change. Volunteers and editors, the sponsors most immediately identifiable with *The Beat,* enact disciplinary discourse consistent with Brandt's conception of power differentials and pursuit of economic advantage *only* to the extent that they gain advantage as ethical subjects, receiving neither monetary compensation, nor prestige ("low on the totem pole"). Volunteers are gratified by the possibility of helping writers process negative emotion towards self-truth and better relationships, and the hope that they might carry those practices with them into social and even political action. In this way, they do gain advantage on the order of discourse, affirming, through their own regular practice of correspondence, the value of writing emotions to uncover a true self, and enhance the possibility of ethical social/political action later on.

In some ways, *askēsis* for *Beat* volunteers becomes a positive feedback loop, activating toward future action over and over again, or hope as preparation for hope. At the same time, because volunteers both recognize the limits of their knowledge and power, and acknowledge the need to regularly interrogate their motivations and positionality, there is a way in which this *askēsis* regime is what makes hope, and a sense of futurity, possible, even when they recognize that positive outcomes are in no way assured, or even likely.

Youth mirror this regime of hope when they express gratification in not just being read by a public of their peers across the country, but by the possibility that their writings might either help someone else, or make change -- whether through the energies created through affective solidarity with their audience, by providing a cautionary tale to those on the same path, or by making citizens on the outside aware of the prison-industrial complex's costs to civil society. A significant theme for *The Beat's* variant of literacy, then, is discipline as a condition of hope and futurity -- the freedom, perhaps, that Foucault characterizes as the content of an ethical practice informed by reflection ("The Ethics of Concern" 284).

Counselors reflect this disposition, too, although their sense of discipline around language correctness and accountability reflects more of a *Discipline and Punish* variant, invested in optimal regulation of the subject away from impulsivity, and towards accomplishment of measurable outcomes. This effort affirms the directional logic (and conventions) of civic reintegration that undergird the institution itself, and by extension, the state. However, it also makes an argument for a degree of continuity between the regulatory practices of the Stoics Foucault describes in his later lectures on care of the self, and the more antagonistic disciplinary regimes described in *Discipline and Punish.* Specifically, it serves to remind that a care of the self cultivated through *askēsis* was, in Foucault's paraphrase of Aristides, "the very principle of good government" (*CoTS* 88) in the context of a society in which historical recipients of this pedagogy were literate and enfranchised -- by Foucault's own admission, Hellenistic and Roman society's elite (*Hermeneutics of the Subject* xx).[131] This admission leaves an opening for Susan Jarratt's

---

[131] Given that, in *The Politics,* Aristotle more or less admits that slave labor is a condition for sustaining the political order -- "For he who can foresee with his mind is by nature intended to be lord and master, and he

critique of Foucault's "inward turn" in the later lectures: that readers are "invited to contemplate and, implicitly, admire canonical figures from a conventional [philosophical] history" (Jarratt 225) in a way that fails to subject those figures themselves to Foucault's critical framework (225), while also being "[unwilling] to turn the project of investigating the production of truth -- the game of truth-telling -- into an advocacy of liberatory political speech" (225).

Yet, within the sponsorship, there remain differences, notably in the way that volunteers understand *The Beat* as a way for writers to survive, if not engage in political activity against, the dehumanizing structures of the institution. When asked about the relationship between the institution and *The Beat,* only two volunteers returned the sense of shared purpose that counselors expressed, while the others described it in terms of "censorship," "restriction," and being there "at Probation's pleasure." Volunteers' and counselors' different conceptions of what a regime of writing does and should accomplish affirms Brandt's characterization of residual literacies and new literacies not growing out of one another, but existing simultaneously, and even in tension ("Accumulating Literacy" 654-665). On the one hand, *The Beat* sponsors a mode of ethical literacy that interrogates the dominant-discursive logics placing volunteers in positions of power, and youth in conditions of subjection; on the other hand, it sponsors the kind of functional literacy and subjectivation of dominant discourse that makes it a model program in the eyes of the correctional institution. The irony is not lost on me that in order for *The Beat* to conduct

---

who can work with his body is a subject, and by nature a slave" (*The Politics*, Book I 1252b), there is a way in which *The Beat's* variant of *askēsis* as a mode of psychosocial and sponsorship is fundamentally bound to the strictures of state-institutional discourse.

this work, it relies on its own set of sponsors, in the form of public and private foundations -- foundations who require either measurable outcomes, or the promise of measurable outcomes. Foundations built on the fortunes of people with accumulations of literacy[132] and power made possible by a political and judicial system that assures the continued structural subjugation of the thousands of youth and adults that use *The Beat* as a lifeline. That irony amplifies when I acknowledge that my own research agenda, and the literacies that have shaped this chapter, provide the condition of possibility for *The Beat* to provide those measurable outcomes -- while also providing me with a site to demonstrate my own literacies at work, thereby using an entire community to my own advantage, and the professional, economic opportunities that such an advantage purports to bring.

This brings us back to the question of ethics. For Foucault's highly specific historical-philosophical project, ethics is "the form freedom takes when it is informed by reflection" ("The Ethics of Concern" 284); however, in the context of this literacy community, the correctional institution, detained writers, and *Beat* sponsors subscribe not to Foucault's notion of ethics, but to one defined by cultural and juridical categories of good and evil produced by a civil society founded on Judeo-Christian values. That ethics is already necessarily embedded in the very discourses that extend the legal attainder responsible for conflating blackness and criminality -- an issue very much at the heart of a program in which significant numbers of detained and incarcerated populations are Black. More than half of the writers interviewed for this study were Black, even though they account for just 12% of the U.S. Population, according to the latest U.S. Census (U.S. Census

---

[132] Brandt chronicles the phenomenon of literacy accumulation over time ("vertical literacy") as a significant feature in shaping access to economic and political advantage ("Accumulating Literacy" 653-663).

Bureau). Joan Dayan traces this inheritance of "synthetic slavery" to English law and later American case law in her exploration of the totality of civil death, and the structural violence it extends (Legal Slaves 2), a legal attainder doubled for African-Americans subjected to centuries of physical enslavement. Given that the discourses of *The Beat* are significantly defined by an ethics that connects virtue to a renunciation of violence, and self-truth to a mode of future action in which the subject is presumed to act in accordance with the laws of a civil society made possible, according to Wilderson, by gratuitous violence to the black subject ("Whither" 225-229), is *The Beat's* mode of ethical literacy meaningful? Or is it merely an extension of Wilderson's contention that American democracy is ethically bankrupt, limiting it to a modality of literacy that can only situate participants along Brandt's axis of exploitation and brute economic advantage?[133]

Understanding Beat *Literacy Practice as Event-Practice*

Lest I fall again under the sway of this political-ontological dyad, it is worth remembering that *Beat* writers -- powerless both as detained subjects, and as members of communities struggling against the structural antagonisms of American society -- make themselves appear to self and others by writing toward aims not necessarily synonymous with those of their sponsors, to include institutional critique, and cultivation of affective solidarity with writers in publics uninterested in *The Beat's* romance of democratic participation. Moreover, that sense of self and community is strengthened not because sponsors exhort them to truth, but because they exhort themselves and each other to a

---

[133] Wilderson challenges the state as an ethical formation frequently in his work, from his troubling of Gramsci's definition of an ethical civil society ("Whither" 227-228), to his account of the conflict between radical politics and the federal government in the 1960s and 1970s (*Red, White, and Black* 3-4).

disposition of the "real." Finally, because these otherwise powerless subjects provide a

regular reality check for volunteers, reminding them of the need for greater accord

between *bios* and *logos* in their own writing and lives, there is a way in which *The Beat*

shows us how this Greco-Roman practice Foucault named as so vital to our "modern mode

of being subjects" (*Hermeneutics of the Subject* xx) is not as "peculiar" to that historical

moment, or its class designation, as he would have us believe. Rather, *The Beat's*

sponsorship dynamic shows that both the rituals and the aims of these techniques of the

self are alive and well, providing a mode of ethical literacy and preparedness for action in

(counter)public life even as members of *The Beat* do not ascribe to either the vocabularies

of Foucault's ancient frameworks, or his broader philosophical-historical project.

In this way, the unlikelihood of *The Beat's* epimeleian literacy actualizes one of

Foucault's central projects over the course of his work, summarized by David Tell as an

effort against a set of metonymical concepts (significantly, the prisoner and delinquent)

that "obscured the raw material of history" (Tell 103). Where one might argue that class,

legal status, and historical discontiguity discourage a genealogy in which these two sets of

writing practices might be productively linked, *The Beat's* practices as a set of *events* -- with

similar circumstances, written activity, and desired outcomes -- empty out a metonymy in

which the *categories* of *Beat* writing and Stoic philosophical practice are necessarily

mutually exclusive. In so doing, *Beat* practice dislodges the fixity of a political ontology in

which the "Bay Area prisoner of color, marginalized by lack of educational attainment"

must necessarily exist in opposition to, or in thrall to, a hegemonic discourse serving

Greece and Rome's political elite. Borrowing Tell's conception of "event," then, I adopt the

term, "event-practice" to describe the *askēsis*-oriented literacy practices that render Stoic

askēsis and *The Beat* permeable to one another. Even as Harvey Graff reminds us that

literacy economies have historically operated on *moral* economy (Graff 245), thereby

inviting dismissal of Foucault's framework as an extension of an Althusserian state

apparatus, the literacy event-practices surrounding *The Beat Within* might also allow for a

reading of Foucault's project that errs on the side of self-care as a means of, "invent[ing] . . .

a way of being that is still improbable" (Foucault, qtd. in Nehemas 169) for subaltern

voices, rather than merely an extension of elite, hegemonic discourse.

Concurrent Literacies, Hybrid Publics

The use of these techniques, however, in no way replace or stand in for the

multitude of concurrent literacies *Beat* writers bring with them to the program. By

identifying practices that resonate with a distinctly historical, interpretively selective, and

narrowly western regime of written activity, I do not suggest that participants do not

already possess or continue to engage in equally advantageous literacy traditions, or even

equally meaningful counter-practices, given that, historically, literacy has been used not

just for liberation, but for what Harvey J. Graff calls, "other, non-liberating uses," including

"work preparation, assimilation…, and instillation of a pan-Protestant morality" over poor,

Black, and immigrant populations (211-13) -- the very populations that comprise the

majority of prisoners and detainees writing to *The Beat.* In Chapter Two, I outlined the

ways in which *Beat* writer Lil' Purp's use of rap poetics affirms the value of hip-hop

literacies as a means of constructing meaningful counter-public space in the context of

African-American and street cultures, notably through the trope of "keepin' it real." Many

(9) of the writers interviewed maintained those literacy practices before writing for *The*

Beat, including poetry and rap lyrics written with friends -- even sharing those practices over flip-phone text message in English and Spanish.

For detainees with Latin American roots, for example, one might argue that the literacy practices extended by *The Beat* community make use of practices transmitted in Spanish-speaking communities or other language-minority youth that rely more on household and other social networks to transmit what Moll and González argue are "funds of knowledge" towards participation in wider economies (Moll and González 159). These constitute biliterate social networks that replicate *compradrazgo* in a way that does not reproduce Brandt's power differential. Instead, Marcia Farr argues that such literacies rely on a network of mutual obligation to "make up an emotional and social support group" built on trust and commitment that spans public and private space and incorporates multiple generations, taking care of one another's families, celebrating holidays, and -- similar to an *askēsis* that relies heavily on written forms of ethical accounting through the *hupomnēmata's* already-said -- engaging in the written rituals of catechism. According to Farr's fieldwork with Mexicans located in Chicago, the religious practice of *doctrina,* conducted in Spanish, "involves the reading and writing of extended texts" that include writing lists of one's intended good deeds, and comparison with lists of what deeds one had managed to accomplish for the week (Farr 468-479). In this way, one might argue that the literacy traditions of *compradrazgo* perform much of the work a Foucauldian reading of *The Beat* might offer; we do see a regularity of practice, and a cyclical reflection on the already said and done towards future thought and action -- one with a public good at its base, though one squarely situated in the values of the Catholic Church, rather than a secular civil society.

Given the number of African-American writers in the program, and the significant influence of African-American hip-hop culture in street culture more broadly, *The Beat's* mode of ethical literacy might also be interpreted through the lens of the African-American practice of testifying, which, according to Rhea Estelle Lathan, is "a tool permeating literacy acquisition and use" (Lathan 36) that uses "dramatic narration requiring a communal reenactment of one's feelings and experiences" (31) towards "communicating valuable, life-giving, life-changing solutions" (34). While testifying is conventionally associated with spiritual practice, it also constitutes an intellectual practice "though which individual acts of evaluation inform larger social systems such as the Civil Rights Movement . . . [thereby] intersect[ing] both secular and sacred ideologies" (33). Furthermore, Lathan's description of testifying relies heavily on communal reenactment and processes of critical evaluation that occur between speaker and audience (35), which might illuminate our understanding of *Beat* writers' movements between individual meditation and public expression of feeling for the world to see (and learn from).

Moreover, because testifying has relied on a dynamic of call-and-response to energize participants towards such activities as the Civil Rights Movement, it most certainly performs work analogous to Foucault's account of Seneca's correspondence, activating both writer and audience towards social action in the future. This model echoes Chapter Two's account of the affective solidarity Lil' Purp cultivates with his call to *Beat* readers to "keep it lit," a Bay Area-specific, African-American exhortation to preserve the vitality of a relationship to a person or community. Finally, the physicality of testifying as an intellectual practice asserts a unity of body and mind that rejects what Lindon Barrett called the "alleged corporeality of blackness" that has historically asserted a binary

between white/black and literacy/illiteracy around the authority of the slave narrative (Barrett 415), and the prisoner narrative, by extension; *The Beat's* emphasis on transmitting emotion to paper as a means of stress relief, reflection, connection, and preparation for future social action does reject a Cartesian mind/body dichotomy, even as writers and sponsors seek to manage negative emotion in favor of more "positive" outcomes. One might say that the physicality of testifying and its role in knowledge production becomes its own mode of phronetic wisdom.

And yet, neither of these traditions fully account for the suite of practices that *The Beat* community mobilizes to conduct its work nation-wide. This goes to show that, just as writers, counselors, and volunteers take up different versions of discipline in their sense of what writing does -- even within groups, so does *The Beat* demonstrate how the concurrent, overlapping, and even conflicting literacies that participants bring with them to the scene of writing reflect the publics and counter-publics that intersect within and around the institution making it possible for *The Beat* to conduct its work, rejecting any one unitary or originary explanation for how it is they do so. Only a fraction of writers and sponsors, for example, might have access to the kind of *compradrazgo*-focused literacy that Farr describes, as only nine of the twenty-one writers are Latino; only a fraction of those volunteered information about Mexican identities, primarily through their gang membership (2), while nearly all participants avowed hip-hop culture's emphasis on "keepin' it real." Furthermore, the only two writers who likened *The Beat's* writing regime and sponsorship dynamic to practices they know from church were African-American, while the one Latino writer invoking spiritual practice did so by privileging his gang

affiliation over the editorial rules of the publication, since his gang was "like a religion."[134]

Moreover, even as the African-American practice of testifying might account for the gratification both writers and sponsors feel in sharing and reading authentic emotion, and offer the possibility of "life-changing solutions" (Lathan 34), it does not capture *The Beat's* pedagogical-disciplinary impulses away from violence and toward a modality of truth as part of an ethical disposition that understands the self as occupying a position of choice -- ethical choice that might be better understood within Plutarch's "field of complex relations" (Plutarch, qtd. in *CoTS 88*).

My purpose in focusing on Foucault's techniques of the self rather than the literacy and literacy-auxiliary practices described above is neither to marginalize practices already used by *Beat* participants to mitigate the leveling, disciplinary effects of the very dominant-cultural discourses that produced and reified the work of the Stoics in the first place. Nor do I shoe-horn a diverse body of writers and sponsors into a unifying theory of practice to affirm the primacy of elitist western philosophical traditions; as argued above, emptying out the metonymic categories of "imprisoned writer of color" and "elite western philosophical practice" makes one available to the other in a way that encourages us to reject the utility of contiguous genealogies in producing empowered, ethical subjects, and embrace the possibility that such practices might not only reappear in unexpected places as

---

[134] This says nothing of the fact that Farr's use of a *compradrazgo*-based literacy that operates in religious spaces also depends upon a logic of original sin, Christian contrition, and forgiveness. Following the list-based accounting for good deeds in catechism described by Farr is the lesson that, "God always forgives us when we are really sorry" (Farr 479); this draws into stark contrast the mode of "realness" that *The Beat* promotes -- one that explicitly forbids discussing or admitting guilt for alleged crimes.

events, but become, as Foucault suggests, a way to "invent --- I don't mean discover -- a way of being that is still improbable" (Foucault, qtd. in Nehemas 169).

The availability of an epimeleian practice to literacy studies provides new ways of understanding individual and shared scenes of writing as not just conduits to preparedness for social action, but conduits for ethical engagement in public domains. That practice bolsters the affective work of African-American traditions of testifying described by Lathan, while also providing an important ethical auxiliary to the kinds of critical literacies traditionally cultivated by progressive-minded and social-justice oriented activists and literacy practitioners in carceral spaces. The possibilities created by an ascetic writing practice towards a mode of ethical literacy -- the horizons of hope and futurity unfolding on a field leveled by the rhythms of *askēsis* -- start to sound a bit like the "liberating dialogue" that Freire and Shor danced out[135] in *A Pedagogy of Liberation* (1987), wherein they envisioned teacher and student engaging in a "critical theory of knowing" that collapses the traditional "gnosiological cycle,"[136] or process of knowledge creation, comprised of distinct

---

[135] Freire and Shor describe their project as a conversation with a "dancelike quality" that might help them examine "the facts of real life" towards a "theory to embrace everyday living" (Shor and Freire 2).

[136] Gnosiology ("gnoseology"), a term rooted in *gnosis*, or "knowledge," and *logos*, or "word," is defined in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* as, "[a]ny philosophy or branch of philosophy concerned either with solving problems about the nature and possibility of knowledge, or with delivering knowledge of ultimate reality especially in so far as this is not available to sense-experience. 'Gnoseology' is an archaic term and has been superseded in the former sense by 'epistemology' and in the latter sense by 'metaphysics'" (Priest). Though Freire and Shor do not discuss the genealogy of this term, its use in Eastern Orthodox theology and a practice known as "Orthodox Psychotherapy" to denote a study of knowledge that uses ancient Greek intellectual practices to know God through personal experience (Vujisic 30, Vlachos --) serves as a reminder that Freire

sites of knowledge production by others and apprehension by the student (7). Important to *Beat* practices that complicate the sponsor/recipient dynamic though regular cycles of reflection and correspondence, Shor and Freire's critical dialogue works to "[seal] together . . . the teacher and the students in the joint act of knowing and re-knowing the object of study (100). This affinity with the activity of *The Beat* suggests that Foucault's account of Stoic and Socratic-*parrhêsiatic* practice not only helps flesh out a genealogy of critical literacy education based on (however discontiguous) events rather than metonymies of hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourse, but also helps us appreciate the extent to which those techniques of the self reach beyond the particularity of their historical moment.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

I sit here, having waded through layers of text, listening for subtle and emphatic inflections in myriad audio files, discerning patterns and consonances among and even within disparate voices on and off the page -- wondering if those patterns of critical awareness constitute any kind of real intervention for writers marked by the negative ontology of civil death. Volunteers hope that *The Beat's* regime of writing will help keep the younger ones from landing back in detention, or the older ones from heading straight to jail, but the reality is that recidivism is high, and even for those who don't land back in the same facilities, neither *The Beat* nor the institution have the means of tracking where these writers go; all they have is hope, and the occasional letter of thanks or shout-out in the

---

and Shor's critical-pedagogical project shares significant discursive genealogy with the very "Western Christian civilization" he critiques in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (139-40).

publication for giving *them* hope to persevere. And that's the high they run on, until the next one.

I fully admit that this fills me with sadness -- that this hope should operate in a way that is cyclical and unfulfilled. Like the volunteers, I want more for them, these writers perched between "screwed for life" and a horizon of hope, with the possibility that their writing can "change the world" in some shiny version of the future -- I want this as an activist, as a teacher, as a researcher, all governed by a preoccupation with the proto-citizen, even as I recognize the cruel optimism of that formation. But when I remember Purp's refrain, over and over through the course of his rhymes: "We all we got," echoed by all those writers who value the mentorship of the lifers as a site of wisdom toward preparedness, and the possibility that they might invigorate one another just by being present in the reception of one another's words, revealing that their shared ontology is negative only insofar as it stands in contradistinction to the volunteers', institutions, and my own desire for writing towards positive appearance in the context of a civic imaginary.

I do not end on this footing as because it is comfortable, knowing that this portrait might, at best, reach a limited audience of teachers, scholars, and activists similarly preoccupied with writing and the proto-citizen in a space where their beginnings are less assured than their ends, in this case, years-long sentences dropping with the directional certainty of a bomb. However many frustrated sighs and cramped fingers, however dissipated my body from hunching over in thought, at the end of the day I remain insulated from the political, economic, physical, and psychological effects of what it means to need *The Beat* the way these writers do. The regularity of *Beat* writers' attention -- and the attention of the volunteers who write, reflect, and drive -- sometimes hours, sometimes

more than once a week -- is something I survey from a luxuriant distance. And I bundle my

corpora of documents as enticingly as I can, so that potential buyers in the academic

marketplace might look on my curation with delight -- a positive appearance of my own

exetastic investigation as a scholar, and evidence of what critical knowledge I might

produce in the future. Critical rhetorical ethnographer Aaron Hess may name "advocacy" as

the logical activity for vernacular rhetorical scholarship interested in social progress, but

the reality is that Hess, myself, and other scholars with activist impulses have the luxury to

embed in the field at will, conduct analysis, publish, and move on. My positionality as a

rhetorical field scholar examining vernacular rhetorics and community literacies, however

progressive my orientation, remains vexed -- I can only hope that this dissertation serves to

"keep it real" in a way that writers for *The Beat* would require of me when they ask, "Why

are you here?" And, "To what end?"

This gets back to questions about the use-value of our disciplinary practices, and the

necessity of engaging in vernacular rhetorical scholarship and community-based

partnerships that strive to go beyond Hess's call for advocacy (Hess 147). Ellen Cushman's

call for reciprocity is a start ("Rhetorician as an Agent"), although I would argue that the

term has been bandied about with less attention to political-ontological subject positioning

than is needed for conducting critical-rhetorical work with imprisoned writers. In the same

piece, Cushman calls not for advocacy, but for "creating solidarity" (7)[137] -- recognizing

social positionality, and the possibilities of working across in order to enact social change.

---

[137] Cushman takes her definition of solidarity from Freire and applies it to teacher-student relations,

rephrasing it as something that happens "when there are common threads identity between the student and

teacher..., [who] must be a partner of the students in his relations with them" (18).

However, given the limited audience of scholarly work and my failure to meet all the demands of the IRB, maybe the true test-case for me keeping it real is the work I have done in partnership with *The Beat* that will remain unpublished -- namely, the program evaluation surveying all 96 program participants, 60 of whom are minors. That survey featured many of the same conclusions, but many more testimonials of both youth and volunteers; that survey has become a tool for Lisa and David to determine how they might change *The Beat* to better meet the needs of the writers and volunteers, both. They have, in turn, taken those observations, testimonials, and recommendations, and incorporated them into successful grant applications and funding reports -- their own writing, for their own sponsors, always full of hope, but deeply humble.

Is there an ethical peril in disclosing intellectual labor that I've done for *The Beat* as a condition of access, labor that will remain unpublished? Does it compromise my critical integrity to say that I drafted a document that, while inclusive of important criticisms by *Beat* participants, nevertheless professes belief in the work that *The Beat* undertakes in ways useful to them, but different from what I have written here? Or is it enough to say that, through this portrait and its post-critical moves, I not only stand in solidarity, but embrace the thrill of witnessing *The Beat* gather and disperse the magic of writing entirely without my recognition or aid? Anthropologist Annelise Riles argues that the symbolic dimensions of documentation cannot fully represent "the articulatory needs of social life" (Riles 12); perhaps somewhere between the documentation I share and the documentation I do not lies a shared horizon of possibility that a regime of writing extends not for a unitary public with measurable, directional aims, but one in which we might all invent new possibilities of being.

Walking the Talk of the IRB

That tension between the said and the unsaid, the permissible and the inadmissible, brings another question to the fore about the rhetorical field researcher's capacities and obligations as an ethical phronetic instrument in the context of the research university. Near completion of the writing of this dissertation, the IRB conducted an EQUIP review of the interview protocol detailed in Chapter Two, and issued a series of requirements. Significantly among these were the IRB's requirement that I omit the responses from the two emancipated youth who volunteered to interview, while also concluding that I should have ceased the interview protocol entirely and written an IRB modification request to include emancipated minors (See Appendix D). The IRB moreover suggested that, once I discovered I would not be permitted to contact parents, that I stop and rewrite the IRB protocol to include only adults before beginning interviews of any kind. In accordance with the IRB's audit, I have omitted the responses of emancipated interviewees, despite their being recognized by the California Superior Court as legally permitted to provide their own consent.

However, the IRB's statement that I should have ceased interviewing entirely urges consideration of the extent to which the IRB is able to exercise the kind of prudential wisdom necessary to both protect research subjects and empower rhetorical field researchers to work in solidarity with a literacy communities, particularly when the conditions of access and even the community itself are quite fluid, if not fragile. Unfortunately, my obligations to *The Beat* and to the facilities partnering with *The Beat* were not something that could wait for an IRB protocol modification that might take another several months for approval. As with most external organizations and institutions,

The Beat and the facilities involved have their own windows of availability. Not one month after I completed field research, Superintendant Watson in Solano retired; his successor does not share Watson's progressive vision of what programming like *The Beat* might accomplish with more communication between *Beat* volunteers and facility staff, perhaps because he has not witnessed the long arc of its impact. Watson had wanted to see the final program evaluation for *The Beat* so that he could coordinate staff response in meaningful ways. His successor did not express interest.

The Beat has its own set of constraints, largely connected to personnel and financial support; by the time fieldwork was complete, *The Beat* had moved out of the space they had been renting inside the Pacific News Service office, and were operating out of David's basement. These developments made it difficult for Lisa and David to facilitate further introductions and coordinate with volunteers for an additional set of interviews within the facility; however welcoming initially, permission granted by each court had an expiring window of access. These conditions attest to the fleetingness of vernacular rhetorics and the literacy communities that emerge and cohere around those conditions -- ones that do not cohere to university time tables, or IRB committee schedules, however important that review process to assuring ethical conduct. Coupled with these constraints, I had my own expiring window of access as an instrument, having commenced field work when six months pregnant, in places at least eight hours' drive from home. For these reasons, I opted to cut my losses, honor my obligations to *The Beat* by keeping minor data separate, and retain only adult detainee data for university research purposes.

This confluence of events, contingencies, and institutional requirements suggests an uncomfortable irony: that the IRB, a body comprised of researchers consistently concerned

with the ethical treatment of human research subjects, risks imposing a more rigid set of

subject-object relations than the instruments of the law for the state of California --

instruments which often come under the critical gaze of the very researchers who comprise

the IRB. In my response to the IRB detailing why I was not able to obtain parental consent, I

provided this excerpted correspondence from Judge Tondreau in Santa Clara:

> I don't know whether you have "federally recognized guardianship right". What I do
>
> know is that for every minor in juvenile hall I have made a finding that the minor is
>
> not safe in the home, removal from the home is necessary, and I have placed care
>
> and control on the minor in the hands of probation, under court supervision.
>
> Wardship is a technical disposition for many minors, but minors can be in juvenile
>
> hall for many reasons. Since these minors are under the care of probation, we
>
> routinely make decisions about their medical care without parental permission. We
>
> have a Standing Order that covers routine medical care. We determine where they
>
> sleep, what they eat, who gets to visit them, where they go to school etc. We do
>
> routine medical, dental, and mental health screenings without parental consent. We
>
> provide reproductive health and safety resources without parental consent
>
> (Personal Correspondence).

While on the one hand it may be argued that this statement reveals the court and the

detention facility as total institutions capable of undermining the authority of the nuclear

family unit, it also illustrates a prudential attention to health and safety more attuned to

localized, individual needs than the IRB as a federal entity was capable of providing in this

case. Moreover, it is in accordance with the court's interest in detainee health that the three

respective judges permitted me to do research on behalf of *The Beat* in the first place, based

on the understanding that *The Beat* not only upholds the court's mandate for protecting detainee health, but also helps detainees cultivate self-care for themselves.

There is a way in which these complications boil down to my own failure to achieve accord between *bios* and *logos* on multiple levels. On one level, it exhibits a failure to anticipate the complications of the field in an extraordinarily complicated setting with a highly vulnerable population, and then write an IRB protocol to reflect that complexity of life. To the IRB, this constituted a violation of ethics. Sadly, however, that failure has prevented me from being able to transmit the scale and complexity of *Beat* writers' voices to a public outside of the organization's administration and a handful of grant-making foundations. Was some tragic injustice rendered to those whose voices will never be transmitted in publication? It is arrogant for any researcher to think that it is her bearing witness that somehow permits the subject to speak. Nevertheless, to my mind, the often difficult strictures of IRB protocol risk undermining community literacy and rhetorical fieldwork's ability to stand in full solidarity with community partners.

What are the implications, then, for conducting rhetorical work in the field that exceeds the capacities of what the IRB can permit, or evaluate in a timely fashion? Perhaps this example may serve as an occasion to return to Brummett's call for a moral rhetorical heuristic that exceeds scholarly storehouses of knowledge through action (Brummett 105) -- and a call to curate fieldwork in spaces accessible to publics beyond the walls of peer-reviewed publications and scholarly institutions. This is not to say that the IRB is not a vitally important body, with necessarily rigorous standards of conduct; while my exasperation with this process might be coded as, "Not All Researchers," it does not eliminate the need for vigilance in research settings, particularly for vulnerable

234

populations. However, the IRB cannot, by virtue of its institutional structure, work nimbly or attentively enough to monitor the vagaries of vernacular rhetorical activity. What I suggest, however, is that rhetorical-activist scholarship might work more ethically towards social change if it were to conceive of widening its audience, embracing the spirit of the IRB, but finding new ways to respond tactically to the capricious demands of vernacular space beyond peer-reviewed publication venues. The IRB-inadmissible program evaluation for *The Beat,* however limited its readership, has nevertheless transmitted the voices of *Beat* participants on all levels to people best equipped to attune that community's practice to its values -- to walk the walk, not just in Solano, Santa Clara, and San Francisco, but all over the country.

CONCLUSION

Understanding that this dissertation is neither definitive nor conclusive in answering the questions I set out in the introduction, here are additional options for future research. One would be to work with other prison-based community literacy organizations to determine the extent to which the sponsorship dynamics of *The Beat* exist on a broader scale, noting differences in those working with long-time adult prisoners as opposed to the youth-oriented, proto-citizen-oriented programming detailed here. As many detained interviewees observed, they "still have a chance," while the adults who write in to *The Beat* are "grown-ass men" who don't merit either the institution's or the organization's time; this has implications for what it is that rehabilitative discourse around writing signifies when reintegration with society is not the objective. Another open question to pursue would be to look at the pedagogical and rhetorical practices of radical critical theorists like Wilderson and Rodríguez, and consider the extent to which they participate in the kind of maieutic listening towards affective solidarity that detainees cultivate in the pages of *The Beat.* Doing so might move towards better understanding of how radical critique operates in the context of a civil construct predicated on futurity, and help articulate more fully the role of non-instrumental rhetorics for spaces defined by the prison-industrial complex and other antiblack, white-supremacist structures.

Another inquiry bubbling out of the corners of this dissertation is one that examines rhetorical figuration of death in legal and judicial scholarship, notably around the prison. Legal theorists such as Colin Dayan have traded heavily on the aesthetics of death and the undead to characterize non- and bare-life subjectivities shaped by both prison and solitary confinement. Scholars and activists working on antiblackness, including those such

236

as Rodríguez, use Afro-pessimist conceptions of gratuitous violence and Patterson's social

death to significant rhetorical effect; the psychagogic operation of these figured deaths

would be a useful auxiliary to understanding the rhetorical effectivity of radical critique on

issues of race and incarceration, particularly where that psychagogic operation works in

tandem with the kind of prosthetic-metaphoric work identified in Rodríguez's use of

voyeurism.

The richness and difficulty of the prosthetic metaphor invites its own avenue of

inquiry. The concept of prosthetic emotion mobilized by *The Beat* is potentially productive

for public writing pedagogy in two ways, both as a model for the civil body, and as a

pedagogical intervention. Part of that work will be to explore how prosthetic emotional

labor not only performs a politics of the body, but also affords new understanding of the

body politic.[138] In addition, prosthetic emotion might also invite new thinking about the

ethical and epistemological underpinnings of the classical-rhetorical progymnasmatic

exercise of *ēthopoeia.* Church and Sigrell, for example, have found that ethopoietic exercises

in developmental composition classrooms -- particularly exercises focusing on emotion,

"make it easier to respond to each student's individual needs" (552); this finding suggests

---

[138] I am thinking, here, of Hobbes, who argued in the opening of *Leviathan* that human beings not only

construct nature, but the "Artificial Animal" of the *civitas* whose "strings," "joints," and "Wheeles" perform

their function based on the desires of the "Artificer" (9). While Hobbes's leviathan body reflects historical

political formations in ways radically different from the contemporary American *polis,* his theories about the

artificiality of that body nevertheless resonate with contemporary conceptions of the public sphere, including

Anderson's "imagined communities" and Candice Rai's characterization of the public as a deliberate

construction of faith ("Power, Publics").

that such prosthetic emotional labor makes it possible for divergent bodies and interests to work in synchrony for practical, localized classroom concerns.

The apparent adaptability of *ēthopoiesis* opens additional avenues of discussion for *phronēsis* as an auxiliary to classroom pedagogy and literacy sponsorship. To the extent that the day-to-day demands of composition pedagogy require an apparatus-like framing of rhetorical and compositional skills that often need to be rearranged or modified to respond to the vagaries of the classroom and ever-changing student needs, the ethopoietic imagining of self-as-other retains a material presence, even as we understand the discursive power those apparati have as ideological constructs either to solidify repressive discourse or interrupt its power. Here, the phronetic becomes a means of calibrating the emotional prosthesis: a phronetic sensibility makes it easier to identify moments of discursive/material tension and respond to them in ways that promote critical literacy, but also allows students to write (and feel) their way to social identities of their own making beyond the classroom. Just as prudential wisdom in the field becomes a way for the rhetorical field researcher to calibrate ethical-methodological response in vernacular spaces, so does might the phronetic become an opportunity to stand in solidarity with students using their literacies for their own purposes.

Finally, this dissertation's interest in the curatorial character of literacy and rhetorical scholarships invites a survey of prison-based programming and scholarship oriented towards public engagement. Such a survey would gauge the extent to which that programming constitutes an effective intervention in political discourse outside of the genre of academic scholarship. It also invites further discussion of disciplinarity, and the

extent to which literacy and rhetorical scholarship can and should remain moored to peer-

reviewed publication and university settings.

WORKS CITED

Abu-Jamal, Mumia. *Live from Death Row.* New York: Avon Books, 1996. Print.

Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness." The*
Massachusetts Review 18.4 (1977): 782-794. Print.

Ahearn, Laura. "Language and Agency." *Annual Review of Agency* 30(2001): 109-37.
Annualreviews.org. Accessed 10 January 2014. Web.

Alexander, Jonathan and Jacqueline Rhodes. "Queer: An Impossible Subject for
Composition." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 1 and 2 (2011): 177-206. Print.

Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*.
New York: New Press, 2010. Print.

Alim, Samy H. *Roc The Mic Right: The Language of Hip Hop Culture*. London: Routledge,
2006. Print.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* London and New York: Verso, 1996. Print.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. "The First Eight Years." KIDS COUNT Data Snapshot. Annie E.
Casey Foundation. February 2013. Updated September 2013. Accessed 30
December 2013. Web.

Appleman, Deborah. "Teaching in the Dark: The Promise and Pedagogy of Creative Writing
in Prison." *English Journal* 102.4 (2013): 24-30. Print.

---. "Writing as Liberatory Gateway." Response to featured address by Jimmy Santiago
Baca. Conference on College Composition and Communication. St. Louis, MO: 22
March 2012.

Aptheker, Herbert. "The Confessions of Nat Turner ... As fuly and voluntarily made to

      Thomas R. Gray." Baltimore, 1831. *Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion.* New York: Grove

      Press, 1968. 129. Print.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition.* Chicago and London: U. of Chicago Press, 1958.

      Print.

Aristotle and J A. K. Thomson. *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics.* Trans.

      Hugh Tredennick. Harmondsworth, NY: Penguin, 1976. Print.

Aristotle. *Metaphysics.* Trans. W.D. Ross. *The Internet Classics Archive.*Classics.mit.edu, 2009.

      Accessed 9 October 2012. Web.

---. *Politics.* Trans. Benjamin Jowett. *The Internet Classics Archive.* Classics.mit.edu, 2009.

      Accessed 29 June, 2015. Web.

---. *Politics.* Ed. W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Perseus Digital Library. Updated

      28 June 2015. Accessed 29 June 2015. Web.

Arthur-Montagne, Jacqueline. "Persuasion, Emotion, and the Letters of the *Alexander*

      Romance." *Ancient Narrative* 11 (2013): 159-190. Print.

Arum, Richard and Gary LaFree. "Educational Attainment, Teacher–Student Ratios, and

      the Risk of Adult Incarceration Among U.S. Birth Cohorts Since 1910." *Sociology of*

      Education, Vol. 81 (October 2008): 397–421. Print.

Asmus, Elizabeth. "Psychagogia in Plato's Phaedrus*." Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 11, No.

      1/2 (1986): 153-172. JSTOR. Accessed 1 March 2014. Web.

atnightlyfilm. "Spoon reading audio.mov." *Youtube.* Uploaded 16 February 2010. Accessed

      4 September 2014. Web.

Baca, Jimmy Santiago. *A Place to Stand*. New York: Grove Press, 2007. Print.

---. "Writing as Spiritual Discourse." Featured address. Conference on College

  Composition and Communication. NCTE. St. Louis, MO: 22 March 2012.

Bal, Mieke. "Curatorial Acts." *Journal of Curatorial Studies* 1.2 (2012): 178-192. Print.

Bartholomae, David. *Inventing the University*. New York: Guilford, 1985. Print.

Barrett, Lindon. "African-American Slave Narratives: Literacy, the Body, Authority."

  American Literary History 7.3 (Autumn 1995): 415-442. JSTOR. Accessed 7 April

  2015. Web.

Bartlett, Lesley, and Dorothy Holland. "Theorizing the Space of Literacy Practices". *Ways of*

  Knowing, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2002).

Bawarshi, Anis S. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of*

  Invention in Composition. Logan, UT: Utah State U. Press, 2003. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis and Mary J. Reiff. *Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and*

  Pedagogy. Fort Collins, Colo: The WAC Clearinghouse, 2010. Internet resource.

Bazerman, Charles. "Speech Acts, Genres, and Activity Systems: How Texts Organize

  Activity and People." *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to*

  Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices. Charles Bazerman and P. Prior, Eds. Mahwah,

  NJ: Erlbaum, 2004. Print.

---. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*.

  Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. Print.

---. "Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions." *Genre and the New Rhetoric*

  / Edited by Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway. (1994). Print.

Beach, King. "Consequential Transfer: A Sociocultural Expedition Beyond Transfer in

  Education. *Review of Research in Education.* Vol. 24 (1999): 101-139. Print.

Beat Within, The. About Us. *The Beat Within: A Publication of Art and Writing from the Inside*. Updated 10 April 2015. Accessed 11 April 2015. Web.

----. "Lil' Purp: From Imitation to Innovation." *Writing for their Lives: The Impact of the Beat Within Program on Five Incarcerated or Formerly Incarcerated Youth*. San Francisco: *The Beat* Within, 2009.

Bennett, James. *Oral History and Delinquency: The Rhetoric of Criminology*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1981. Print.

Berlant, Lauren. *Cruel Optimism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011. Print.

---. "Love, a Queer Feeling." *Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis.* Tim Dean, Christopher Lane, Eds. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 2001. Print.

Berlin, James. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class." *Norton Book of Composition Studies. College English*, 1988. Susan Miller, Ed. New York: Norton and Co., 2009. 667-684. Print.

Bernard-Donals, Michael. *The Practice of Theory: Rhetoric, Knowledge, and Pedagogy in the Academy.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U. Press, 1998. Print.

Bernstein, Sharon. "California allowed to force-feed hunger-striking prisoners, judge rules." Reuters. *The Christian Science Monitor* 20 August 2013. csmonitor.com. Accessed 29 August 2013. Web.

Berry, Patrick W. "Doing Time with Literacy Narratives." *Pedagogy* 14.1 (2014): 137-160. Web.

Blackburn, Simon. "Maieutic method." *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy.* 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press, 2008. Oxford Reference Online. Accessed 16 May 2014. Web.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture.*

      New York: Sage Publications, Ltd., 1977.

Bourdieu, Pierre and John B. Thompson. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Trans. Gino

      Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

      Print.

Bradley, Adam. *Book of Rhymes: The Poetics of Hip Hop*. New York: Basic *Civitas*, 2009.

      Print.

Branch, Kirk. *"Eyes on the Ought to Be": What We Teach About When We Teach*

      *About Literac*y. Cresskill, N.J: Hampton Press, 2007. Print.

Brandt, Deborah. "Accumulating Literacy: Writing and Learning to Write in the 20th

      Century." *College English* 57.6 (October 1995): 649-668. Print.

---. *Literacy and Learning: Reflections on Reading, Writing, and Society.* 2009. Print.

---. *Literacy in American Lives.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

---. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*, Vol.

      49 No. 2 (1998): 165-85. Print.

Brandt, Deborah and Katie Clinton. *Limits of the Local: Expanding Perspectives on Literacy*

      As a Social Practice. Journal of Literacy Research, 2002. Print.

Brice-Heath, Shirley. "The Book as a Prop in Language Acquisition." *The Acquisition of*

      Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives. Bambi B. Schieffelin and Perry Gilmore, Eds.

      Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1986. Print.

---. "The Madness(es) of Reading and Writing Ethnography."

      Anthropology and Education Quarterly 24.3 (1993): 256-268. Print.

----. "Ethnography in Communities: Learning the Everyday Life of America's Subordinated

    Youth." *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. James A. Banks and

    Cherry A. McGee, Eds. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1995. 114-129. Print.

Brodkey, Linda. "On the Subjects of Class and Gender in" The Literacy Letters"." *College*

    English (1989): 125-141.

----. "Writing on the Bias." College English 56.5 (September 1994): 527-547. Print.

----. "Writing Critical Ethnographic Narratives." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*

    18.2 (1987): 67-76. Accessed 28 February 2015. Web.

Brodkey, Linda and James Henry. "Voice Lessons in a Post-Structuralist Key: Notes on

    Response and Revision." A Rhetoric of Doing: essays on written discourse in honor

    of James L. Kinneavy. Stephen P. Witte, Neil Nakadate, and Roger Cherry, Eds.

    Carbondale, IL: Southern IL University Press, 1992. Print.

Brummett, Barry. "Rhetorical theory as Heuristic and Moral: A Pedagogical Justification."

    Communication Education 33 (1984): 97-108. Print.

Buck-Morss, Susan. "Hegel and Haiti." *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 26, No. 4 (Summer 2000): 821-

    865. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. "From A Grammar of Motives." 1969. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings*

    from Classical Times to the Present. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, Eds.

    Boston: Bedford St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Butler, Judith. *Giving an Account of Oneself.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.

    Print.

Campbell, Kermit E. *Gettin'Our Groove On: Rhetoric, Language, and Literacy for the Hip Hop*

    Generation. Detroit: Wayne State U. Press, 2005. Print.

Chang, Jeff. "Chuck D: rapping the vote: former Public Enemy front man on the political

power of hip-hop. *Mother Jones* (September/October 2004). Web. Accessed 18

March 2014.

Cherney, James L. "The Rhetoric of Ableism." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 31.3 (2011).

Accessed 6 October 2014. Web.

Chlup, Dominique T., and Irene C. Baird. "Literacies from the inside: learning from and

within a culture of corrections." *Learning for Economic Self-Sufficiency:*

Constructing Pedagogies of Hope Among Low-Income, Low-Literate Adults. Alfred,

Mary V*.,* Ed. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Pub, 2010. Print.

Church, A. P., and Anders Sigrell. "*Cum Poterit*-Rhetorical Exercises for Transitional and

Developmental Students." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. 49.5

(2005): 543-556. Print.

Cisneros, J. David. "(Re)bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and

Citizenship in La Gran Marcha." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 97.1 (2011). Print.

Clear, Todd R., Dina R. Rose, Judith A. Ryder. "Incarceration and the Community: the

Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders." *Crime and Delinquency*. Vol. 47,

No. 3 (July 2001). 335-351. Print.

Conquergood, Dwight. "Ethnography, Rhetoric, and Performance." *Quarterly Journal of*

Speech 78 (1992)*:* 80-123. Print.

---. "Rethinking Ethnography: Towards a Critical Cultural Politics." *Communication*

Monographs 58 (June 1991): 179-194. Print.

Coogan, David. "Moving Students into Social Movements: Prisoner Reentry and the

Research Paper." *Active Voices: Composing a Rhetoric for Social Movements* (2010):

149.

---. "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* (2006): 667-693. Print.

Cutler, Celia. *White Hip Hoppers, Language and Identity in Post-Modern America.* New York: Routledge Press, 2014. Print.

Cushman, Ellen. "Elias Boudinot and the Cherokee Phoenix: The Sponsors of Literacy They Were and Were Not." *Literacy, Economy, and Power: Writing and Research ' after Literacy and American Lives*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U. Press, 2014. Print.

---. "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change." 1996. *Writing and Community Engagement*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2010. Print.

---. "Service Learning as the New English Studies." *Beyond English, Inc*. Eds. Downing, Hurlbert, and Mathieu. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2002. 204-218. Print.

Davis, Angela Y. *Are Prisons Obsolete*? New York: Seven Stories Press, 2003. Print.

---. "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves." *The Massachusetts Review.* Vol. 13, No. 1/2, Woman: An Issue (Winter - Spring, 1972): 81-100. Print.

Davis, Angela Y. and Dylan Rodríguez. "The Challenge of Prison Abolition: A Conversation." *Social Justice* 27.3 (2000): 212-218. Print.

Dayan, Colin. "Cruel and Unusual: The End of the Eighth Amendment." *Boston Review: A Political and Literary Forum* 5 (October/November 2005). Accessed 14 April 2011. Web.

---. "Legal Slaves and Civil Bodies." *Nepantla: Views from the South*. 2.1. Duke University

    Press, 2001. Print.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*. Urbana, IL:

    NCTE, 2000.

---. "Richard Rorty's Social Hope and Community Literacy." *Community Literacy Journal*

    3.2 (2009). Accessed 14 February 2012. Web.

Delpit, Lisa. *Other People's Children.* New York: The New Press, 1995. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago

    Press, 1996. Print.

---. *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation: Texts and*

    Discussions with Jacques Derrida. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska Press, 1985. Print.

---. *Of Grammatology.* Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Trans. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins

    U. Press, 1997. Print.

Devault, Marjorie L. and Liza McCoy. "Institutional Ethnography: Using Interviews to

    Investigate Ruling Relations." *Institutional Ethnography as Practice.* Dorothy E.

    Smith, Ed. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 2006. 15-44. Print.

Devitt, Amy J, Mary J. Reiff, and Anis S. Bawarshi. *Scenes of Writing: Strategies for Composing*

    with Genres. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004. Print.

Devitt, Amy. "Teaching Critical Genre Awareness." *Genre in a Changing World.* Charles

    Bazerman, Adair Bonini, and Débora Figueiredo, Eds. Fort Collins: *WAC*

    Clearinghouse, 2009. 344-346.

---. *Writing Genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004. Print.

---. "Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre." *College English*. 62.6 (2000): 696-718. Print.

DeVoss, Danielle Nicole, Ellen Cushman, and Jeffrey T. Grabill. "Infrastructure and Composing: The When of New Media Writing". *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Sep., 2005), pp. 14-44. JSTOR.

Douglass, Frederick and James M'Cune Smith. *My Bondage and My Freedom.* 1855. Chicago: Ebony Classics-Johnson Publishing Co. University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center. Accessed 20 July 2011. Web.

Dubinsky, James M. "Service Learning as a Path to Virtue: the Ideal Orator in Professional Communication." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* Spring 2002: 61-74. Print.

Dukakis, Andrea. "Clements murder investigation continues, as do his prison reforms." *Colorado Public Radio.* Colorado Matters. 19 March 2014. Accessed 30 March 2015. Web.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics.* Bloomington, IL: U. of Indiana Press, 1976. Print.

Elk, Mike and Bob Sloan. "The Hidden History of ALEC and Prison Labor." *The Nation.* August 1, 2011. Web. Accessed August 4 2013.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Globalization.* New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Farr, Marcia. "En Los Dos Idiomas: Literacy Practices Among Chicago Mexicanos." *Literacy: A Critical Source Book*. From Literacy Across Communities. Ed. Beverly J. Moss. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1994. 9-47.

Feeley, Malcolm M. and Jonathan Simon."The New Penology – Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and its Implications." *Criminology.* 30.4 (November

1992): 449-474. Print.

Fielding, Nigel. "The Role of Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis: Impact on
Emergent Methods in Qualitative Research." *Handbook of Emergent Methods.*
Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia L. Leavy, Eds. New York: Guilford, 2008.
Print.

Fishman, Stephen M. and Lucille McCarthy. "Talk about Race: when Student Stories and
Multicultural Curricula Are Not Enough." *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8.4 (2006):
347-364. Print.

Flava Flav, Chuck D, and Andrew Trendell. "Public Enemy: Jay Z, Snoop Dogg and Drake are
not real Hip Hop." Interview. *Gigwise,* 27 July 2013. Accessed 21 March 2014. Web.

Flower, Linda."Intercultural Inquiry and the Transformation of Service." *College English*
65.2 (Nov. 2002): 181-201. Print.

Fontana, Andrea and James Frey. "Interviewing: The Art of Science." *Handbook of
Qualitative Research*, Norman K. Denzin, Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
Publications, 1994. 361-76. Print.

Foss, Sonia K. , Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric:
30th Anniversary Edition.* Waveland Press, 2014.

Foucault, Michel. *Dits et écrits,* vol. IV. Paris: Gallimard, 1994. Print.

---. *Fearless Speech.* Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001. Print.

---. *Discipline and Punish*: *The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New
York: Vintage Books, 1977.

---. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth.* The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. I. Paul

      Rabinow, Ed. Robert Hurley and others, Trans. New York: The New Press, 1994.

      Print.

---. "*Scientia Sexualis.*" *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1*. Vintage Books Edition. New York:

      Random House, 1990. Print.

---. *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3*. Robert Hurley, Trans. New York:

      Pantheon, 1986. Print.

---. *The Courage of Truth (Lectures at the College de France, 1983-1984).* Graham Burchell,

      Trans. London: Palgrave Macmillan 2011. Print.

----. "The Ethics of the Concern for Self as a Practice of Freedom." Interview. *Ethics:*

      Subjectivity and Truth. The Essential Works of Michel Foucault (1954-1984). Vol I.

      Ed. Paul Rabinow. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: The New Press, 1998. 281-301.

      Print.

---. "The Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of a Work in Progress." Interview with Hubert L.

      Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault – Beyond Structuralism and*

      Hermeneutics. Second Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 229-252. Print.

Franklin, H. Bruce. *The Victim as Criminal and Artist: Literature from the American Prison*

      New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually

      Existing Democracy." *Social Text,* 25/26 (1990): 56-80.

Fraser, Steve an Joshua B. Freeman. "Locking Down an American Workforce: Prison

      Labor as the Past -- and Future -- of American "Free-Market" Capitalism."

      Huffington Post. April 20 2012. Web. Accessed August 4 2013.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. Bloomsbury

    Publishing USA, 2014. Print.

Fuller, Margaret. *"Review of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave,*

    Written by Himself (Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845). New York Daily Tribune, 10

    June 1845, p I; reprinted, New-York Weekly Tribune, 14 June 1845, P I. Margaret

    Fuller, Critic: Writings from the New-York Tribune, 1844-1846, Volume 1.

Garner, Bryan A., and Henry C. Black. "In Loco Parentis." *Black's Law Dictionary, Pocket*

    Edition, 4th Ed. 1910. West Publishing 2011. Print.

Gee, James Paul. *Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.* London: Routledge. 1999. Print.

---. *Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Third Edition.

    New York and London: Routledge Press, 2011. Print.

---. *Social linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse* (2nd Ed.). Philadelphia:

    Falmer, 1990. Print.

Geertz, Clifford. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology.* New York:

    Basic Books, 1983. Print.

---. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author.* Stanford, CA: Stanford U.

    Press, 1988. Print.

George, Diana. "The Word on the Street – Public Discourse in a Culture of Disconnect."

    2002.

Gilroy, Paul. "After the love has gone": Bio-politics and etho-poetics in the Black public

    sphere. *Back to reality? Social experience and cultural studies.* A. McRobbie, Ed.

    Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1997. 83-115. Print.

Gilyard, Keith. "Higher Learning: Composition's Racialized Reflection." *Race Rhetoric, and*

Composition (1999): 44-52.

---. *Voice of the Self: A Study of Language Competence.* Detroit: Wayne State University

    Press, 1991. Print.

Glascott, Brenda. "Constricting Key Words: Rhetoric and Literacy in our History Writing."

    Literacy in Composition Studies 1 (2013): 18-25. Accessed 12 July 2015. Web.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for*

    Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967. Print.

Glasswell, Kathryn and George Kamberelis."Drawing and Redrawing the Map of

    Writing Studies." *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (2007): 304-323.

Goddu, Theresa A. *Gothic America: History, Narrative, and Nation.* New York: Columbia

    U. Press, 1997. Google Books. Accessed 18 August 2014. Web.

Gonzalez, Leonard. "Each One, Teach One: Starting a Poetry Class behind the Walls."

    Reflections 4.1 (2004): 88-90.

Graff, Gerald. *Beyond the Culture Wars: how teaching the conflicts can revitalize American*

    Education. New York: Norton and Co., 1992. Print.

Graff, Harvey J. "The Nineteenth-Century Origins of Our Times." *The Legacies of Literacy.*

    Bloomington: Indiana U. Press, 1987. Literacies: A Critical Source Book. Ellen

    Cushman et al. Eds. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 211-233. Print.

Graff, Richard and Wendy Winn. "Presencing" Communion" in Chaim Perelman's New

    Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 39.1 (2006): 45-71. Print.

Greenbaum, Andrea. *Emancipatory Movements in Composition: The Rhetoric of*

    Possibility. SUNY Press, 2012. Print.

Gross, Daniel. *The Secret History of Emotion: from Aristotle's Rhetoric to Modern Brain Science.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006. Print.

Guerino, Paul, Paige M. Harrison, and William J. Sabol. "Prisoners in 2010." U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Revised 2.9.12. Accessed 4 September 2013. Web.

Gusdorf, Georges. "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography." Trans. James Olney." *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. Print.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Vol. 2. New York: Beacon press, 1989. Print.

Han, Sora. "The Purloined Prisoner." *Theoretical Criminology*. 16.2 (2012): 157-174.

Hariman, Robert. "Prudence/Performance." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 21.2 (Spring 1991): 26-35. Print.

Hartman, Saidiya. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.

---. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux: 2008. Print.

Hartnett, Stephen John. "Introduction." *Challenging the Prison-Industrial Complex: Activism, Arts, Educational Alternatives*. U. of Illinois Press, 2010. Print.

Haswell, Richard. "NCTE/CCCC's Recent War on Scholarship." *Written Communication* 22.2 (2005): 198-223. Print.

Hauser, Gerard. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres.* Columbia, SC: U. of South Carolina Press, 1999. Print.

Henze, Brent, Wendy Sharer, and Janice Tovey. "4 Disciplinary Identities: Professional

Writing, Rhetorical Studies, and Rethinking "English"." *PERSPECTIVES ON*

WRITING: Composing and Writing Programs in Professional and Technical Writing.

Ed. Mike Palmquist. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearing House, 2010. 63. Accessed 29

August 2013. Web.

Herzberg, Bruce and Patricia Bizzell. *Negotiating Difference: Case Studies for*

Composition. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996. Print.

Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Teaching." *College Composition and*

Communication 45.3 (Oct., 1994): 307-319. JSTOR. Accessed 7 February 2014. Web.

Hess, Aaron. "Critical-Rhetorical Ethnography: Rethinking the Place and Process of

Rhetoric." *Communication Studies* 62.2 (2011): 127-152). Print.

Himley, Margaret. "Facing (Up To) 'The Stranger' in Community Service Learning."

College Composition and Communication, v55 n3 (Feb., 2004): 416-438. *JSTOR.*

Accessed 4 September 2013. Web.

Hirschinger-Blank, Nancy, Lori Simons, Laura Finley, Joseph Clearly, and Michael

Thoerig. "A Pilot Study of a Criminal Justice Service-Learning Course: the Value of

a Multicultural Approach." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in*

Higher Education. 25.1 (2013): 14-28. Print.

Hoad, T.F. *"*Testify." *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Etymology.* Oxford U. Press, 1996.

Oxford Online, updated 2003. Accessed 26 April 2014. Web.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan.* Revised Student Edition. Richard Tuck, Ed. Cambridge U. Press,

1996. Print.

Holland, Dorothy, and Naomi Quinn, Eds. *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Print.

Holsinger, Kristi. *Teaching Justice: Solving Social Justice Problems Through University*

   Education. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2012. Print.

hooks, bell. *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Howard, Robert Glenn. "A Theory of Vernacular Rhetoric: The Case of the Sinner's Prayer

   Online. *Folklore* 116.2 (August 2005): 172-188. Print.

Howell, James C. *Preventing and Reducing Juvenile Delinquency: A Comprehensive*

   Framework. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003. 2nd Ed. 2008

Hubbell, Harry M. "Introduction." *The Rhetorica of Philodemus.* Trans. Henry M. Hubbell.

   Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 23 (1920): 243-382.

   New Haven, CT: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. 1920. *Internet Archive.*

   Updated 31 December 2014. Accessed 29 June 2015. Web.

Huckin, Thomas, Jennifer Andrus, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. "Critical Discourse Analysis

   and Rhetoric and Composition." *College Composition and Communication*. 64.1

   (September 2012): 107-129. Print.

Inside Out Center, The."About Us." Temple University. Accessed 30 June 2014. Web.

---. "The Network." Temple University. Accessed 30 June 2014. Web.

---. "Programs." Temple University. Accessed 30 June 2014. Web.

Investigative News Network. "Pacific News Service/New America Media". Investigative

   News Network. Last Updated December 14 2014. Accessed 18 December 2014. Web.

Isaksen, Judy L. "From Critical Race Theory to Composition Studies: Pedagogy and

   Theory Building." The *Legal Studies Forum*. 24 (2000): 695. Print.

Jackson, Spoon and Judith Tannenbaum. *By Heart: Poetry, Prison, and Two Lives.* New

   York: New Village Press, 2010. Print.

Jackson, Spoon. "The Brave Six." Spoon Jackson Realness Network, 01 July 2012. Accessed 7

    April 2014. Web.

Jacobi, Tobi. "Slipping Pages through Razor Wire: Literacy Action Projects in Jail."

    Community Literacy. 2.2 (2008): 67-86. Print.

---. "Speaking Out for Social Justice: The Problems and Possibilities of US Women's

    Prisons and Jail Writing Workshops." *Critical Survey* 23.3 (2011): 40-54.

---. "Rewriting Confinement: Feminist and Queer Critical Literacy in SpeakOut! Writing

    Workshops." *Radical Teacher* No. 95 (Spring 2013): 32-40. Project Muse. Accessed

    Online 15 February 2014. Web.

Jacobi, Tobi and Elliott Johnston. "Writers Speaking Out: The Challenges of Community

    Publishing from Spaces of Confinement." Circulating Communities: The Tactics

    and Strategies of Community Publishing.

Jacobs, Dale. "What's Hope Got to Do with It? Towards a Pedagogy of Hope." *Journal of

    Advanced Composition* 25.4(2005): 782-802. Print.

James, William. "What Pragmatism Means." *Pragmatism: A Series of Lectures by William

    James, 1906-1907.* Rockville, MD: ArcManor LLC, 2008. Print.

Jarratt, Susan. "Becoming Rhetorical: Figuring Foucault's *Parrēsia*." "Forum on Arthur

    Walzer's "*Parrēsia,* Foucault, and the Classical Rhetorical Tradition." *RSQ* 43.4

    (2013): 361-367. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words*. Jarratt, Susan

    C., and Lynn Worsham, eds. New York: MLA, 1998. Print.

Jay, Gregory. "Service Learning, Multiculturalism, and the Pedagogies of Difference."

    Pedagogy: *Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Languages, Composition and*

Culture 8.2 (2008): 255-81). Print.

Journet, Debra. "Narrative Turns in Writing Studies Research." *Writing Studies Research*

in Practice: Methods and Methodologies. Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Eds.

Carbondale: Southern Illinios Univ. Press, 2012. Print.

Karpowitz, Daniel. "Prison, College, and the Paradox of Punishment." *Crime and*

Punishment: Perspectives from the Humanities. Studies in Law, Politics and

Society, Vol. 37 (2005): 305-331. Print.

Kennedy, George A. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton U.   Press,

2009. Print.

---. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Leiden, NL: The

Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. Print.

Kennedy, Tammie M., Joyce Irene Middleton, and Krista Ratcliffe. "The Matter of

Whiteness: Or, Why Whiteness Studies Is Important to Rhetoric and Composition

Studies." *Rhetoric Review* 24 (2005): 359-73.

Kerr, Tom."Between Ivy and Razor Wire: A Case of Correctional Correspondence."

Reflections, 4.1 (2004). Accessed 22 June 2015. Web.

---. Presentation, "Prison Writing and Critical Literacy." Session: "Opening Prison Gates:

Creating, Sustaining, Researching, and Extending Literacy Programs behind Bars."

Conference on College Composition and Communication. St. Louis, Mo: 21-24

March, 2012.

---. Press Release, "Trading Letters, Trading Places: One Cross-Country College-Prison

Collaboration," Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta,

April 6-9 2011. *Intercom.* Ithaca College. 20 April 2011. Accessed 4 September 2014.

Web.

---. "Prison U: How the Late Tookie Williams and Other Incarcerated Writers are

Teaching Us." Paumanok Lecture, Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus. 30

March 2006. *Google Scholar.* Accessed 15 February 2014. Web.

---. "Prison Writing and Critical Literacy." Unpublished Conference Paper. Conference on

College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO, 21 March 2012.

Kirsch, Gesa and Jacqueline Royster. "Feminist Rhetorical Practices: In Search of

Excellence."*College Composition and Communication* 61.4 (2010): 640–72. Print.

Kvale, S. S. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996. Print.

Lathan Rhea Estelle. "Testimony as a Sponsor of Literacy: Bernice Robinson and the South

Carolina Sea Island Citizenship Program's Literacy Activism." *Literacy, Economy,*

and Power: Writing and Research after "Literacy in American Lives. John Duffy et al

Eds. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U. Press, 2014. Print.

Lather, Patti. "Postmodernism, Post-structuralism, and (Post)Critical Ethnography: of

Ruins, Aporias, and Angels." 2001. *Handbook of Ethnography*. Paul Atkinson et al.,

Eds. Sage Publications, 2001. 477-489. Print.

Lopoo, Leonard M. and Bruce Western. "Incarceration and the Formation and Stability of

Marital Unions." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 67 (August 2005), 721-734. Print.

Lu, Ming Zhan and Bruce Horner. "The Problematic of Experience." *College English* 60.3

(March 1998): 257-277. Print.

Lucaites, John and Celeste Condit. "Re-constructing Narrative Theory: A Functional

Perspective. *Journal of Communication* 35 (1985): 90.)

Luke, Allan. "Theory and Practice in Discourse Analysis." *Norton Book of Composition*

      Studies. Ed. Susan Miller. New York: Norton and Co., 2009. Print. Catchings 78

Lynch, Mona. "Rehabilitation as Rhetoric: The Ideal of Reformation in Contemporary Parole

      Discourses and Practices." *Punishment and Society,* Vol. 2, No. 1 (2000): 40-65. Print.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *Le Différend.* Trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis, MN: U.

      of Minnesota Press, 1988. Print.

Madison, D. Soyini. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*. Sage

      Publications, 2011. Print.

Marcus, George. *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press,

      1998. Print.

Marcus, George E. "Rhetoric and the Ethnographic Genre in Anthropological Research."

      Current Anthropology. 21.4 (1980): 507-510. Print.

Martinot, Steve and Jared Sexton. "The Avant-garde of White Supremacy." *Social*

      Identities. 9.   2 (June 2003): 169-181. Print.

Massoglia, Michael. "Incarceration, Health, and Racial Disparities in Health." *Law and*

      Society Review. 42 (2008): 275-306. Print.

Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition.* Portsmouth:

      Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 2005. Print.

Matteson, John. *The Lives of Margaret Fuller: A Biography.* New York: W.W. Norton, Co.,

      2012. Print.

Maxwell, Joseph A. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand

      Oaks: Sage, 2012. Print.

McBride, Dwight. *Impossible Witness: Truth, Abolition, and Slave Testimony.* New York:

NYU Press, 2001. Print.

McCormick, Samuel. "Earning One's Inheritance: Rhetorical Criticism, Everyday Talk, and

the Analysis of Public Discourse." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89.2 (2003): 109-131.

Print.

McCurdy, David W., James P. Spradley, and Dianna J. Shandy. *The Cultural Experience:*

Ethnography in a Complex Society. Long Grove, IL: Waveland, 2005. Print.

McGushin, Edward F. *Foucault's* Askēsis*: An Introduction to the Philosophical Life.*

Northwestern U. Press, 2007. Print.

McKee, Heidi. "Your Views Showed True Ignorance!!!": (Mis)communication in an Online

Interracial Discussion Forum." *Computers and Composition*. 19.4 (2002). Elsevier.

Accessed 7 February 2014. Web.

McRuer, Robert. *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*. New York: New

York University Press, 2006. Print.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice and Taylor Carman. *Phenomenology of Perception.* Donald A.

Landes, Trans. New York: Routledge Press, 2012. Print.

Micchiche, Laura. "More than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work." *College*

English 64.4 (2002): 432-458. Print.

Middleton, Michael K., Samantha Senda-Cook, and Danielle Endres. "Articulating

Rhetorical Field Methods: Challenges and Tensions." *Western Journal of*

Communication 75.4 (July-September 2011): 386-406. Print.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded*

Sourcebook. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994. Print.

Mill, John S. and J. L. Laughlin. *Principles of Political Economy*. New York: D. Appleton,

1884. *Internet Archive.* Accessed 08 October 2013. Web.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* Vol. 70 (1984): 151-
167. Print.

Mintz, Sidney W. and Wolf, Eric R. "An Analysis of Ritual Co-parenthood
(Compadrazgo)." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 6 (1950): 341-367. Print.

Morrison, Toni. "Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination." *Modern
Philology* 92.2 (1994): 267-271. Print.

Munby, Jonathan. *Under a Bad Sign: Criminal Self-Representation in African-American
Popular Culture.* Chicago: U. Chicago Press, 2011. Print.

Myers-Lipton, S.J. "Effect of Service-Learning on College Students' Attitudes Toward
International Understanding." *Journal of College Student Development.* 37.6 (1996):
659-668. Print.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Program." Conference on College Composition
and Communication. St. Louis, MO: March 21 - March 24, 2012. Print.

Nehamas, Alexander. *The Art of Living: Socratic Reflections from Plato to Foucault.*
Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998. Print.

Newkirk, Thomas. "Seduction and betrayal in qualitative research." *Ethics and
Representation in Qualitative Studies of Literacy* (1996): 3-16. Web.

Newman, Lance. "Free Soil and the Abolitionist Forests of Frederick Douglass's "The
Heroic Slave". *American Literature* 81.1 (March 2009): 127-152.

Noblit, George W., Flores, Susana Y., and Murillo, Enrique G. "Postcritical Ethnography:
Reinscribing Critique." *Understanding Education and Politics.* Cress, NJ: Hampton
Press. 2004. Print.

Nunley, Vorris. *Keepin' It Hushed: The Barbershop and African American Hush Harbor*

      Rhetoric. Wayne State University Press, 2011. Print.

Ono, Kent. A., and Sloop, John M. "The Critique of Vernacular Discourse."

      Communication Monographs 62 (1995): 19–46. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary. "Curator." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford U. Press, 2014.

      Oxford English Dictionary Online. Accessed 2 February 2014. Web.

---. "Cure." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford U. Press, 2014. Oxford

      English Dictionary Online. Accessed 2 February 2014. Web.

Page, Joshua. "Eliminating the Enemy: The Import of Denying Prisoners Access to Higher

      Education in Clinton's America." *Punishment and Society*. 6 (2004): 357. Print.

Palta, Rina. "LA County's probation chief urges his employees to be honest." Southern

      California Public Radio. March 2013. Accessed 8 January 2015. Web.

Parks, Steven J. "Texts of Our Institutional Lives: Strategic Speculations on the Question

      of Value--The Role of Community Publishing in English Studies." *College English*,

      71.5 (May 2009): 506-527. Print. JSTOR. Accessed 2 September 2013. Web.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

      Print.

Peirce, Charles S. *Collected Writings*. Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss and Arthur W Burks,

      Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931-58. Print.

Plemons, Anna. "Color Theory for Writing Teachers." *ALT/SPACE: Teaching Artist Spaces*

      from the Field. August 13, 2013b. Accessed 15 February 2014. Web.

---. "Literacy as an Act of Creative Resistance: Joining the Work of Incarcerated

      Teaching Artists at a Maximum-Security Prison." *Community Literacy Journal*. 7.2

(2013): 39-52. Accessed 6 January 2014. Web.

---. "Spoon Jackson changed by writing not observation:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EaVfMYph9Ykandfeature=player_embedded#!.

" *Twitter,* #twt597. 06 September 2010. Accessed 4 September 2014. Web.

---. "Working in Impossible Places." *ALT/SPACE: Teaching Artist Spaces from the Field.*

November 12, 2012a. Accessed 15 February 2014. Web.

Pompa, Lori. "Disturbing Where We are Comfortable: Notes from Behind the Walls."

Reflections Vol. 4 No. 1 (2004). Web.

---. "Service-Learning as Crucible: Reflections on Immersion, Context, Power, and

Transformation." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Vol. 9 No. 1

(Fall 2002): 67-76.

Pough, Gwendolyn D. *Check It while I Wreck It: Black Womanhood, Hip-Hop Culture, and

The Public Sphere.* University Press of New England, 2004. Print.

---. "CCCC Chair's Address: It's Bigger than Comp/Rhet: Contested and *Un*disciplined."

College Composition and Communication, Vol. 63, No. 2

(December 2011): 301-313. Print.

Priest, Stephen. "Gnoseology." *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Second Edition. Ted

Honderich, Ed. Oxford U. Press, 2005. Oxford Reference Online. Accessed 10 April

2015. Web.

Puente, Teresa. "Professor Denies Tie to 1999 Bombing." *Chicago Tribune* 10 March 1999.

Chicagotribune.com. Accessed 16 April 2014. Web.

Rai, Candice. "Power, Publics, and Rhetorical Uses of Democracy." *The Public Work of

Rhetoric: Citizen-scholars and Civic Engagement*. John Ackerman and David

Coogan, Eds. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010. Print.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, and Whiteness.* Carbondale:

Southern Illinois U. Press, 1999. Print.

Ray, Kali O. "History." *Marcus Bookstores.* San Francisco, CA 2012. Accessed 29 March 2014.

Web.

Redd, Theresa M. "Tryin to Make a Dolla Outa Fifteen Cent": Teaching Composition with

the Internet at an HBCU." *Computers and Composition.* 20.4 (2003). Elsevier.

Accessed 7 February 2014. Web.

Reiff, Mary Jo. "The Spatial Turn in Rhetorical Genre Studies: Intersections of *Metaphor and*

Materiality". *JAC* Vol. 31, No. 1-2 (2011). Print.

Reilly, Ryan J. "Eric Holder Outlining New Justice Sentencing Reforms." *Huffington Post*

August 12 2013. Huffingtonpost.com, accessed 4 September 2013. Web.

Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference.*

Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004. Print.

Richardson, Elaine. "Coming from the Heart: African American Students and Literacy

Stories." Richardson, Elaine B, and Ronald L. Jackson. *African American Rhetoric(s):*

Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Print.

---. *Hiphop Literacies.* New York: Routledge Press, 2006. Print.

Ricoeur, Paul. "The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling." *Critical*

Inquiry, Vol. 5, No. 1, Special Issue on Metaphor. (Autumn 1978): 143-159. JSTOR.

Accessed 28 October 2014. Web.

Riles, Annelise. *Documents: Artifacts of Modern Knowledge.* Ann Arbor, MI: U. of Michigan

      Press, 2006. Print.

Robinson, Cedric. *Forgeries of Memory and Meaning: Blacks and the Regimes of Race in*

      American Theater and Film Before World War II. Chapel Hill, NC: U. of North Carolina

      Press, 2007. Print.

Rodríguez, Dylan. "Against Prison Writing." *Genre* XXXV (Fall/Winter) 2002: 407-428.

      Accessed 24 April 2012. Web.

---. Forced *Passages: Imprisoned Radical Intellectuals and the U.S. Prison*

      Regime. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006. Print.

Rogers, Laura. "Where Lifelines Converge: Voices from the Forrest Correctional Creative

      Writing Group." *Reflections* Vol. 4, No. 1 (2004): 12-23. Print.

---. "Diving in to Prison Teaching: Mina Shaughnessy, Teacher Development, and the

      Realities of Prison Teaching." *Reflections* Vol. 8 (2008/9): 99-121. Accessed 4

      October 2013. Web.

---. "'The Secret Soul of Prisoners:' A Different Prison Teaching Story. *Open Words* (Fall

      2011): 60-78). Accessed 8 July 2014. Web.

Rolston, Simon. "Conversion and the Story of the American Prison." *Critical Survey*, Volume

      23, Number 3 (2011) 103-118. Print.

---. *Narratives of Conversion and Coercion: American Prison Life Writing since*

      1945. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2010. Accessed 12 October 2011.

      Web.

Rooney, Ellen and Gayatri Spivak. "'In a Word: Interview." *Differences,* 1.2 (1993): 124–56.

      Reprinted in Gayatri Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching*. Machine (New York and

London: Routledge, 1993. 1–26. Print.

Rose, Mike. *Lives on The Boundary: The Struggles and Achievements of America's Underprepared*. New York: Free Press, 1989. Print.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." *College Composition and Communication* 47.1 (February 1996): 29-40. Print.

Rumsey, Suzanne Kesler. "Family History Writing: A Prototype for Local Service Learning." *Community Works Journal*. 2010. communityworksinstitute.org. Accessed 3 September 2013. Web.

Ryden, Wendy and Ian Marshall. *Reading, Writing, and The Rhetorics of Whiteness*. Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Communication. New York: Routledge Press, 2012. Print.

Ryder, Phyllis Mentzell. *Rhetorics for Community Action: Public Writing and Writing Publics.* Lanham: Rolling and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011.

Sakala, Leah. "Breaking Down Mass Incarceration in the 2010 Census: State-by-State Incarceration Rates by Race/Ethnicity." *Prison Policy Institute.* 28 May 2014. Accessed 29 June 2015. Web.

Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers.* London: Sage Publications, 2009. Print.

Saltmarsh, John, and Edward Zlotkowski. *Higher education and democracy: Essays on Service-Learning and Civic Engagement.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2011. Print.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. "Crime and Deviance in the Life Course." *American Sociological Review* 18 (1992): 63-84. Print.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics.* 1916. Trans. Wade Baskin. London:

 Fontana/Collins, 1974. Print.

Scott, Dominic. *Plato's Meno*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.

Sentencing Project, The. "Felony Disenfranchisement Laws in the United States." *The*

 Sentencing Project. September 2008. Accessed 04 June 2009. Web.

Sexton, Jared. *Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism.*

 Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.

---. "People-of-Color-Blindness: Notes on the Afterlife of Slavery." *Social Text*, 28.2 (2010):

 31-56. Accessed June 27 2012. Web.

Shaw, Shaka. "The Difference between Rap and Hip Hop: Shaka Shaw weighs in on the

 musical battle between generations." *Ebony.com,* 19 September 2013. Accessed 21

 March 2014. Web.

Shoemaker, Donald J. *Juvenile Delinquency.* Lanhanm Maryland: Rowan and Littlefield,

 2009. Print.

Shor, Ira and Paulo Freire. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming*

 Education. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc. 1987. Print.

Smith, Caleb. The Prison and the American Imagination. New Haven: Yale University

 Press, 2009. Print.

Smith, Sidonie. *Where I'm Bound: Patterns of Slavery and Freedom in Black American*

 Autobiography. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974. Print.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America.* Detroit: Wayne

 State U. Press, 1977. Print.

---. Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans. New York: Routledge Press,

  2006. Print.

---. *Black Talk: Words and Phrases from the Hood to the Amen Corner.* 1994

Solchack, Vivian. "A Leg to Stand On: Prosthetics, Metaphor, and Materiality." *The*

  Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Marquard

  Smith, Joanne Morra, Eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006. Print.

Spillers, Hortense. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar book." *Diacritics,*

  17.2 (1987): 65-81. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?." *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture.*

  Urbana, IL: U. of Illinois Press, 1988. 271-313.

Stepto, Robert. "I Rose and Found My Voice: Narration, Authentication, and Authorial

  Control in Four Slave Narratives." *Behind the Veil: A Study of Afro-American*

  Narratives. U. of Illinois Press, 1991. Print.

Strauss, Anselm L. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists.* Cambridge University Press,
  1987. Print.
Street, Brian. *Literacy in Theory and Practice.* Vol. 9. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
  Print.
---. *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Vol. 23. Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.

---. *Literacies Across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching*. Philadelphia:

  Caslon Pub, 2005. Print.

---. "New Literacy Studies and the Continua of Biliteracy." *Educational Linguistics in*

  Practice: Applying the Local Globally and the Global Locally. Francis M. Hult, Kendall

  A. King, Eds. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2011. Print.

---. "What's "New" in New Literacy Studies? Critical Approaches to Literacy in Theory and

  Practice." *Current Issues in Comparative Education,*Vol. 5, No. 2 (2003): 77-91. Print.

Taylor, Todd. "The Persistence of Difference in Networked Classrooms: Non-Negotiable

    Difference and The African American Student Body." *Computers and Composition*,

    Vol. 4, No. 2 (1997): 169-178. JSTOR. Accessed online 9 September 2013. Web.

Thomas, Jim. *Doing Critical Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1993.

    Print.

Tomlinson, Elizabeth C. "Mediation and Legal Literacy." *Community Literacy Journal*

    (Spring 2011): 75-100. Accessed 26 October 2013. Web.

Toole, Gerald. *An Autobiography of Gerald Toole, the State's Prison Convict, who Murdered*

    Daniel Webster ... Written by Himself. Hartford, CT: Press of Case, Lockwood and Co.,

    1862. *Internet Archive.* Accessed 9 September 2010. Web.

Tracy, Karen, James P. McDaniel, and Bruce E. Gronbeck. *The Prettier Doll: Rhetoric,*

    Discourse, and Ordinary Democracy. University of Alabama Press, 2007. Print.

Tuell, Cynthia. "Composition Teaching as 'Women's Work': Daughters, Handmaids,

    Whores, and Mothers." *Writing Ourselves into the Story*. Sheryl I. Fontaine, Susan

    Hunter, Eds. Carbondale, IL: Southern IL University Press, 1993. Print.

Tyler, Stephen A. *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern*

    World. Madison, WI: U. of Wisconsin Press, 1987. Print.

U.S. Census Bureau. "Table 1. Population by Sex and Age, for Black Alone and White

    Alone, Not Hispanic: 2011." Updated 6 April 2013. Accessed 30 June 2014. Web.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). "Information Sheet - Guidance for

    Institutional Review Boards and Clinical Investigators." FDA.gov. Updated 25 June

    2014. Accessed 7 January 2015. Web.

U.S. Supreme Court. Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 1966.

Uchill, Rebecca. "Hanging Out, Crowding Out, or Talking Things Out: Curating the

      Limits of Discursive Space." *Journal of Curatorial Studies* 1.1 (2012): 26-43. Print.

Uggen, Christopher and Jeffrey Manza. "Democratic Contraction? Political Consequences of

      Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States." American Sociological Review. Vol.

      67 (December 2002): 777-803. Print.

Uggen Christopher, Jeffrey Manza and Angela Behrens. "Less Than the Average Citizen:

      Stigma, Role Transition and the Civic Reintegration of Convicted Felons." *After*

      Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration. Shadd Maruna and

      Russell Immarigeon, ed. Portland: Willan, 2004. Print. 258-290.

Useem, Bert and Peter Kimball. *States of Siege: U.S. Prison Riots 1971-1986*. Oxfort: Oxford

      U. Press, 1989. Print.

Van Maanen, John. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Second Edition. Chicago:

      U. of Chicago Press, 2011. Print.

Villacorte, Christina. "LA County Probation Department sees 46 employee arrests this

      year." Los Angeles Daily News 9 December 2012. Accessed 8 January 2015. Web.

Villanueva, Victor. *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color*. Urbana, Ill: National

      Council of Teachers of English, 1993. Print.

Vivian, Bradford. "Parrēsia and the Problem of Rhetorical Speech." *RSQ* 43.1 (2013): 367-

      373. Print.

Vlachos, Archimandrite Hierotheos. *The Illness and Cure for the Soul in the Orthodox*

      Tradition. Effie Mavromichali, Trans. Levadia: Birth of the Theotokos Monastery

      Press, 1993. Print.

Vujisic, Zoran. "The Impact Of Orthodox Christian Neptic-Psychotherapeutic Interventions On Self-Reported Depressive Symptomatology And Comorbid Anxiety." Dissertation. Praetoria: University of South Africa, 2009. UNISA Institutional Repository. Accessed 10 April 2015. Web.

Wacquant, Loïc. "From Slavery to Mass Incarceration: Rethinking the 'race question' in the US." *New Left Review*, 13 (Jan/Feb 2002): 41-60. Print.

Wakefield, Sara. "Parental Disruption of Another Sort? Parental Imprisonment and Children's Mental Health and Well-Being." Paper presented at the Annual Workshop on Criminology and Population Dynamics, June 1-2, 2009, in Baltimore, Md. Print.

Walzer, Arthur E. *"Parrē*sia, Foucault, and the Classical Rhetorical Tradition." *RSQ* 43.1 (2013): 1-21. Print.

Warnick, Barbara. "Judgment, Probability, and Aristotle's Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 9 (1989): 299-311. Print.

Weiler, Kathleen. *Feminist Engagements: Reading, Resisting, and Revisioning Male Theorists in Education and Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Wells, Susan. "Rogue Cops and Healthcare: What Do We Want from Public Writing?". *College Composition and Communication*, 47.3 (Oct. 1996): 325-341. Print.

Western, Bruce and Katherine Beckett. "How Unregulated Is the U.S. Labor Market? The Penal System as a Labor Market Institution?" *American Journal of Sociology*. 104.4 (January 1999): 1030-60. Print.

Wetzel, Grace and "Wes." "Prison Collaborative Writing." *Reflections,* 12.2 (Spring 2013): 66-87. Accessed 25 August 2014. Web.

Wheeler, Lesley. "On Capstones, Service Learning, and Poetry." *Profession.* 207-219.

MLAjournals.org. Accessed 3 September 2013. Web.

White, Mark Bernard. "The Rhetoric of Edification: African American Didactic Literature

and the Ethical Function of Epideictic." *Howard Journal of Communication* 9.2

(1998): 125-136. Print.

Wilburg, Peter. *The Therapist as Listener: Martin Heidegger and the Missing Dimension of*

*Counseling and Psychotherapy Training.*UK: New Gnosis Publications, 2004. Google

Books. Accessed 16 May 2014. Web.

Wilderson, Frank. "Gramsci's Black Marx: Whither the Slave?". Social Identities, Vol. 9,

No. 2 (2003): 225-240. Print.

---. "Hegemony's (Silent) Scandal." Joy James, Ed. *War in the American*

Homeland. Durham: Duke U. Press, 2007. Print.

---. *Red, White, and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms*.

Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Wolcott, Henry F. "On Ethnographic Intent." *Interpretive Ethnography of Education at*

Home and Abroad. George and Louise Spindler, Eds. 2014. First published 1987 by

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. New York: Psychology Press, 2014. Print.

Wright, Randall. "Care as the 'heart' of prison teaching." *Journal of Correctional*

Education, 55, No. 3 (2004): 191-210.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. "Women's Lament and the Neuming of the Classics." *Music and*

Medieval Manuscripts: Paleography and Performance; Essays Dedicated to Andrew

Hughes. John Haines, Ed. Ashgate, 2004. Print.

Zwarg, Christina. "Feminism in Translation: Margaret Fuller's *Tasso.*" *Studies in*

Romanticism, 29.3 (Fall 1990): 463-490. *JSTOR.* Accessed 17 October 2013. Web.

APPENDIX A

Citation Key for Exchanges between Purp and The Beat Within

Poem No.[a]	Publication (Vol./No./Date)
1	*BW* 13(41), 26.
2	*BW* 13(41), 27.
3	*BW* 13(41), 29.
4	*BW* 13(42), 23.
5	*BW* 13(42), 24.
10	*BW* 13(48), 12.
12	*BW* 14(01), 28.
14	*BW* 14(02), 5.
16	*BW* 14(09), 12.
17	*BW* 14(09), 18.
18	*BW* 14(09) 28.
19	*BW* 14(10), 26.
20	*BW* 14(11), 20.
25	*BW* 14(27), 17.
26	*BW* 14(27), 25.
28	*BW* 14(29), 26.

Note. In-text citations of Purp notated with numeral only; editor responses notated with the suffix, -b.

[a] Omitted numbers in this sequence represent exchanges between Purp and *The Beat* not cited in this analysis; I preserve this sequence to retain a sense of the full chronology of communications.

APPENDIX B

PROTOCOL NARRATIVE FOR EXPEDITED OR FULL COMMITTEE RESEARCH

University of California, Irvine
Institutional Review Board
Version: May 2011

IMPORTANT: CAREFULLY READ THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR EACH SECTION
BEFORE COMPLETING THE PROTOCOL NARRATIVE.

WHEN CUTTING AND PASTING FROM ANOTHER APPLICATION OR
PROTOCOL,   PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE INFORMATION IS COMPLETE,
SUPPLEMENTED   WHERE NECESSARY, PASTED IN A LOGICAL ORDER,
AND IS RELEVANT TO   THE SPECIFIC SECTION.

NEED HELP? CONTACT THE HRP STAFF FOR ASSISTANCE.

<div align="right">

HS#:_____

For IRB Office Use Only

</div>

Lead Researcher Name: Elizabeth Catchings
Study Title: "Gauging Writing Practices and Perceptions of Publication for Detained
Juveniles in *The Beat* Within Rehabilitative Writing Program: A Qualitative Study"

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Provide a non-technical summary of the proposed research project that can be
understood by IRB members with varied research backgrounds, including non-scientists
and community members. The summary should include a brief statement of the purpose
of the research and related theory/data supporting the intent of the study as well as a
brief description of the procedure(s) involving human subjects. *This summary should not
exceed ½ page.*

This study aims to determine how detained youth see the relationship between their
impulses to write, the writing workshops provided by *The Beat* Within, and their role as
writers for an audience beyond themselves - including peers, the probation institution,
and the world outside. Through a series of interviews at three facilities, the study will
examine the writing workshop-to-publication process, as *The Beat* Within program
publishes a bi-weekly newsletter featuring juvenile submissions generated during their
weekly visits. Data gathered will be coded and analyzed using critical discourse analysis
for purposes of scholarly publication in the genre of Writing Studies for the field of
Composition, and by *The Beat* Within for program evaluation.

The study is shaped mainly by Composition Studies, with a focus on Public Writing. As the field of Composition has a historical interest in how personal narratives affect both critical literacy and civic engagement, this study aims to discern the extent to which life writing effectively performs those tasks in a detained youth facility. Composition Studies has taken particular interest in prison writing subjects in recent years, but no study has looked at this unique population as a means of understanding where correctional discipline, rehabilitative discourse, and writing-as-empowerment overlap, either from the standpoint of theories of the Public Sphere, or from the standpoint of a qualitative, "Writing Studies" orientation. I intend to perform a Grounded Theory-based, critical discourse analysis as a means of situating more accurately this population's lived experience within the discipline's theoretical concerns. It is also informed, however, by the work of Prison Studies, in ways I will detail more fully below.

SECTION 1: PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

1. Describe the purpose of the research project and state the overall objectives, specific aims, hypotheses (or research question) and scientific or scholarly rationale for performing the study.
2. Provide the relevant background information on the aims/hypotheses (or research question) to be tested and the procedures/products/techniques under investigation.
3. Include a description of the predictor and outcome variables, as appropriate.
4. Include a critical evaluation of existing knowledge, and specifically identify the information gaps that the project intends to address.
5. Describe previous research with animals and/or humans that provides a basis for the proposed research. Include references/citations, as applicable.
This section should not exceed 4 pages.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which a pedagogy of public writing in the composition classroom might be informed by what we learn about how rehabilitative "therapy writing" in a juvenile detention facility, and its subsequent circulation via publication, condition the thoughts and emotions of the detained writing subject towards civic engagement. In so doing, I hope to gain a fuller understanding of the way in which Public Writing's use of liberationist pedagogies (Freire 1993, Lee 2000) in Composition Studies, critical ethnographic method (Brodkey 1987, Villanueva 1993), and life-writing (Blanchot 2000, hooks 1990) constitute viable avenues for developing critical consciousness and a sense of political agency. At the same time, Foucault and radical Prison Studies scholars such as Angela Davis (1998), Colin Dayan (2001), and Dylan Rodriguez (2006) provide valuable insight into the ways in which powerful structural forces shape and undermine the subjectivities of prison populations in ways not experienced by the writing citizen-subject addressed in most Composition research.

However, I resist offering any kind of hypothesis about my findings, precisely because

the two fields in question -- Composition Studies and Prison Studies -- tend toward neater characterizations of hope or despair. Publications in the field of Composition often use language of optimism (Baca 2002, Coogan 2009), transcendence (Pompa 2004), and empowerment (Waxler 2008) when discussing writing programs in detention facilities, while Prison Studies scholarship suggests prisoners' writings fall into two categories: valiant resistance against a terminally oppressive system (Franklin 1989, Rodriguez 2006, Davis 1998), or deluded submission to carceral domination (Rodriguez 2003, Simon 2003). While their research helps articulate the systemic oppression perpetuated by corrective institutions, the aesthetics of this discourse -- in part motivated by scholarship, in part by political activism -- is insufficient to the task of explaining how such corrective and rehabilitative institutions participate in cultural discourses not exclusively grounded in discipline, punishment, or hegemonic domination. Furthermore, scholars in this genre write primarily about adult prisons, and do not address the unique liminal space that is the juvenile detention facility, where correction is only one of many institutional objectives. Therefore, I believe that the proposed qualitative study, using the words of the youth writers themselves, can reveal a great deal about the extent to which this population uses expressive, therapeutic writing to exercise different kinds of personal agency -- agency that resists flat characterizations of the discourses and interpersonal relationships at work in the institutions where these detained youth reside.

EXISTING RESEARCH on DETAINED YOUTH, THERAPY WRITING: There is a large body of scholarship across social-scientific disciplines that examines the psycho-social development of detained youth, from Steinberg, Cauffman *et al'*s 2009 study on the population's ability to accept criminal responsibility, to Uggen and Manza's 2002 study on failed literacy as a predictor of incarceration. Yet, these fields do not address the expressive writing workshop as a discursive intervention that would have bearing on juvenile development of civic empowerment. There is even a Stanford outcomes study on juveniles writing for *The Beat* Within (Velez-Young 2009). However, this study mainly concludes that participating youth *like* the program and its volunteers, even though they don't consider themselves writers -- and one of the more interesting research questions posed, about possible unintended consequences of the program, remains unanswered. My study aims to go beyond whether the youth like the program to gauge their attitudes about what they think writing and publication *do* for a writer in or out of detention, and the extent to which the practices of writing and publication can offer any meaningful intervention on either a personal or a community-based level. There is also research on the effects of writing for adult incarcerated populations; Richards, Beal, Seagal and Pennebaker (2000) tested the physical effects of psychiatric prisoners writing about trauma, concluding that it has a positive physical effect even when asked to write about a trauma they did not experience. My research, however, is interested not in a correlation between writing and health outcomes, but rather in the way in which various discourses around the exercise of writing may contribute to a sense of conscious self-regulation or desire to engage with various "publics" in the world beyond the immediate carceral setting.

To this end, though the primary site of my investigation is the youth writers themselves,

I will also be interviewing writing program volunteers (to whom I will henceforth refer as *volunteers*) and probation staff (to whom I will henceforth refer as *counselors,* the term used by the probation institution itself), to gauge the extent to which their expectations about the writing practice influence or overlap with those of the youth themselves. By triangulating the responses of these three main groups involved in *The Beat*'s writing program, I hope to be able to corroborate some of the responses the youth provide by virtue of the regular observations made available through probation counselors and the writing program volunteers who teach the youth week after week.

VARIABLES: This study is designed to sample attitudes about *The Beat* Within writing program at a single point in time, and therefore will not measure any kind of change. Furthermore, as there will be no significant statistical analysis, I will not identify either predictor or outcome variables. In terms of outcome variables, the only change that the study attempts to gauge is the three groups' *perceptions* of the extent to which being in the writing program changes youth attitudes towards either the institution, or their interpersonal relationships. However, as I will replicate two of the youth-focused questions posed in the 2009 Stanford study - including what youth participants might change about the program, and what they think of the volunteers -- one might be able to perform a secondary analysis on these findings to discern a shift in program effectiveness contingent upon any programmatic changes that have taken place since 2009. However, this will not be part of my analysis.

SECTION 2: ROLES AND EXPERTISE OF THE STUDY TEAM

List all study team members below.

1. Identify each member's position (e.g., Associate Professor, graduate or undergraduate student) and department, and describe his or her qualifications, level of training and expertise. Include information about relevant licenses/medical privileges, as applicable.
2. Describe each team member's specific role and responsibility on the study.
3. Faculty Sponsors - list as Co-Researchers and describe their role on the project; include oversight responsibilities for the research study.
4. Explain who will have access to subject identifiable data.
5. Indicate who will be involved in recruitment, informed consent process, research procedures/interventions, and analysis of data.

Lead Researcher:
Elizabeth Catchings, M.A., Dept. of English - Lead Researcher will conduct all interviews, code all data, perform analysis, and assemble results. The Lead Researcher has previous volunteer experience teaching rehabilitative writing in juvenile facilities and is familiar with security protocols and the rituals assoc-iated with writing in these settings. Only

the Lead Researcher will have access to subject-identifiable data. Only the Lead Researcher will be involved in the recruitment, informed consent process, and development/execution of research procedures. Analysis of data will be supported by Faculty Sponsor Jonathan Alexander, insofar as he will verify the accuracy of the Coding Scheme developed (confirming inter-rater reliability).

Co-Researcher(s):
Jonathan Alexander, Professor of English, Chancellor's Fellow, Campus Writing Director (Faculty Sponsor) - Professor Alexander will serve in an advisory capacity for whatever site-specific challenges, methods-based issues, or problems with analysis arise over the course of this study. He will also perform secondary discourse analysis on a selection of coded data to assure inter-rater reliability of the coding schema. Jonathan Alexander, Faculty Sponsor, will not have access to subject-identifiable data. Jonathan Alexander serves strictly in an advisory capacity for the development of research procedures; the design and implementation of recruitment, informed consent process, and research procedures will be undertaken by Lead Researcher Elizabeth Catchings alone. Jonathan Alexander will, however, support data analysis by verifying the accuracy of the Lead Researcher's Coding Scheme.

Research Personnel:
none

SECTION 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/STUDY PROCEDURES

A. Study Design and Procedures

1. Provide a detailed chronological description of all study activities (e.g., pilot testing, screening, intervention/interaction/data collection, and follow-up) and procedures. Include an explanation of the study design (e.g., randomization, placebo-controlled, cross-sectional, longitudinal, etc.)
   a. Indicate how much time will be required of the subjects, per visit and in total for the study.
   b. Indicate the setting where each procedure will take place/be administered (e.g. via telephone, clinic setting, classroom, via email). *Note: If any of the procedures will take place at off-campus locations (e.g., educational institutions, businesses, organizations, etc) Letters of Permission are required.*
   c. If a procedure will be completed more than once (e.g., multiple visits, pre and post survey), indicate how many times and the time span between administrations.
2. For studies that involve routine (standard of care) medical procedures:

Make clear whether procedures are being done for clinical reasons or for study purposes, including whether the procedures are being done more often because of the study. Use the following guidelines to determine the extent to which standard procedures and their associated risks need to be described in protocol:

a. If the standard procedure is not explicitly required by the study protocol, the protocol need not describe that procedure or its risks.

b. If the standard procedure is a main focus of the study (e.g., one or more arms of a randomized study is standard) or is explicitly required by the study protocol, the protocol must include a full description of the procedure and its risks.]

3. It is strongly recommended that you include a table of visits, tests and procedures. Tables are easier to understand and may help to shorten long repeated paragraphs throughout the narrative.

4. If study procedures include collecting photographs, or audio/video recording, specify whether any subject identifiable information will be collected and describe which identifiers will be collected, if any.

5. Describe how the subject's privacy will be protected during the research procedures. *Note: This is not the same as confidentiality (see the Privacy and Confidentiality web page).*

6. Be sure to submit data collection instruments for review with your e-IRB Application (e.g., measures, questionnaires, interview questions, observational tool, etc.).

---

1. METHODOLOGY: In order to perform a critical discourse analysis, this study uses mixed methods and sources, drawing on both publicly available archival texts (*The Beat Within* publication, its organizational and training literature, and goal statements from participating juvenile institutions), and interviews with the youth, Beat Within volunteers, and Probation counselors. For this reason, I will employ qualitative-based, critical discourse analysis on interview data, using Grounded Theory and critical phenomenological approaches to institutions and work (Ahmed 2006, Dorothy Smith 2006). Interview design is in part informed by work in forensic psychology (Loftus, *et al* 1978, Loftus 2005), so as to avoid language that might coach or pressure subjects to respond or remember experiences in particular ways.

2. PILOT TESTING: I have used an unpublished 2009 Stanford study for the Department of Education (Velez-Young) as a pilot test to gauge existing research and relationships with this organization, initial attitudes of the youth population under investigation, as well as the variance in style and complexity of responses to a similar series of questions.

PILOT STUDY DESIGN: The researcher conducted two phases of ethnographic field work, including
    1) Observation of Beat Within workshops conducted in the detention center's school classrooms;
    2) Structured interviews to capture educational histories of youth participants with 16% of those observed in the workshop setting, (51 interviews total); and

3) Structured interviews with Beat Within volunteers and Probation counselors, occurring between 2-10 times over the course of one year.

4) Youth participants were given snacks as "appreciation" for their participation; detention school teachers hosting Beat Within workshops observed were given $20 gift cards.

Observation was concurrent with the Lead Researcher's tenure as a teacher in the detention center's school from 2006-2008, capturing observation of 37% of the facility's entire youth population; interviews took place over the course of two weeks in 2008. Analysis was conducted using a sequence of open coding, focused coding, and close analysis of interview data, derived from methods of Wieder (1974).

PARTICIPANT POPULATIONS:

- YOUTH: The participant population were housed at the Santa Clara County Juvenile Detention Facility in San Jose. The study sampled youth in Detention Education classrooms, totaling 90 youth between the ages of 10-19; those chosen for structured interviews had been sentenced from five months to two years. Their tenure with *The Beat* Within varied from one month to two years.
- COUNSELORS and VOLUNTEERS: The Probation counselors and volunteers sampled were selected solely on availability and affiliation with *The Beat* Within program.

FINDINGS of the STUDY: Findings focused on the following:

- That 57% of juvenile writers do not already consider themselves "writers;"
- That 89% of juvenile writers record positive relationships with Beat Within volunteer instructors, suggesting the program's potential as positive mentoring model;
- That reading *The Beat* Within publication improves juvenile literacy; and that
- The juveniles write in order to receive recognition.

RECRUITMENT STATUS: This study is closed; there is no active recruitment.

3. SCREENING, CASE SELECTION: There are three groups to be interviewed in the current study: 1) detained youth in *The Beat* Within's program, 2) volunteers who teach *The Beat* Within workshops, and 3) Probation counselors who observe the program in session. Because the program spans different research sites, I will be conducting the study with all three groups for three separate sites.

- <u>YOUTH:</u> Because the eligible population is relatively small, the study will focus on a small number of participants for a case study. Participants will be selected according to the following criteria: a) their exposure to the program via attendance of weekly Beat Within workshops; b) their age, ideally (but not necessarily) between 16-19 years of age, to ensure the required degree of intellectual maturity for the questions posted; and c) their tenure in the facility - specifically, they will need to have participated in at least two weeks worth of Beat Within workshops, and read or submitted material to at least one edition of the Beat Within newsletter. I hope to secure the participation of 20 youth participants per research site, for a total of 60. Some youth (those between 18-19 years old) will actually be considered adults, and those 16-17 will be considered Child/Minors.
- <u>VOLUNTEERS:</u> The case selection for this group is smaller, as a select group of

adults over the age of 18, non-incarcerated Beat Within volunteers conducts workshops of up to 20 students per class per week. This group, too, will fall under a case study, and will be selected according to their tenure with the program (at least 3 months). I select for a lower threshold of program participation because of the high turnover of *The Beat*'s all-volunteer pool. I hope to secure the participation of 4-6 volunteers per research site, for a total of 12-18.

- COUNSELORS: The case selection for this group will derive from those Probation counselors over the age of 18 who are familiar with the program, and have observed both workshops and their effects on the youth participants for at least 6 months. I hope to secure the participation of 4-6 counselors per research site, for a total of 12-18.

4. DATA COLLECTION: Data collected will be audio recordings of interview responses for all three groups at all three research sites, with self-identification discouraged, to then be de-identified and randomized for coding. Data between the three research sites will be combined with all other coded responses for the final report.

5. STUDY DESIGN: This study is designed to capture a snapshot of attitudes and perceptions about *The Beat* Within writing program at three different juvenile facilities. Interviewee responses will be cross-assessed with *The Beat* Within's own verbiage about the program and what it hopes to accomplish, available as part of volunteer training materials and *The Beat* Within's website and strategic plan. It will also be cross-assessed with interviews by Beat Within volunteers and Probation counselors about the writing program, so as to gauge the extent to which institutional and Beat Within programmatic aims overlap with how the youth themselves see the writing and publication process.

- YOUTH: After obtaining consent from the court and the Institutional Review Board, I will, at a regularly scheduled Beat Within writing workshop, solicit participation in a standardized, 25-question, open-ended interview about the Beat Within workshop and publication process, using a recruitment form. Signing the recruitment form, however, expresses only interest, and not consent, as that will be provided verbally at the beginning of the interview, after youth have had at least one week to read the Study Information Sheet (See Appendices P for why this study opts for verbal as opposed to written consent/assent, per the IRB's request). For youth under 18 interested in the study, the Lead Researcher will secure parental/guardian permission; all youth will be provided with the Study Information Sheet to study over the course of at least one week so that they have time to raise any questions or concerns before the interview occurs. Then, the lead researcher will coordinate with probation counselors to arrange a schedule during which interviews may take place. Following verbal consent, interviews will be conducted focus-group style, in groups of three, so as to replicate the openness of the Beat Within workshop discussion setting on a more intimate scale, thereby reducing peer pressure to respond in particular ways, but facilitating comfort with the interviewer. Interviews will include a snack (Facility-approved chips, or candy, etc.), as the interview is long, and it demarcates this time as recreational, rather than as a chore or more corrections-based evaluation, so as to a) incentivize participation; and b) provide a sense of ease about the interview in-progress. Finally, interviews will be audio-recorded on a

password-protected smartphone, to be later de-identified from any names or nick-names given in the interview when it is coded for analysis.

- VOLUNTEERS: After obtaining consent from the Institutional Review Board, I will solicit participation of adult (over the age of 18) Beat Within volunteers via email for a standardized, 20-question, open-ended interview about the Beat Within workshop and publication process. After gaining verbal consent from participants, interviews will be conducted in person, one on one, and will be audio-recorded on a password-protected smartphone, de-identified from any names or nick-names given in the interview, and coded for analysis. Appendix P - Volunteers indicates why verbal as opposed to written consent best secures the confidentiality of the youth workshop participants about whom volunteers will be asked in the interview.

- COUNSELORS: After obtaining consent from the IRB, I will solicit participation of eligible Probation counselors (adults over the age of 18) via the Detention Facility Superintendent, or other Administrator in charge for a standardized, 14-question, open-ended interview about the Beat Within workshop and publication process. After gaining verbal consent from participants, interviews will be conducted in person, one on one, and will be on a password-protected smartphone, de-identified from any names or nick-names given in the interview, and coded for analysis. Appendix P - Volunteers indicates why verbal as opposed to written consent best secures the confidentiality of the youth workshop participants about whom counselors will be asked in the interview.

6. TIME REQUIRED of PARTICIPANTS:
- YOUTH: The initial solicitation and scheduling should take no more than 15 minutes of the subjects' time. The youth interested in participation will have at least one week to read the Study Information Sheet and generate any questions or concerns before providing verbal consent (over 18)/assent (under 18). The interview itself should take 45 minutes to an hour to accommodate responses from all three focus group members. They will answer a series of 25 open-ended questions in five categories: Workshop, Emotion, Mentorship, Rehabilitation, and Publication. However, participants will not be told what those 5 categories are, to keep the interview as close to an organic conversation as possible. Unless there is some interruption, preventing completion of the interview, no follow-up will be necessary.

- VOLUNTEERS: The initial solicitation and scheduling should take no more than 15 minutes of the subjects' time. The volunteers interested in participation will have at least one week to read the Study Information Sheet and generate any questions or concerns before providing verbal consent. The interview itself should take 30-45 minutes. They will answer a series of 20 open-ended questions in five categories: Workshop, Emotion, Mentorship, Rehabilitation, and Publication. However, participants will not be told what those 5 categories are, to keep the interview as close to an organic conversation as possible. Unless there is some interruption, preventing completion of the interview, no follow-up will be necessary.

- COUNSELORS: The initial solicitation and scheduling should take no more than 15 minutes of the subjects' time. Counselors interested in participation will have at least one week to read the Study Information Sheet and generate any questions or

concerns before giving verbal consent. The interview itself should take 20-30 minutes. They will answer a series of 14 open-ended questions in five categories: Workshop, Emotion, Mentorship, Rehabilitation, and Publication. However, participants will not be told what those 5 categories are, to keep the interview as close to an organic conversation as possible. Unless there is some interruption, preventing completion of the interview, no follow-up will be necessary.

7. RESEARCH SITE:
- <u>YOUTH:</u> For each site, interviews will take place in the same room where writing workshops take place at the juvenile facility; however, because interviews will be conducted during hours when the writing workshop does not normally meet, that space will be vacant for group interview to take place. Because interviewees are already familiar with the space as one designated for writing, it will facilitate more conversational discussion about what takes place during the workshop itself. While no other youth will be allowed in the room during interviews, a Probation counselor, most likely seated at a fixed desk in the corner of the room, will be within the line of vision (but not earshot) to ensure participant safety.
- <u>VOLUNTEERS:</u> For each site, interviews will take place outside the juvenile facility itself; interviews may take place in a neutral location, such as the Pacific Media offices in San Francisco, or a public location near satellite facilities (i.e., Solano and Santa Clara), such as a sound-proof public library meeting room convenient to volunteer participants.
- <u>COUNSELORS:</u> For each site, interviews will take place in the juvenile facility, in a space designated by the facility as one that is comfortable, sound-proof, and convenient for one-on-one interviews.

8. PRIVACY

<u>YOUTH:</u> The privacy of the youth will be protected with respect to their peers, and Probation counselors, to varying degrees. Youth will sign written interest forms silently - forms that will have been distributed to every writer in the workshop. The lead researcher will give potential participants the remainder of the 1.5 hour session to respond Yes/No to the solicitation with their name, at which time the lead researcher will collect all forms, so that youth opting into the interview do not feel a breach of privacy among those peers they would not wish to know of their interest. Once it is determined which youth want to participate, the lead researcher will work with Probation counselors to schedule the interviews. However, expression of interest will not signify consent or assent to participate, and therefore, do not constitute a breach of confidentiality that would endanger the youths' legal status or well-being. Privacy during the interview itself will be protected from the youths' peers with the exception of the other two subjects who agree to the interview, but concealing participation will not be possible from counselors, as the lead researcher relies on Probation counselors for scheduling, space allocation, and youth security during the interview. However, youth privacy from counselors will be protected during the interview itself insofar as the interviews will take place in the far corner of the empty group writing room in the line of sight of a Probation counselor to insure security, but out of earshot, so that youth feel privacy from Probation ears. However, because it is possible that the other two youth participants in the interview setting may break their agreement to keep all responses private and confidential, there is

some risk to youth participants - risk that the Probation supervisors and counselors will be made aware of, so that they are prepared to address any incidents related to emotional or psychological distress deriving from breach of privacy by fellow interview participants. Even so, all interview responses will be de-identified upon transcription to assure confidentiality from Probation, *The Beat* Within, and any other adult interested in the study's findings.

VOLUNTEERS: The privacy of the volunteers will be protected from fellow volunteers, Probation counselors, and youth in two ways. One, all solicitations, statements of assent, and scheduling, will take place via email with only the lead researcher. As solicitations will go out to all Beat Within volunteers for a given site, it will not be apparent to anyone which volunteers decided to participate - especially after interview responses have been de-identified. Their privacy will also be protected by having interviews off-site, meaning, neither at *The Beat* Within headquarters, nor at the detention facility, but rather at a public library meeting room, or other public place of their choosing where they feel most comfortable. Finally, their privacy will be protected by the confidentiality and de-identification of their responses in the transcribed version of the interview. Furthermore, any name-identifiable data used for logistics or initial contact, such as phone numbers or email addresses, will be password-protected, accessible only by the lead researcher, and destroyed once interviews take place.

COUNSELORS: The privacy of counselors will be protected in some ways, but not in others. For example, counselors will contact the Lead Researcher directly via email, so as to avoid the possible intrusion of Probation Administration superiors. Also, the interviews will take place in a sound-proof room of the facility's choosing, so that no one but the lead interviewer can hear what is being said. However, because the lead researcher relies on the Detention Facility superintendent to coordinate counselor schedules, counselor participation will not be anonymous. That said, because the facility has indicated interest in the results of this study for their own evaluations, counselor members who choose to participate face no retribution. Their responses, too, will be de-identified during the course of transcription. Any names secured in the process of recruitment and scheduling logistics will be password-protected, accessible only by the lead researcher, and destroyed once the interview has been transcribed.

9. PROCEDURE: Below are the introduction and interview questions that will be posed to participants in the group interview setting, in the following order.

B) Interview Introduction

1. YOUTH:

   Hi there, thanks for meeting with me! You're here because you agreed to share your opinions about writing for *The Beat*, and the idea of writing and publication in general. This is an opportunity to talk about what you like about being able to write for *The Beat*, or what you would change about the program to make it better.

   The interview should take about 45 minutes to an hour, and I'm going to ask the three of you 25 questions in all. Since it's a long time to talk, I have snacks to share. And since we're a small group, feel free to think of this as a discussion, just like you would if

you were in a workshop for *The Beat*, when you talk about the topics they bring in week to week. If there's something you don't feel comfortable answering, you can pass. If there's something you're not sure about yet, let me know and we can return to that question at the end after you've given it some thought.

As a reminder, our conversation will be audio-recorded; you don't need to share your name, but if you choose to use your name, when I transfer your voice to print, your name will be taken off. That way you can feel completely safe about anything you say, since any comments you have will be totally anonymous. However, in order to maintain that confidentiality, you have to agree to keep the responses of your fellow interviewees confidential as well. This is the only way that all of you can feel safe about your responses. Do you agree? Once we're all done, your responses will be put together with the responses of other youth writing for *The Beat* all over California, so we get a better picture of what everyone thinks.

You have been given the Study Information Sheet, so you know what this interview is about. You are welcome to read it again, now, if you'd like - that way it's fresh in your mind, and easier to remember if you have any questions about it.

Lead Researcher gives participants a hard copy of the Study Information Sheet to read.

Any questions before we start? Do you agree that all of this is okay?

2. <u>VOLUNTEERS:</u>
Hello, and thank you for meeting with me! You're here because you have agreed to share your opinions about *The Beat*, and the idea of writing and publication and general. This is an opportunity to talk about what brings you to *The Beat*, and what you like, or might change, about the program to make it better.
The interview should take about 30-45 minutes; I'm going to ask you 20 open-ended questions. If there is something you don't feel comfortable answering, you can pass; if you're not sure of the answer, let me know and we can return to that question at the end.

As a reminder, our conversation will be audio-recorded, and when I transcribe your voice, your responses will be de-identified, along with the responses of other Beat volunteers in your facility and other facilities in California. All of those responses, in combination with the responses of the kids and probation counselors, will then be compiled in a report that assesses the impact of *The Beat*'s programming.

You have been given the Study Information Sheet, so you know what this interview is about. You are welcome to read it again, now, if you'd like - that way it's fresh in your mind, and easier to remember if you have any questions about it.

Lead Researcher gives participants a hard copy of the Study Information Sheet to read.

Any questions before we start? Do you agree that all of this is okay?

3. <u>COUNSELORS:</u>
Hello, and thank you for meeting with me! You're here because you have agreed to share your opinions about *The Beat*, and the idea of writing and publication and general. This is also an opportunity to offer your observations about what is useful about the program, or what you might change about the program to make it better.

The interview should take about 20-30 minutes; I'm going to ask you 14 open-ended questions. If there is something you don't feel comfortable answering, you can pass; if you're not sure of the answer, let me know and we can return to that question at the end.

As a reminder, our conversation will be audio-recorded, and when I transcribe your voice, your responses will be de-identified, along with the responses of other counselors at your facility and other facilities in California. All those responses, in combination with the responses of the youth and Beat Within volunteers, will then be compiled in a report that assesses the impact of *The Beat*'s programming.

You have been given the Study Information Sheet, so you know what this interview is about. You are welcome to read it again, now, if you'd like - that way it's fresh in your mind, and easier to remember if you have any questions about it.

Lead Researcher gives participants a hard copy of the Study Information Sheet to read.

Any questions before we start? Do you agree that all of this is okay?

<u>9. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</u>
Interviews will be voice recorded, with a password protected smartphone recorder, and a second password-protected smartphone for back-up.

<u>YOUTH:</u>
   <u>I. WORKSHOP</u>
 1. How old are you, and how long have you been in _____ (facility)?
 2. What happens when *The Beat* comes in, when they give you the pencil and paper?
 3. When you're writing, do you ever imagine you're writing to specific people, or is it just for you? Who would you *like* to have read what you write? Why? What do you think they'd do or say, if they read your words?
 4. What do you think is good about *The Beat* coming in?

   <u>II. EMOTION</u>
 5. When are the times when you feel like you want or need to write, whether it's personal thoughts, lyrics, a submission for *The Beat,* or something else?
 6. How does writing about your feelings on your own seem different from when you

288

read them out loud for others, or get something published in *The Beat*?
7. How do you think expressing your emotions in writing helps somebody "become a functioning part of society?"
8. What does becoming a "functioning part of society" mean to you?

III. MENTORSHIP
9. How would you describe the role of *The Beat* volunteerss? Are they different from other authority figures (teachers, parents, Probation officials, pastors, or counselors)? How are they different?
10. Do they ever share truths about themselves? Does that change them in your eyes, and influence whether or not you feel like writing for *The Beat*?

IV. REHABILITATION
11. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here
12. Does writing for *The Beat* change for you what it means to be at _____ (facility)?
13. How does writing for *The Beat* affect how you deal with the past, the future, or how you relate to friends, family, community, and the law?
14. Do you think you'll keep writing once you get out? Why or why not?

V. PUBLICATION
15. So, who do you think reads *The Beat,* besides you?
16. What parts do you read, and why?
17. Do you ever send stuff in?
18. Have you had anything published? How did that feel?
19. What do you think makes something *worth* being published, for *The Beat,* or in general?
20. What does it does *to* somebody, or *for* somebody, when they get published?
21. What do you think newspapers and magazines do for society, whether it's a small town, or the whole country? Do you think *The Beat* does anything like that?
22. What do you think it means to society when someone publishes their writing from the inside of a cell, like Mumia Abu-Jamal, or the writers in *The Beat Without*?
23. A while back, *The Beat* asked how you would want to change the world; do you think writing about issues like that in a publication like *The Beat* (or somewhere else) can make actual changes in the world? Why or why not?
24. Is there anything you'd like to change about *The Beat,* either the workshop or the publication*?*
25. CLOSING: Is there anything I've missed? Anything you'd like to add before we finish?

VOLUNTEERS:
I. WORKSHOP
1. Why did you join *The Beat*? How long have you been working with the kids?
2. How would you describe what you do for *The Beat?*
3. How would you describe what *The Beat* does for you?
4. What are some of the things that you say to the kids when you're trying to get them

to write?
5. In your experience, what kinds of writing prompts do the kids like to write or talk about, and which ones do they avoid? Can you think of an example of one that went well, or one that did not?
6. What's your perception of the relationship between *The Beat* and Probation?

II. EMOTION
7. What happens when someone writes about their feelings, and why do you think it's important?
8. (For volunteers who evaluate *Beat* submissions, and write responses): According to *The Beat* writing rubric, the best pieces are "emotional," and "honest." Why do you think emotional honesty is an important factor for these kids' submissions? How do you think it helps further the goals of *The Beat,* Probation, or the kids themselves?
9. How do you think expressing your emotions in writing helps someone "become a functioning part of society?" What does becoming a "functioning part of society" mean to you

III. MENTORSHIP
10. How do volunteers for *The Beat* differ from other authority figures, e.g., teachers, parents, pastors, and counselors?
11. Do you ever share your own truths with the kids about your life experience? Why or why not? How
    do you think that changes your relationship to them?

IV. REHABILITATION

12. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here, and to circulate the   publication?
13. How do you think writing for *The Beat* changes how they think about the past, or future goals?
14. How do you think writing for *The Beat* changes their relationship to family, community, and the law?

V. PUBLICATION
15. What do you think it means to have your writing published in general? What does it do *to* or *for* the writer?
16. Some of the prompts focus on self-reflection, while others focus on issues happening in the outside world, like when *The Beat* asks kids to express opinions about the legalization of marijuana, or juvenile sentencing laws. What do you think about these kinds of questions? Do you think it's constructive for *The Beat* to ask kids to write critically of the world around them, or should it focus mostly on their internal experiences? Or should it do both?
17. A while back, *The Beat* asked the youth to write about how they would want to change the world; do you think writing about issues like that in a publication like *The Beat* can make actual changes in the world for these kids? Why or why not?

18. How do you think *The Beat* affects these kids' likelihood for community engagement or political participation later on?
19. Is there anything you would change, either about the workshop or the publication?
20. Is there anything you'd like to add that I haven't asked about?

PROBATION COUNSELORS
I. WORKSHOP
    1. How long have you been sitting in on workshops for *The Beat*?
    2. What happens when *The Beat* comes in the room? Do you notice that the kids change behavior, either during the workshop, or afterwards?

II. EMOTION
    3. What happens when someone writes about their feelings, and why do you think it's important?
    4. To be published in *The Beat,* pieces need to be "emotional," and "honest." Why do you think emotional honesty is an important factor for these kids' submissions? How do you think it helps further the goals of *The Beat,* Probation, or the kids themselves?
    5. How do you think writing about their feelings helps the youth "become a functioning part of society?" What does becoming a "functioning part of society" mean to you?

III. MENTORSHIP
    6. How do you see the role of *The Beat* volunteers differ from other authority figures, e.g., teachers,
        pastors, law enforcement, or counselors?

IV. REHABILITATION
    7. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here?
    8. How do you think *The Beat* workshop changes what it means for kids to be at _____ (facility), or change how they relate to family, their communities, and the law?

V. PUBLICATION
    9. Do you ever read *The Beat*? If so, what parts do you read, and why?
   10. What do you think it means to have your writing published in a public forum in general, whether in a newspaper, or an online blog? What does it do *to* or *for* the writer?
   11. Some of the weekly prompts focus on self-reflection, while others focus on issues happening in the outside world, such as when they ask kids to express opinions about the legalization of marijuana, or juvenile sentencing laws. What do you think about these different kinds of questions? Do you think it's constructive for programs like *The Beat* be asking the youth to write more critically of the world around them, or should it focus mostly on the internal, emotional experiences of the youth? Or something else?

12. A while back, *The Beat* asked the youth to write about how they would want to change the world; do you think writing about issues like that in a publication like *The Beat* can make actual changes in the world? Why or why not?
13. How do you think *The Beat* affects these kids' likelihood for community engagement or political participation later on?
14. Is there anything that you'd change, either about the workshop, or the publication? Why?

B. Statistical Analysis Plan

1. Variables of Interest - Clearly identify the primary outcome(s) and key factor(s) of interest.
2. Statistical goal - State the statistical goal(s) of the study (e.g., Comparison of group means, estimation of the proportion of success, estimation of variability for future study design, etc.).
3. Statistical approach - Describe the statistical approach(es) to be used to address the study's statistical goal(s) (e.g., T-test to compare means, confidence interval estimate(s), etc.). *Note: Required for ICTS SRC review.*
4. Secondary analyses - Clearly state any secondary analyses to be performed including secondary outcomes and comparison groups along with the statistical methods that will be used to perform the secondary analyses. *Note: Required for ICTS SRC review.*

If a statistical analysis plan is not appropriate for your study design, please describe a non-statistical plan for assessing your study results.

1. VARIABLES of INTEREST -
<u>Primary Outcomes</u>: As mentioned in my Purpose statement, I am interested in complicating the rhetoric around rehabilitative writing, by teasing out discourses not exclusively grounded in discipline, punishment, or hegemonic domination, and understanding the extent to which detained youth use writing to exercise different kinds of personal agency. "Complicating the rhetoric" means complicating logics mobilized around rehabilitative writing that either ...
1. Focus on pragmatic outcomes, i.e., whether or not such programs are "effective" at reducing recidivism or emotional health (see the Velez-Young study);
2. Focus on narratives of hope, i.e., the extent to which such programs constitute an affirmation of transcendent values or shared humanity (see Pompa and Baca);
3. Focus on ideological structures as defined by Marxian or Critical Race Theoretical

lenses of critique, i.e., the myriad ways that writing in prisons perpetuates the
subjection of social death, or the repressions of the police state (see Rodríguez and
Davis).

For initial outcomes, I anticipate acquiring data that will enable me to flesh out the
perspectives (and respective, guiding ideologies) of Beat volunteers, counselors, and
youth. How those perspectives and uses of language overlap remains to be seen.

Factors of Interest: I will be looking for both resonances between the three groups, and
divergences between attitudes about given questions, since most questions are variants of
the same questions for all participants. In particular, I will be interested in seeing whether
the three groups use similar vocabularies to respond to particular questions, and the
extent to which they ascribe ownership, political awareness, or value judgment to any
part in the writing or publication process.

2. STATISTICAL GOAL, APPROACH, ANALYSES - As this is a qualitative case study, and
not a quantitative analysis, I will not be performing statistical analysis. I will, however,
be developing a discourse-based coding scheme that may note frequency of terms or
particular constructions. However, these will be discussed in the context of other
literature and participant statements, and not treated in a quantitative fashion
whatsoever. I will also not determine that scheme until I have the full array of linguistic
phenomena transcribed. Once a coding scheme is developed, I will have my faculty
sponsor perform secondary discourse analysis on a selection of coded data to assure
inter-rater reliability of the coding schema. Then I will code and assess all the data
myself, potentially with the aid of Computer assisted qualitative data analysis software
(CAQDAS) for search functions and categorization.

3. SECONDARY ANALYSES - there will be no secondary analyses.

SECTION 4: SUBJECTS (PERSONS/CHARTS/RECORDS/SPECIMENS)

A.   Number of Subjects (Charts/Records/Biospecimens)

1. Indicate the maximum number of subjects to be recruited/consented on this UCI
    protocol. This is the number of potential subjects you may need to recruit to obtain
    your target sample size. This number should include projected screen failures and
    early withdrawals. *Note: The IRB considers individuals who sign the consent form to be
    "enrolled" in the research.*
2. For Mail/Internet surveys include the number of people directly solicited.
3. If the study involves use of existing charts, records, biospecimens, specify the
    maximum number that will be reviewed/tested to compile the data or the sample
    population necessary to address the research question.

1. The maximum number of subjects to be recruited/consented to is 98 people; 60 Beat
Within writers (detained youth), 18 Beat Within volunteers, and 18 Probation

counselors.

4-5. The Target Sample size is 20 youth per facility, 4-6 volunteers per facility, and 4-6 Probation counselors - the same as the number of solicitations, though it's possible we will have attrition and refusal to participate. For that reason, we hope for a minimum of 12-15 youth per facility, and 3-5 volunteers and Probation counselors.
6. As established above, there are three main groups of subjects, and no control groups, as all youth in these facilities are exposed to the Beat Within writing program. I will be interviewing only the older youth, however, aged 16-19.

Overall Sample size for the entire study across all three sites is 60 youth, 18 volunteers, and 18 Probation counselors, for a total of 98.

[ ] Not applicable - This study is not a multi-center research study.

8. Target sample size was determined by the availability of a certain age of juvenile who participates in *The Beat* Within program at a given site; because class sizes at the facilities are generally 20 youth, and there is typically at least one Max unit with youth aged 16-19, either girls or boys, 20 is the most comprehensive way to capture their experience with the Beat Within program.
9. Because I am interviewing youth at three different sites, along with Beat volunteers

and Probation counselors, the sample size should be sufficient to gauge attitudes and perceptions about the program.

10. I don't have any assumed group effects, though the 2009 Stanford study (Velez-Young) indicates the literacy levels and type of language youth use to talk about what happens in the writing workshop. However, as mentioned before, this study focuses on outcomes and whether the youth "like" the writing program, which is not the focus of my research. I also have a sense of the kind of language Beat volunteers *may* use to talk about their experiences, having observed a volunteer orientation and listened to volunteers talk about why they're in the program. This is not formal literature, however. The only semi-formal literature is from *The Beat* Within administration, who have provided mission statements, strategic plans, and volunteer handbooks to orient me to their program, including writing rubrics for how youth writings are evaluated for purposes of publication in the newsletter.

B. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

1. Describe the characteristics and provide justification for inclusion of the proposed subject population. At a minimum include information about the age and gender of the study population.
2. Describe different subject groups (e.g., students and teachers; control group and treatment group(s), children and adults) separately.

1. YOUTH: There is no gender preference for youth participation in this program; I have selected detained youth expressly for their detention status and their exposure to a comprehensive writing and publication process through the Beat Within. I have selected youth 16-19 because I want to capture attitudes of youth on the cusp of psycho-social maturity, who have more schooling, and a more developed sense of abstract thought and political awareness. It is worth noting that some of these classes are segregated by gender, and some are not. The gender makeup of this group of subjects will depend largely upon their own interest in study participation, as the organization teaches several classes at each detention facility; any differences that emerge that correlate to gender will be noted in analysis.

VOLUNTEERS: There is no age or gender preference for volunteers, only their tenure with the program a minimum of three months, and adults over the age of 18.

COUNSELORS: There is no age or gender preference for counselors, only their tenure in the detention facility as a witness to Beat Within writing activity.

2. The YOUTH are the primary recipients of program delivery at the juvenile facility; the VOLUNTEERS are their writing teachers, who receive guidelines for weekly writing prompts from *The Beat* Within, and oversee their writing every week. The PROBATION Counselors observe workshops primarily for purposes of maintaining order and security, as it is a juvenile detention facility. Again, there is no control group, but I will be interviewing all three types of subjects who participate in writing programs in three

different juvenile facilities.

3. Provide the inclusion and/or exclusion criteria for the proposed subject population, as applicable.

[X] Not applicable – This is not a clinical investigation and/or the characteristics of the population sufficiently describe the proposed subject population.

4. If exclusion is based on age, gender, pregnancy/childbearing potential, social/ethnic group, or language spoken (e.g., Non-English Speakers), provide a scientific rationale.

SECTION 5: RECRUITMENT METHODS AND PROCESS

A. Recruitment Methods

Please check all applicable recruitment methods that apply to the study. Place an "X" in the bracket [ ] next to the recruitment method.

[ ] This study involves no direct contact with subjects (i.e., use of existing records, charts, specimens) • *Skip to Section 6.*

[X] UCI IRB approved advertisements, flyers, notices, and/or media will be used to recruit subjects. *Submit advertisements for IRB approval.* • Passive Recruitment - Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team. • *Complete Question 5B - Explain where recruitment materials will be posted.*

[ ] The study team will recruit potential subjects who are unknown to them (e.g., convenience sampling, use of social networks, direct approach in public situations, random digit dialing, etc.) • Active Recruitment – Researchers contact potential subjects. • *Complete Question 5B.*

[ ] The UCIMC Clinical Trials web page will be used. *Submit the UCIMC Standard Research Recruitment Advertisement for IRB approval.*
- Passive Recruitment - Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team.
- *Skip to Section 6.*

[ ] The study will be listed on Clinicaltrials.gov. *Note: This is required for all clinical trials.*
- Passive Recruitment - Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team.
- Skip to Section 6.

[ ] The UCI Social Sciences human subject pool will be used. *Submit the Social Science Human Subject Pool Recruitment Advertisement for IRB approval.*
- Passive Recruitment - Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team.
- *Skip to Section 6.*

[ ] Study team members will contact potential subjects who have provided permission to be contacted for participation in future research studies.
- Active Recruitment – Researchers contact potential subjects.
- *Complete Question 5B – Explain when and how these individuals granted permission for future contact; provide the IRB protocol numbers, if applicable.*

[ ] Study team members will approach their own patients, students, employees for participation in the study.
- Active Recruitment – Researchers contact potential subjects.
- *Complete Question 5B.*

[ ] Study team members will send UCI IRB approved recruitment materials (e.g., recruitment flyer, introductory letter) to colleagues asking for referral of eligible participants.*
- Passive Recruitment – Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team or
- Active Recruitment – Colleagues get permission from interested individuals to release contact information to researchers. Researchers contact potential subjects.
- *For Active Recruitment, complete Question 5B.*

Note: Additional requirements for using this recruitment method are included in the Protocol Narrative instructions.

[ ] Study team members will provide their colleagues with a UCI IRB approved introductory letter. The letter will be signed by the treating physician and sent to his/her patients to inform them about how to contact study team members.
- Passive Recruitment - Potential subjects initiate contact with the study team.
- The IRB approved letter must be sent by the <u>treating physician</u>.
- The study team does not have access to patient names and addresses for mailing.
- *Skip to Section 6.*

[ ] UCI study team members will screen UCIMC medical records to determine subject eligibility and approach patients directly about study participation.*
- Active Recruitment – Researchers contact potential subjects.
- *Complete Appendix T to request a partial waiver of HIPAA Authorization.*
- *Complete Question 5B.*

 * Note Additional requirements for using this recruitment method are included in the Protocol Narrative instructions.*

[X] Other Methods:
   YOUTH: <u>In-person, and via paper flier:</u> Lead Researcher will solicit youth participation for the entire housing unit or classroom via verbal introduction; interested participants will mark their interest (Y/N, and name) on the flier distributed at the beginning of a regularly scheduled Beat Within workshop, which the lead researcher will then collect from all participants. Based on interest, and meeting the requirement of having participated in least two weeks worth of Beat Within workshops, youth will be summoned by counselors to sign up for an interview slot.
   VOLUNTEERS: <u>via email</u>; interested participants will respond via email to the lead researcher within the week, at which time participants will receive the assent form and options for possible interview times.
   COUNSELORS: <u>via email, directly to the counselors, with email addresses provided by the Probation Institution</u>, to be distributed to counselors who are tenure-eligible and who regularly oversee Beat workshops. Interested participants will respond to the lead researcher, via the Facility contact, within the week, at which time the lead researcher will mail hard copies of the assent forms to the Facility contacts, and coordinate with those contacts via phone and email to schedule interview times.

- *Complete Question 5B, as applicable.*

A) RECRUITMENT TEXT
1. YOUTH: *Solicitation to be read out loud at the beginning of a regularly scheduled Beat Within writing workshop, text fliers with language identical to the text below will be distributed at the same time. Solicitation will give potential participants the remainder of the 1.5 hour session to respond Yes/No to the solicitation, at which time the lead researcher will collect all forms, so that youth opting into the interview do not feel a breach of privacy. Once it is determined which youth want to participate, the lead researcher will work with counselors to schedule the interviews. Solicitation will only be given to workshops where youth fit the age criteria (16-19 years); these groups are already pre-sorted by age at the facility.*

Dear Writers,

As a researcher with the University of California, Irvine, dedicated to community literacy and writing studies, I'm excited to have the opportunity to work with *The Beat* Within on a study to learn what you think about writing and publishing your work with *The Beat*. We're interested in your point of view, because you're what *The Beat* is all about!

PROCESS
• We'll be conducting interviews with three writers at a time in the next couple of weeks; there are 25 questions, and the interviews take 45 minutes to an hour. Since it's a while to discuss, I'll bring snacks to share.
• We'll then combine your anonymous observations with those of other writers for *The Beat* all over California, so that we can get a clearer picture of what you, as writers, think about the writing program.
• <u>If you'd like to participate, check the box marked, "YES" and please write your name at the bottom of this form;</u> the lead researcher will collect your forms at the end of the workshop. At that time, we'll schedule a time for you to meet for the interview.

CONFIDENTIALITY
• Interviews will be audio-recorded in a private setting, and any personal information you choose to share will be confidential, since I'm the only person who will hear you talk about these issues - both in person, and in the audio recording.
• At the same time, you will be expected to keep the responses of your two fellow interviewees confidential as well. That means, what is said in the room does not leave the room. However, there is no way to prevent the other two participants from talking. If they do, though, and you feel uncomfortable about it, Probation counselors are prepared to help with that situation.
• Once I transcribe your responses, they will be de-identified; that means, <u>your name will be in no way associated with or revealed by the results of the study</u>. Any direct quotes used in the final report will be cited as anonymous. All data will be maintained in a locked room when not in use by the lead researcher, and

will be destroyed after the report is complete.
- However, because interview data will initially be identified with your name before being assigned an anonymous code, there is a minor possibility that there will be a breach of confidentiality. But because only the Lead Researcher will have access to your responses and the storage of those files, the risk to your confidentiality is low.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those encountered in daily life. There is also no penalty if you don't want to participate, and you can stop at any time.

BENEFITS

While there is no direct benefit to participating in this study, <u>participation does you the unique opportunity to improve *The Beat* for everyone involved, most importantly for you and your fellow writers</u> – your voice can influence how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published.

<u>Please Check ONE:</u>

____ YES - I want to participate in the interview.*

____ NO - I don't want to participate in the interview.

NAME: _____

* If you'd like to participate, facility counselors will help schedule a time for you to meet with the lead researcher after the workshop is over.

<u>II. For VOLUNTEERS</u>: *Solicitation will be sent via email; interested participants will respond via email to the lead researcher within the week, at which time participants will receive the assent form and options for possible interview times.*

Dear Beat Volunteers,

As a researcher with the University of California, Irvine, dedicated to community literacy and writing studies, I'm excited to have the opportunity to work with *The Beat* Within on a study see what you as a volunteer think about the writing program and publication process. This study will take into account not only your perceptions as a Beat volunteer, but also the observations of facility counselors, and, most importantly, the kids themselves; doing so, we hope to get a better picture of the way *The Beat* provides programming as a whole. <u>If you would like to participate, reply to this email from the lead researcher (e.catchings.martin@uci.edu) stating your interest.</u> Below please find the full

description of the interview process.

PROCESS
- We'll be conducting one-on-one interviews off-site, but in the area, such as a public library meeting room. There are 20 questions, and the interviews take 30-45 minutes. We'll be scheduling interviews most likely in the next couple of weeks.
- We'll then compile your anonymous observations with those of other volunteers, counselors, and youth all over California, so that we can get a clearer picture of what you, as writers, think about the writing program.
- <u>If you'd like to participate, please respond via email in the next week</u>. At that time, I'll send you the assent form to sign, and then we can schedule the interview. You will bring the assent form at that time.

CONFIDENTIALITY
- Interviews will be audio-recorded in a private setting, and any personal information you choose to share will be confidential, since I'm the only person who will hear you talk about these issues - both in person, and in the audio recording.
- Once I transcribe your responses, they will be de-identified, so <u>your name will be in no way associated with or revealed by the results of the study</u>. Any direct quotes used in the final report will be cited as anonymous. All data will be maintained in a locked room when not in use by the lead researcher, and will be destroyed after the report is complete.
- However, because interview data will initially be identified with your name before being assigned an anonymous code, there is a minor possibility that there will be a breach of confidentiality. But because only the Lead Researcher will have access to your responses and the storage of those files, the risk to your confidentiality is low.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those encountered in daily life. There is also no penalty if you don't want to participate.

BENEFITS
While there is no direct benefit to participating in this study, <u>participation does gives you the unique opportunity to improve *The Beat* for everyone involved</u> – your voice can influence how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published. It will also help Probation get a better sense of what it is *The Beat* does for the kids, which means better partnerships and service delivery for the youth overall. Most importantly, though, your voice will give *The Beat* Within a better sense of what is most important to you as a volunteer - and what you'd like to see in the future, so that you're able to get the best experience possible out of the time

that you share.

III. For PROBATION COUNSELORS: *Solicitation will be sent via email directly to counselors who regularly oversee Beat workshops, so as to avoid the possibility of coercion by administration. Interested participants will respond to the lead researcher, via the Facility contact, within the week, at which time the lead researcher will mail hard copies of the assent forms to the Facility contacts, and coordinate with those contacts via phone and email to schedule interview times.*

Dear Counselors,

As a researcher with the University of California, Irvine, dedicated to community literacy and writing studies, I'm excited to have the opportunity to work with *The Beat* Within on a study to see what you as a counselor think about the writing program's impact on the inside. This study will take into account not only your perceptions as someone who observes *The Beat*'s programming every week, but also those of *The Beat*'s volunteers, and, most importantly, the kids themselves; doing so, we hope to get a bigger, better picture of the effectiveness of Beat programming as a whole, and the extent to which that programming enhances other goals and programs at your institution.

PROCESS
- We'll be conducting one-on-one interviews at the facility in a private room; there are 14 questions, and the interviews take 20-30 minutes. We'll be scheduling interviews most likely in the next couple of weeks.
- We'll then compile your anonymous observations with those of counselors at two other California facilities, so that we can get a clearer picture of what you, as counselors, think about the writing program and publication process as a whole.
- If you'd like to participate, please respond via email directly to the Libby Catchings, the Lead Researcher, by the end of the week at e.catchings.martin@uci.edu, and then I will coordinate with facility administration to schedule your interview.
- The Lead Researcher will then send an electronic version of the Study Information Sheet to you directly via email, so that you can read it and determine if you have any questions or concerns before participating in the interview itself.

CONFIDENTIALITY
- Interviews will be audio-recorded in a private setting, and any personal information you choose to share will be confidential, since I'm the only person who will hear you talk about these issues - both in person, and in the audio recording.
- Once I transcribe your responses, they will be de-identified, so your name will be in no way associated with or revealed by the results of the study. Any direct

quotes used in the final report will be cited as anonymous. All data will be maintained in a locked room when not in use by the lead researcher, and will be destroyed after the report is complete.

- However, because interview data will initially be identified with your name before being assigned an anonymous code, there is a possibility that there will be a breach of confidentiality. But because only the Lead Researcher will have access to your contact information, your responses, and the storage of those files, the risk to your confidentiality is low.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those encountered in daily life. There is also no penalty if you don't want to participate, and you can stop at any time.

BENEFITS
While you may receive no direct benefit from participating in this study, you may receive indirect benefits from having <u>the unique opportunity to improve *The Beat* for everyone involved,</u> as your voice can influence how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published, which means better partnerships and service delivery for the youth overall.

B. Recruitment Process

1. Based on the methods checked above, describe and provide details of the recruitment process (i.e. when, where, by whom and how potential subjects will be approached, e.g. screening medical charts, findings subjects during routine patient visits, etc.).
2. If you will recruit by mail, e-mail, or phone, explain how potential subjects' contact information will be obtained.
3. If active recruitment methods will be used (i.e., researchers will make direct contact with subjects for the purpose of recruitment), explain how the individual's privacy will be protected. *Note: This is not the same as confidentiality (see the <u>Privacy and Confidentiality</u> web page).*

YOUTH: a) Participants will be recruited from housing units that have participated in Beat Within workshops for at least 2 weeks. b) The study will recruit youth ideally between 16-19 years of age, to ensure the required degree of intellectual maturity for the questions posted. If, however, there is not a sufficient number of subjects available in this 16-19 age range, slightly younger subjects may be accepted (14-16). Finally (c), Recruitment will aim at youth who have a baseline tenure at the facility - at least two weeks, so that they will have attended two weeks' worth of Beat Within workshops, and have read or submitted material to at least one edition of the Beat Within newsletter. This recruitment solicitation will happen verbally at the beginning of a regularly

scheduled writing workshop, including distribution of an interest form in print, having already received legal consent from the Juvenile Court and/or Juvenile Detention facility Superintendant. Interested youth over 18 will, with the aid of Probation counselors on duty, schedule interview times later after the writing portion of the workshop, before obtaining verbal consent. Youth under 18 will express interest, which will then be transmitted to facility administration to obtain parental/guardian permission before obtaining verbal assent.

VOLUNTEERS: eligible volunteers (with 3 months experience or more) will be recruited from *The Beat* Within, and their email addresses will be provided by Beat administration. The recruitment solicitation will be sent from the lead researcher via email, with expressed interest to be received via email as well. Beat administration will have no knowledge of which volunteers decide to participate.

PROBATION COUNSELORS: eligible counselors (with 6 months experience or more) will be recruited via the Juvenile Detention Facility's superintendent, who will forward to them the text of the recruitment solicitation included above.

3. PRIVACY

YOUTH: The privacy of the youth during recruitment will be protected with respect to their peers, and Probation counselors, to varying degrees. Youth will sign interest forms silently - forms that will have been distributed to every writer in the workshop. The lead researcher will give potential participants the remainder of the 1.5 hour session to respond Yes/No to the solicitation with their name, at which time the lead researcher will collect all forms, so that youth opting into the interview do not feel a breach of privacy among those peers they would not wish to know of their interest. Once it is determined which youth want to participate, the lead researcher a) distribute the assent form, and b) will work with counselors to schedule the interviews. Privacy will be protected from the youths' peers with the exception of the other two subjects who agree to the interview, but concealing participation will not be possible from counselors, as the lead researcher relies on Probation counselors for scheduling, space allocation, and youth security during the interview. However, youth privacy will be protected during the interview itself insofar as the interviews will take place in the far corner of the group writing area in the line of sight of Probation counselors to insure security, but out of earshot, so that youth feel privacy from counselor ears.

VOLUNTEERS: All solicitations, statements of assent, and scheduling, will take place via email with only the lead researcher. As solicitations will go out to all Beat Within volunteers for a given site, it will not be apparent to anyone which volunteers decided to participate - especially after interview responses have been de-identified.
PROBATION COUNSELORS: The privacy of counselors will be protected in some ways, but not in others. Because the Detention Facility will have knowledge of counselor schedules, participation will not be anonymous. That said, because the facility is interested in the results of this study for their own purposes, counselors who choose to participate face no retribution, as it does not reflect on counselor performance, but only on the performance

of a third-party service provider. Furthermore, because interested counselors will express interest in the study and coordinate scheduling via email directly with the Lead Researcher, the possibility of coercion by Probation administration is at least decreased.

SECTION 6: INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS

1. Specify how consent will be obtained and describe the specific steps for obtaining informed consent.
2. Include information about when and where consent will take place and the length of time subjects will be given to decide whether they wish to participate.
3. If study team members will approach their own patients, students, or employees for participation in the study, explain what precautions will be taken to minimize potential undue influence or coercion, and how compromised objectivity will be avoided.
4. If children are involved in this study, please describe the parental permission process and the child assent process.
5. Be sure to submit the consent/assent document(s) with your e-IRB Application (i.e. Study Information Sheet, Recruitment script, Consent Form, etc.).
6. If this study involves the creation, use, or disclosure of Protected Health Information (PHI), specify the process for obtaining HIPAA Authorization. Be sure to submit the HIPAA Research Authorization form with your e-IRB Application.

Check all that apply:

[ ] Written (signed) informed consent will be obtained from subjects. Signed informed consent, parental permission, and/or child assent will be obtained from subjects, as applicable. *Describe the informed consent process.*

[X] Requesting a waiver of written (signed) informed consent (i.e., signed consent will not be obtained). Informed consent, parental permission and/or child assent will be obtained from subjects, as applicable. Explain how informed consent will be obtained. *Complete Appendix P.*

[ ] Requesting a waiver of informed consent (i.e., consent will not be obtained).
    Complete Appendix O. Skip to Section 7.

I.Steps for Obtaining Verbal Consent
YOUTH Over 18
1. Those participants over 18 will be able to provide their own verbal consent to participate. See Appendix P - Youth for why verbal rather than written consent best secures the confidentiality of youth participants.
2. After youth have expressed interest in participation via the recruitment form, the

lead researcher will coordinate with facility counselors to distribute hard copies of the Study Information Sheet to those youth over 18 who want to be interviewed. Youth over 18 will receive the sheet at the same time that they are scheduling their interview with counselors.

3. Youth over 18 will have at least a week to read think about the Study Information Sheet, and prepare any questions or concerns they might have for when they meet with the lead researcher before the interview begins. The lead researcher will emphasize, at that time, that they are under no obligation to participate if their concerns have not been addressed, and that they may terminate their participation at any time. The youth will have 5 minutes to re-read the Study Information Sheet at the time before the interview begins, to assure that the youth understand and agree with its terms via verbal consent.

4. COMPENSATION: The Study Information Sheet will inform youth participants that a snack will be provided during the interview.

5. CONFIDENTIALITY: Included in the Study Information Sheet is a requirement that the youth participants keep the responses of the other two group interviewees confidential to protect themselves and others. However, it will also reiterate the fact that, barring breach of confidentiality by fellow interviewees, their participation in the interview will be kept confidential from outside youth at the facility, Beat Within volunteers, Probation counselors, and anyone else interested in the results of the study.

6. This study does not use Public Health Information, so no HIPAA documentation is required.

VOLUNTEERS
1. After volunteers have expressed interest in participation via email, the lead researcher will email each volunteer the Study Information Sheet, along with a reminder that the participant is welcome to voice any questions or concerns via email or phone up until the day of the interview. The Lead Researcher will give her contact information and also request volunteers' phone numbers to facilitate real-time communication, and any updates to meeting times/places, etc. Should the volunteer need to reference the Study Information Sheet at the time of the interview the lead researcher will bring a hard copy for the participant to read at that time.

2. Volunteers will have at least one week to read the emailed Study Information Sheet and agree to its terms, after which time, the lead researcher will coordinate with the volunteer to schedule the interview. Should the volunteer need to reference the Study Information Sheet at the time of the interview, the lead researcher will bring a hard copy for the participant to read at that time, and give the volunteer 5 minutes to re-read its terms and ask any questions before giving verbal consent.

3. COMPENSATION: the Study Information Sheet will inform volunteers that there will be no compensation for participation.

4. CONFIDENTIALITY: Because the Lead Researcher will have 1) emails, and 2) phone numbers for volunteer participants, there is a remote possibility that

confidentiality will be breached. However, these files will be stored on either a password-protected hard drive, a password-protected smartphone, and/or a password-protected, encrypted university server, to be deleted once data is collected. Because interview data will initially be name-identified, there is a minor possibility that there will be a breach of confidentiality. However, because only the Lead Researcher will have the passwords to the initial recording device, the device (and its backup) itself, and the password-protected computer and hard drive used for data encoding, there is very little risk of breaching confidentiality before coding is completed. Furthermore, once data is de-identified from its sources and coded, to be then combined with all other volunteer data at other sites, volunteers risk no breach of confidentiality whatsoe\ver.

5. There will be no problem with coercion from the lead researcher, since there is no professional affiliation, nor will there be a risk of coercion from *The Beat Within*, as the anonymous, email-only recruitment process means that consent will be confidential.

6. This study does not use Public Health Information, so no HIPAA documentation is required.

PROBATION COUNSELORS

1. After counselors have expressed interest in participation to their facility contact/superintendant, the lead researcher will, via email, send the facility contact/superintendant Study Information Sheets for each facility counselor to read before the interview, along with a reminder that the participant is welcome to voice any questions or concerns via email or phone over the course of the week prior to the interview. Should the counselor forget his/her form, the lead researcher will bring a hard copy for the participant to read beforehand. The Lead Researcher will have only names for counselors, as the Probation facility contact will distribute all communications and facilitate interview logistics. Those names will be stored either on a password-protected university email server, a password-protected hard drive, or both, to be destroyed once data is collected.

2. Probation counselors will have at least one week to read the emailed Study Information Sheet and generate any questions or concerns for the Lead Researcher to answer, after which time, the Lead Researcher will coordinate with the facility contact/superintendant to schedule the interview. Should the counselor forget the Study Information Sheet, the lead researcher will give the volunteer 5 minutes to re-read its terms and ask any questions before providing verbal consent.

7. COMPENSATION: The Study Information Sheet will inform counselors that there will be no compensation for participation.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY: Because interview data will initially be name-identified, there is a minor possibility that there will be a breach of confidentiality. However, because only the Lead Researcher will have the passwords to the initial recording device, the device (and its backup) itself, and the password-protected computer and hard drive used for data encoding, there is very little risk of

breaching confidentiality before coding is completed. Furthermore, once data is de-identified from its sources and coded, to be then combined with all other volunteer data at other sites, volunteers risk no breach of confidentiality whatsoever.

9. There will be no problem with coercion from the lead researcher, since there is no professional affiliation. It is conceivable that counselors may face coercion from the facility superintendent/other supervisor overseeing facility participation in this process; however, because the reading of the Study Informaton Sheet will, before the scheduled interview, emphasize both counselor confidentiality and the option to opt out at any time, coercion to participate in the interview itself is severely limited.

10. This study does not use Public Health Information, so no HIPAA documentation is required.

II. Steps for attaining ASSENT

YOUTH

7. Because the youth participants in *The Beat* Within workshops are 16-19 years of age, some will be legal adults, and others (under 18) will be minors. Those under 18 can give verbal assent only after having gained the permission of a parent or legal guardian.

8. After youth have expressed interest in participation via the recruitment form, the lead researcher will coordinate with facility counselors to facilitate parental/legal guardian permission before scheduling interviews with staff; at the time of scheduling, youth will receive a copy of the Study Information Sheet.

9. Youth under 18 will have at least a week to read think about the Study Information Sheet, and prepare any questions or concerns they might have for when they meet with the lead researcher before the interview begins. The lead researcher will emphasize, at that time, that they are under no obligation to participate if their concerns have not been addressed, and that they may terminate their participation at any time. The youth will have 5 minutes to re-read the Study Information Sheet at the time before the interview begins, to assure that the youth understand and agree with its terms via verbal consent.

10. COMPENSATION: The Study Information Sheet will inform youth participants that a snack will be provided during the interview.

11. CONFIDENTIALITY: Included in the Study Information Sheet is a requirement that the youth participants keep the responses of the other two group interviewees confidential. However, it will also reiterate the fact that, barring a breach of confidentiality by fellow interviewees, their participation in the interview will be kept confidential from outside youth at the facility, Beat Within volunteers, Probation counselors, and anyone else interested in the results of the study.

12. This study does not use Public Health Information, so no HIPAA documentation is required.

7. Non-English Speaking Participants: In order to consent subjects who are unable to read and speak English, the English version of the consent form must be translated into appropriate languages once IRB approval is granted.

Check all that apply:

[X] Not applicable - Only individuals who can read and speak English are eligible for this study.

[ ] The English version of the consent form will be translated into appropriate languages for non-English speaking subjects once IRB approval is granted. An interpreter will be involved in the consenting process. *Note: The IRB must officially stamp the translated consent forms.*

[ ] Requesting a short form consent process. *Complete Appendix Q.*
  The short form process will be used for the following languages:
  [ ] All non-English languages
  [ ] All non-English languages except Spanish
  [ ] Other languages (specify): <Type here>

SECTION 7: RISK ASSESSMENT AND POSSIBLE BENEFITS
Note: Review of the instructions for this section is strongly recommended.

A. Risk Assessment

Place an "X" in the bracket [ ] next to the level of review (based upon the investigator's risk assessment).

[ ] This study involves greater than minimal risk to subjects and requires Full Committee review.

[X] This study involves no more than minimal risk and qualifies as Expedited research. *Provide justification below for the level of review and for the applicable Expedited Category(ies) that you have chosen:*

This research qualifies as Expedited Research because it is generating private, confidential, and de-identified voice data via interview to locate the subjectivity, language, beliefs, and practices of participants in *The Beat* Within writing program for purposes of program evaluation. This group includes detained youth writers, program volunteers, and

probation counselors (Categories 6 and 7 under 45 CFR 46.110).

B. Risks and Discomforts

1. Describe the risks/potential discomforts (e.g., physical, psychological, social, economic) associated with <u>each</u> intervention or research procedure.
2. Describe the expected frequency (i.e., probability) of a given side effect or harm and its severity (e.g., mild, moderate, severe).
3. If subjects are restricted from receiving standard therapies during the study, describe the risks of those restrictions.
4. If collecting identifiable private information, address the risk of a potential breach of confidentiality.

1. <u>Potential risks/discomforts:</u>
YOUTH - This study involves no more than minimal risk for the youth writers because they are participating in a feedback session that does not differ greatly from the writing workshop that is part of their weekly lives at the juvenile detention facility. The interview process incurs no physical risk of any kind; any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that the youth will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable, and that they may terminate their participation at any time. Any psychological distress they may encounter as a result of disclosing opinions in the presence of the two other interviewees is no more of a risk than the self-disclosure that already happens in the Beat Within writing workshop, when volunteers foster discussion and encourage youth to share their writings and personal feelings with peers in the room; moreover, all three will have agreed, as part of the assent process, to keep the responses of their fellow interviewees confidential. Finally, the youth are protected from risk of retribution by Probation counselors and Beat Within volunteers because youth responses will be both private and confidential. Youth privacy will be protected during the interview itself insofar as the interviews will take place in the far corner of the group writing area in the line of sight of a Probation counselor to insure physical security, but out of earshot, so that youth feel privacy from counselor ears. Because results will be de-identified and combined with those of two other institutions, there is no risk of identification. However, there is the possibility that youth may experience emotional/psychological distress as a result of the interview process, either through coming to terms with their own responses, or if the other two interview participants break the agreement to maintain interview confidentiality. Should this occur, a protocol for each facility is in place to ensure that those emotional and psychological issues are addressed.
- For SANTA CLARA, all Probation Counselors receive between 2-8 hours of mandatory annual training to handle "Communication with Aggressive, Mentally Ill, and Emotionally Disturbed Youth," as well as "Suicide Detection and Prevention in Jails and Institutions" (Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Commission

Inspection Report, February 2012). Santa Clara also has an Incident Report protocol for Counselors to document incidents that might ensue from this psychological/emotional discomfort (Report 11), as well as 24-hour nursing care and a suicide "Crash Cart" ready to respond to any room at the facility where an incident occurs (14). Supervisor Bret Fidler has indicated that counselors will be alerted to the possibility of a psychological or emotional incident deriving from the interview, and will act in accordance with Probation protocol to ensure youth safety.

- For SAN FRANCISCO, Chief Sifferman and Director Powell have not yet provided the explicit protocol for how they handle incidents of psychological/emotional distress; however, they have referred me to the facility's adherence to Title 15 (Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities), and will work with the Lead Researcher to assure that a protocol will be in place. They have also alerted the facility's behavioral health staff of the study (Roban San Miguel and Stefan Strassfield), and have forwarded the interview protocol to them so that they are aware of the kinds of questions youth will be responding to.

- For SOLANO, Superintendent Watson outlines a number of ways for youth to receive psychological/emotional care in the event of an interview-related incident. 1) The facility has a mental health counselor on call 24 hours a day, to which counselors escort youth based on need, identifiable through their training as counselors. 2) All counselors are either familiar with or trained to conduct the Aggression Replacement Training program (ART), which helps youth manage anger and improve social relations. 3) Teachers in the facility's school program are also trained to identify risk behaviors and given access to tools and contacts to convey youth to counseling services, or the nurse's clinic, available 15 hours/day. Superintendent Watson has indicated that he will alert counselors to the possibility of an adverse psychological/emotional impact resulting from the interview process, so that they will be ready to get youth the help they need.

2. VOLUNTEERS - This study involves no more than minimal risk for the Beat Within volunteers because their participation in the interview will be private, confidential, and off-site; therefore, they should fear no retribution from Beat Within program administration, or facility counselors. The interview process incurs no physical risk of any kind; any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that volunteers will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable. Because responses will be de-identified in the final study, no one will be able to identify the statements of any given volunteer.

3. PROBATION COUNSELORS - This study involves no more than minimal risk for detention facility counselors because their responses in the interview, will be both private and confidential; therefore, they should fear no retribution from Beat Within program administration, or facility administration. The interview process incurs no physical risk of any kind; any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that facility counselors will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable. Because responses will be de-identified in the final study, no one will be able to identify the statements of any given counselor.

2. Frequency of Side Effects/Harm

YOUTH - This is not a medical procedure. The only possible side effects from participating in this confidential interview would be 1) the youth coming to terms with their own beliefs about the program, and their place in it; and 2) any discomfort with having chosen to disclose certain opinions in the presence of the two other interviewees. However, it will be emphasized that they are under no obligation to even answer questions with which they are uncomfortable, and youth will have agreed in the assent form to keep fellow interviewee responses confidential. Because the interview is a one-time-only event, there is no frequency-related concern. Because their responses will be de-identified and combined with those of other youth, they will not experience additional discomfort by fearing identification. However, there is the possibility that youth may experience emotional/psychological distress as a result of the interview process. Should this occur, a protocol for each facility will be in place to ensure that those emotional and psychological issues are addressed. See the section, "Potential Risks and Discomforts" above for more details.

VOLUNTEERS - This is not a medical procedure. The only possible side effects from participating in this confidential interview would be 1) the volunteer coming to terms with their own beliefs about the program, and their place in it; and 2) any discomfort with having chosen to disclose certain opinions in the presence of the interviewer. However, it will be emphasized that they are under no obligation to even answer questions with which they are uncomfortable. Because the interview is a one-time-only event, there is no frequency-related concern. Finally, because their responses will be de-identified and combined with those of other volunteers, they will not experience additional discomfort by fearing identification.

PROBATION COUNSELORS - This is not a medical procedure. The only possible side effects from participating in this confidential interview would be 1) the counselor coming to terms with their own beliefs about the program, and their place in it; and 2) any discomfort with having chosen to disclose certain opinions in the presence of the interviewer. However, it will be emphasized that they are under no obligation to even answer questions with which they are uncomfortable. Because the interview is a one-time-only event, there is no frequency-related concern. Finally, because their responses will be de-identified and combined with those of other counselors, they will not experience additional discomfort by fearing identification.

Restriction from Therapies?

YOUTH - this interview does not supplant or detract from other activities designed for youth rehabilitation at the detention facility. While the interview will take place during a regularly scheduled personal or recreation hour, the lead researcher will work with facility counselors to ensure that critical medical or psychological therapies are not compromised by the interview schedule.

VOLUNTEERS and COUNSELORS - Because volunteers and counselors are not the subjects receiving treatment in the juvenile facility, their participation in interviews is not a restriction concern.

Potential Breach of Confidentiality?

YOUTH - It is possible that one of the three members of the group interview may choose to disclose the responses of peers to either counselors or other youth in the facility. However, as is stated in the recruitment form, and Study Information Sheet, youth will be

asked to agree verbally to keep their peers' responses confidential as well. Each facility, however, has protocols in place to address any emotional or psychological distress youth encounter as a result of such a disclosure (see above B. section of Potential Risks and Discomforts).

VOLUNTEERS - There is virtually no risk of breach of confidentiality, since all interactions will be via private email and interview solely with the lead researcher, and all responses will be recorded on a password-protected smartphone recording device, and transcribed off-site in a secure, locked location using a password-protected computer and hard drive, to then be de-identified as soon as they are transcribed to text format.

PROBATION COUNSELORS: There is virtually no risk of breach of confidentiality, since all interactions will be via private interview solely with the lead researcher, and all results are private and de-identified. Even if confidentiality of participation is breached by facility administration, there is no way that the confidentiality of individual responses will be breached, as the responses will be recorded on a password-protected smartphone recording device, and transcribed off-site in a secure, locked location using a password-protected computer and hard drive, to then be de-identified as soon as they are transcribed to text format.

5. Discuss what steps have been taken and/or will be taken to prevent and minimize any risks/ potential discomforts to subjects (address physical risks as well as other risks such as the potential for a breach of confidentiality). Examples include: designing the study to make use of procedures involving less risk when appropriate; minimizing study procedures by taking advantage of clinical procedures conducted on the subjects; mitigating risks by planning special monitoring or conducting supportive inventions for the study.

YOUTH - This study has been designed to minimize any potential psychological or physical risks to the subject. The questions to be asked interrogate the youths' feelings and opinions about the writing program as writers, but purposely avoid asking about personal issues related to their legal cases, or any current of past emotional trauma. This study is intended to capture a single snapshot of juvenile writers' attitudes about a program they already participate in weekly, and therefore will not require monitoring of any kind. Any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that they will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable.

And while there is marginally more risk of psychological distress in conducting interviews in threes rather than one-on-one, any psychological distress they may encounter as a result of disclosing opinions in the presence of the two other interviewees is no more of a risk than the self-disclosure that already happens in the Beat Within writing workshop; moreover, they will have agreed verbally to keep all responses in the room. Finally, youth privacy will be protected during the interview itself insofar as the interviews will take place in the far corner of the group writing area in the line of sight of a Probation counselor to insure physical security, but out of earshot, so that youth feel privacy from counselor ears. Because results will be de-identified and combined with those of two other institutions, there is no risk of identification.

However, if the participant has difficulty coming to terms with his/her own responses, or the other two interview participants break the agreement to maintain interview confidentiality, a protocol for each facility is in place to ensure that those emotional and psychological issues are addressed.

- For SANTA CLARA, all Probation Counselors receive between 2-8 hours of mandatory annual training to handle "Communication with Aggressive, Mentally Ill, and Emotionally Disturbed Youth," as well as "Suicide Detection and Prevention in Jails and Institutions" (Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Commission Inspection Report, February 2012). Santa Clara also has an Incident Report protocol for Counselors to document incidents that might ensue from this psychological/emotional discomfort (Report 11), as well as 24-hour nursing care and a suicide "Crash Cart" ready to respond to any room at the facility where an incident occurs (14). Supervisor Bret Fidler has indicated that counselors will be alerted to the possibility of a psychological or emotional incident deriving from the interview, and will act in accordance with Probation protocol to ensure youth safety.
- For SAN FRANCISCO, Chief Sifferman and Director Powell have not yet provided the explicit protocol for how they handle incidents of psychological/emotional distress; however, they have referred me to the facility's adherence to Title 15 (Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities), and will work with the Lead Researcher to assure that a protocol will be in place. They have also alerted the facility's behavioral health staff of the study (Roban San Miguel and Stefan Strassfield), and have forwarded the interview protocol to them so that they are aware of the kinds of questions youth will be responding to.
- For SOLANO, Superintendent Watson outlines a number of ways for youth to receive psychological/emotional care in the event of an interview-related incident. 1) The facility has a mental health counselor on call 24 hours a day, to which counselors escort youth based on need, identifiable through their training as counselors. 2) All counselors are either familiar with or trained to conduct the Aggression Replacement Training program (ART), which helps youth manage anger and improve social relations. 3) Teachers in the facility's school program are also trained to identify risk behaviors and given access to tools and contacts to convey youth to counseling services, or the nurse's clinic, available 15 hours/day. Superintendent Watson has indicated that he will alert counselors to the possibility of an adverse psychological/emotional impact resulting from the interview process, so that they will be ready to get youth the help they need.

2. VOLUNTEERS - This study has been designed to incur only minimal risk for Beat Within volunteers by making solicitation, scheduling, and the interview process completely private and confidential; therefore, they should fear no retribution from Beat Within program administration, or facility counselors. The interview process incurs no physical risk of any kind; any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that volunteers will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable. Because responses will be de-identified in the final study, no one will be able to identify the statements of any given volunteer.

3. PROBATION COUNSELORS - This study has been designed to incur only minimal risk for

detention facility counselors by making the interview itself both private and confidential; therefore, they should fear no retribution from Beat Within program administration, or facility administration. And while the structure of the probation institution - including its modes of security and communication - prevents probation counselors from participating in the interviews anonymously, the interview process itself remains private and confidential. It incurs no physical risk of any kind; any psychological distress is diminished by the fact that facility counselors will be told that they can refuse to answer any questions they find uncomfortable. Because responses will be de-identified in the final study, no one will be able to identify the statements of any given counselor.

C. Potential Benefits

1. Discuss the potential benefits that may accrue directly to subjects. *Note: Compensation is not a benefit. Do not include it in this section.*

[ ] There is no direct benefit anticipated for the subjects.

   OR

YOUTH - Participating in this study gives youth the satisfaction of knowing that their opinions may shape how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published. This means that, as writing program participants, they can feel a sense of agency and ownership of the program which they attend, and to which they contribute, on a weekly basis.

VOLUNTEERS - Participating in this study gives volunteers the satisfaction of knowing that their opinions may shape how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published. In addition, their responses may influence how *The Beat* Within as an organization maintains relationships with Beat volunteers, including how the organization solicits volunteer feedback on given writing prompts, and how recruitment and volunteer orientation are conducted. As a result, participation in this study will give *The Beat* Within a better sense of what is most important to volunteers, so that they are able to get the best experience possible out of the time that they donate to the program.

PROBATION COUNSELORS - Participants will not benefit directly in this study. However, participating in this study gives counselors the satisfaction of knowing that their opinions may shape how the writing workshops are conducted, and how *The Beat* is published. This will foster better communication between *The Beat* and the facility counselors who oversee workshops every week (but do not participate in them directly), thereby enhancing counselors' sense of partnership and meaning for a program which they may otherwise perceive to be outside their jurisdiction.

2. Describe the potential societal/scientific benefit(s) that may be expected from this study.

This study has potential to create social benefits for all stakeholders in the juvenile probation facility. The study will benefit the Court and Probation indirectly by providing a more comprehensive picture of how this particular rehabilitative writing model helps fulfill the goals of the Court, the Probation institution, and *The Beat* Within as a direct service provider. These *indirect* benefits may accrue not only to the institution as a whole, but to the Probation counselors who participate in the interview process. Some of these goals may include improvement of the youths' inter-personal relationships, reduction of violence, increased self-efficacy, and potential for civic engagement. The study will benefit the youth themselves by determining the extent to which *The Beat* Within facilitates improvement of interpersonal relationships, reduction of violence, increased self-efficacy, and potential for civic engagement.

In addition, this study will provide valuable insight into expressive writing in carceral settings for scholars and practitioners in the disciplines of Composition, Writing Studies, and Prison Studies, thereby enriching these disciplines' respective narratives about the carceral writing subject's cultivation of personal agency.

There is no significant benefit to science, but the study's methods will, at least, provide a replicable, aggregable source of data upon which other social-scientific or writing studies-based research might be conducted in the future.

D. Risk/Benefit Assessment

Explain why the study risks are reasonable in relation to the potential benefits to subjects and society.

The study's potential benefits to subjects and society far outweigh its risks, which are psychologically minimal, and physically non-existent. Participation in this study for all participant groups give them opportunities to safely and confidentially share their feelings and opinions about a program they engage in weekly, thereby helping shape that program in a direction that is more meaningful and effective for each group. While the benefits for volunteers and youth are direct, the benefits for Probation counselors are indirect.

SECTION 8: ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION

1. Describe the standard or usual care activities at UCI (or study site) that are available to prospective subjects who do not enroll in this study, as applicable.
2. Describe other appropriate alternative procedures to study participation that are available to prospective subjects.
3. If no alternatives exist, indicate that the only alternative is non-participation

[X] No alternatives exist. The only alternative to subjects is not to participate in the study.

    OR

SECTION 9: ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING/MANAGEMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR INJURY

A. Adverse Events and Unanticipated Problems

1. Indicate that you are familiar with UCI's Adverse Events/Unanticipated Problems reporting policy and procedures. See http://www.research.uci.edu/ora/hrpp/adverseexperiences.htm for details.

[ ] Although this study involves <u>no interaction/intervention</u> with research subjects (i.e., involves the use of records, charts, biospecimens) an unanticipated problem may still occur (e.g., a breach in confidentiality), the researchers are aware of UCI's Unanticipated Problems involving Risk to Participants or Others reporting policy and procedures and will comply with this policy.

[X] This study involves <u>interaction/intervention</u> with research subjects. The researchers are aware of UCI's Unanticipated Problems involving Risk to Participants or Others reporting policy and procedures and will comply with this policy.

2. If this study involves <u>interaction/intervention</u> with research subjects, explain how the research team will manage adverse events and unanticipated problems that may occur

during the study or after completion of the study (i.e., provide a plan).

[ ] Not applicable - This study involves <u>no interaction/intervention</u> with research subjects (i.e., involves the use of records, charts, and/or biospecimens).

OR

YOUTH - should youth experience adverse effects of having participated in the interview process (e.g., they experience psychological distress from coming to terms with their own realizations, or disclosure of their responses by a fellow interviewee to other detained youth), facility counselors are, in keeping with their responsibilities to maintain the safety and health of their juvenile charges, prepared to intervene and minimize harassment, as they are present for all interactions that occur when youth engage in group social activity (e.g., school work, or recreation time, including sports). The lead researcher will include, as part of the permission form, a stipulation that facility counselors be prepared for such adverse effects. In addition, the lead researcher notes the following response infrastructure for each of the three Probation facilities:

- For SANTA CLARA, all Probation Counselors receive between 2-8 hours of mandatory annual training to handle "Communication with Aggressive, Mentally Ill, and Emotionally Disturbed Youth," as well as "Suicide Detection and Prevention in Jails and Institutions" (Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Commission Inspection Report, February 2012). Santa Clara also has an Incident Report protocol for Counselors to document incidents that might ensue from this psychological/emotional discomfort (Report 11), as well as 24-hour nursing care and a suicide "Crash Cart" ready to respond to any room at the facility where an incident occurs (14). Supervisor Bret Fidler has indicated that counselors will be alerted to the possibility of a psychological or emotional incident deriving from the interview, and will act in accordance with Probation protocol to ensure youth safety.
- For SAN FRANCISCO, Chief Sifferman and Director Powell have not yet provided the explicit protocol for how they handle incidents of psychological/emotional distress; however, they have referred me to the facility's adherence to Title 15 (Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities), and will work with the Lead Researcher to assure that a protocol will be in place. They have also alerted the facility's behavioral health staff of the study (Roban San Miguel and Stefan Strassfield), and have forwarded the interview protocol to them so that they are aware of the kinds of questions youth will be responding to.
- For SOLANO: Superintendent Watson outlines a number of ways for youth to receive psychological/emotional care in the event of an interview-related incident. 1) The facility has a mental health counselor on call 24 hours a day, to which counselors escort youth based on need, identifiable through their training as counselors. 2) All counselors are either familiar with or trained to conduct the Aggression Replacement Training program (ART), which helps youth manage

anger and improve social relations. 3) Teachers in the facility's school program are also trained to identify risk behaviors and given access to tools and contacts to convey youth to counseling services, or the nurse's clinic, available 15 hours/day. Superintendent Watson has indicated that he will alert counselors to the possibility of an adverse psychological/emotional impact resulting from the interview process, so that they will be ready to get youth the help they need.

As to the possibility of disappointment if *The Beat* Within as a program fails to adopt each and every recommendation of every youth participant, these outcomes are outside the purview of this study, and the lead researcher will emphasize that *The Beat* Within will be looking at the aggregate of all responses to determine what changes will be made.

VOLUNTEERS - There is virtually no risk of adverse effects for volunteers, as participation is voluntary, private, and confidential. Neither youth, nor *The Beat* as an organization, nor facility counselors will know whether a volunteer participated in the interview. Should the volunteer experience discomfort around certain questions, they can refuse to answer those questions. Should, however, they encounter psychological distress from coming to terms with their own responses after the fact, the lead researcher has no means of managing such adverse events, though this is highly unlikely, as the questions are in no way designed to recall or incite trauma. As to the possibility of disappointment if *The Beat* Within as a program fails to adopt each and every recommendation of every youth participant, these outcomes are outside the purview of this study, and the lead researcher will emphasize that *The Beat* Within will be looking at the aggregate of all responses to determine what changes will be made.

PROBATION COUNSELORS - There is virtually no risk of adverse effects for counselors, as participation is voluntary, private, and confidential. Neither youth, nor *The Beat* as an organization, nor facility counselors will know what a participant has said in the interview, as the setting is private, and all responses will be de-identified and then combined with those of counselors at two additional facilities. Should the counselors experience discomfort around certain questions, they can refuse to answer those questions. Should, however, they encounter psychological distress from coming to terms with their own responses after the fact, the lead researcher has no means of managing such adverse events, though this is highly unlikely, as the questions are in no way designed to recall trauma, or personal information of any kind; rather, they ask counselors to provide largely professional opinions about a program that occurs during work hours. This creates no risk outside counselors' every day working conditions. As to the possibility\ of disappointment if *The Beat* Within as a program fails to adopt each and every recommendation of every youth participant, these outcomes are outside the purview of this study, and the lead researcher will emphasize that *The Beat* Within will be looking at the aggregate of all responses to determine what changes will be made.

B. Compensation for Injury

[X] Not applicable - This study involves no more than minimum risk and qualifies as Expedited research.

[ ] Researchers are familiar with and will follow UC policy regarding treatment and compensation for injury. If subjects are injured as a result of being in the study, UCI will provide necessary medical treatment. The costs of the treatment may be covered by the University of California, the study sponsor, or billed to subject or the subject's insurer just like other medical costs, depending on a number of factors. The University and the study sponsor do not normally provide any other form of compensation for injury.

[ ] Other: <Type here>

SECTION 10: PARTICIPANT COSTS

[ ] Not applicable - This study involves no interaction/intervention with research subjects (i.e., involves the use of records, charts, biospecimens).

[X] There are no costs to subjects/insurers.

 OR

SECTION 11: PARTICIPANT COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT

1. If subjects will be compensated for their participation, explain the method/terms of payment (e.g., money; check; extra credit; gift certificate).
2. Describe the schedule and amounts of compensation (e.g., at end of study; after each session/visit) including the total amount subjects can receive for completing the study.
3. Specify whether subjects will be reimbursed for out-of pocket expenses. If so, describe any requirements for reimbursement (e.g., receipt).

Note: Compensation should be offered on a prorated basis when the research involves multiple sessions.

[ ] Not applicable - This study involves no interaction/intervention with research subjects (i.e., involves the use of records, charts, biospecimens).

[ ] No compensation will be provided to subjects.

[ ] No reimbursement will be provided to subjects.

   OR

YOUTH - The lead researcher will provide a facility-approved snack for each youth interviewee during the interview itself, as the interview is 45-60 minutes long, and it demarcates this time as recreational, rather than as a chore or more corrections-based evaluation, so as to a) incentivize participation; and b) provide a sense of ease about the interview in-progress.

VOLUNTEERS - No compensation will be provided to volunteers.

PROBATION COUNSELORS - No compensation will be provided to Probation counselors.

SECTION 12: CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESEARCH DATA

1. Indicate all identifiers that may be included in the research records for the study. Check all that apply:

   Note: If this information is being derived from a medical record; added to a medical record; created or collected as part of health care, or used to make health care decisions it qualifies as PHI under HIPAA. The subject's HIPAA Research Authorization is required or a waiver of HIPAA Authorization must be requested (Appendix T).

[ ] No subject identifiers are obtained (i.e., researchers will not collect information that can link the subjects to their data)

   OR

[X] Names   [ ] Social Security Numbers   [ ] Device identifiers/Serial numbers
[ ] Dates*   [ ] Medical record numbers   [ ] Web URLs
[ ] Postal address   [ ] Health plan numbers   [ ] IP address numbers
[X] Phone numbers   [ ] Account numbers   [ ] Biometric identifiers
[ ] Fax numbers   [ ] License/Certificate numbers   [ ] Facial Photos/Images
[X] Email address   [ ] Vehicle id numbers   [ ] Any other unique identifier

[ ] Other (Specify all):   <Type here>

* birth date, treatment/hospitalization dates

2. Explain how data will be recorded.

Check all that apply:

[ ] Paper documents/records
[X] Electronic records/database
[X] Audio recording
[ ] Video recording
[ ] Photographs
[ ] Biological specimens
[ ] Other(s) (specify): <Type here>

3. Indicate how data will be stored, secured including paper records, electronic files, audio/video tapes, biospecimens, etc.

Note: If the research data includes subject identifiable private information and/or Protected Health Information, the storage devices or the electronic research files must be encrypted.

Electronic Data (check all that apply):
[X] Coded data; code key is kept separate from data in secure location.
[ ] Data includes subject identifiable information. *Note: Encryption software is required.* (Provide rationale for maintaining subject identifiable info): <Type here>
[ ] Data will be stored on secure network server.
[ ] Data will be stored on stand alone desktop computer (not connected to

network/internet)
[X] Other (specify here):

Interview data will be stored first on a password-protected smartphone recording device, with a second password-protected smartphone recording device as backup, to then be transferred to a password-protected external hard drive, in a secure, locked location, off-site and off-campus, to which only the Lead Researcher has the key. Once data is transferred to the external hard drive, it will be deleted from the smartphone's memory. Password protection is for the use of the phone, not the recordings themselves. However, because name-identifiable data will not be stored on the phones' removable SD cards, the likelihood of someone breaking into the phone and then taking said recordings is low. Should any name-identifiable data be stored on the backup device (in the event the first device fails), that data will be password-protected, transcribed, and removed from the device using the same procedure as the original smartphone recorder.

Initial contact data for Beat Within volunteer participants, including 1) emails, and 2) phone numbers, will be stored on either a password-protected hard drive, a password-protected smartphone, or a password-protected, encrypted university server, to be destroyed once data is collected. No contact data will be stored on the backup password-protected smartphone, as that is solely for recording interviews in the event the first device fails. Should name-identifiable data be stored on the backup device (in the event the first device fails), that data will be password-protected, transcribed, and removed from the device in the same way as the original smartphone recorder.

Initial contact data for Probation counselors, meaning, names only, will be conveyed via email from Probation administration for scheduling purposes only; this means counselor names will be stored on an encrypted university electronic mail server temporarily, and once interview data is recorded, any electronic documents containing names will be destroyed.

Hardcopy Data, Recordings and Biospecimens (check all that apply):
[X] Coded data; code key is kept separate from data in secure location.
[ ] Data includes subject identifiable information (Provide rationale for maintaining subject identifiable info): <Type here>
[ ] Data will be stored in locked file cabinet or locked room at UCI/UCIMC.
[ ] Data will be stored locked lab/refrigerator/freezer at UCI/UCIMC.
[ ] Other (specify here): <Type here>

Data on Portable Devices:
4. Describe the portable device(s) to be used (e.g. laptop, PDA, iPod, portable hard drive including flash drives).
5. Specify whether subject identifiable data will be stored on the device. If so, justify why it is necessary to store subject identifiers on the device.

[ ] Not applicable – No study data will be maintained on portable devices.

   OR

Interview data will be stored first on a portable password-protected smartphone recording device, backed up by a second password-protected smartphone recording device, to then be transferred to a password-protected external hard drive, in a secure, locked location, off-site and off-campus. Once data is transferred to the external hard drive, it will be deleted from both smartphones' memories. The password protection secures the entire device; there is no separate password protection for the recordings. However, because data will not be stored on the phones' removable SD cards, the likelihood of someone breaking into the phone and then finding said recordings is low.

Data Access:
6. Specify who, besides the entities listed below, will have access to subject identifiable private data and records.
7. If there is a code key, specify who on the research team will hold the key, and who will have access to the key.
8. If publications and/or presentations will include subject identifiable information, specify where the data will be published and/or presented and address how the study team will obtain permission from subjects.

[ ] Not applicable – No subject identifiers will be collected.
[ ] Not applicable – Only the entities listed above will have access to subject identifiable private data and records.

ACCESS to SUBJECT -IDENTIFIABLE DATA - only the Lead Researcher will have access to the smartphone-recorded audio files that might link individual interviewees to the sounds

of their voices (and first names or nick-names, if interviewees accidentally reveal their identities even after having been reminded not to do so). Only the Lead Researcher will have access to electronic mail server- and password-protected smartphone-stored contact information and names for volunteers, and names for counselors.
CODE KEY - The lead researcher will generate the code key, and the only other person with access to the code will be the faculty sponsor, strictly for purposes of testing inter-rater reliability of the coding schema.
PRESENTATION and PUBLICATION - will not include subject-identifiable information, as all responses will be de-identified prior to coding.

Data Retention:
9. Explain how long subject identifiable research data will be retained. The data may include a code with a separate code key or the data may include subject identifiers.

Notes:
- *If more than one of the options below is applicable [e.g., the study involves children], records should be kept for the longer period.*
- *Research documentation involving Protected Health Information (PHI) should be retained for six years (e.g., IRB documentation, consent/assent forms – NOT the actual PHI). Investigators must destroy PHI at the earliest opportunity, consistent with the conduct of this study, unless there is an appropriate justification for retaining the identifiers or as required by law.*

[ ] Not applicable. No subject identifiable research data will be retained.

[ ] Destroy once data collection is completed

[X] Destroy at the earliest opportunity, consistent with the conduct of this research. Specify
     timeframe: Subject-identifiable voice-recorded data will be destroyed no later than three months after voice-recorded interviews are complete, as it will take an estimated three months to transcribe the data and then have it ready for de-identification and coding.

[ ] Destroy after publication/presentation

[ ] Maintain for approximately   years. (e.g., 3 months, etc.)

[ ] Maintain in a repository indefinitely. Other researchers may have access to the data for future research. Any data shared with other researchers, will not include name or other personal identifying information. Note: *Appendix M is required.*

[ ] Research records will be retained for seven years after all children enrolled in the study reach the age of majority [age 18 in California] as this study includes children .

[ ] Research records will be retained 25 years after study closure as this study involves in

vitro fertilization studies or research involving pregnant women.

[ ] As this is a FDA regulated study, research records will be retained for two years after an approved marketing application. If approval is not received, the research records will be kept for 2 years after the investigation is discontinued and the FDA is notified.

[ ] Other:

Data Destruction:
10. If audio or video recordings will be taken, specify the timeframe for the transcription and/or destruction of the audio and video recordings.
11. If photographs will be collected, specify the timeframe destruction of photographs.

[ ] Not applicable – No audio/video recordings or photographs will be collected.
[X] Audio or video recordings transcribed; specify time frame: Transcription of all audio recordings should take no more than one month from time of commencement, after which, all audio recordings will be destroyed.
[ ] Audio or video recordings destroyed; specify time frame:
[ ] Audio or video recordings maintained indefinitely
[ ] Photographs destroyed; specify time frame:
[ ] Photographs maintained indefinitely

Certificate of Confidentiality:
12. Specify whether a Certificate of Confidentiality (COC) has been or will be requested from the NIH. If yes, explain in what situations personally identifiable information protected by a COC will be disclosed by the UCI study team.

Note: If the COC has been secured a copy of the COC Approval Letter should accompany the IRB application or be provided to the IRB upon receipt.

[X] Not applicable – No COC has been requested for this study.

OR

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - DETAINEES

I. WORKSHOP

1. How long have you been going to workshops for *The Beat?*
2. Did you ever do writing on the outside?
3. What are some of the things *The Beat* has asked you to write about that you've liked, that you thought were interesting or useful?
4. When you're writing, do you ever imagine you're writing to specific people, or is it just for you?
5. Who would you *like* to have read what you write? Why?

II. EMOTION

4. When are the times when you feel like you want or need to write?
5. How do you think expressing your emotions in writing helps somebody "become a functioning part of society?"
6. What does becoming a "functioning part of society" mean to you?

III. MENTORSHIP

7. What do you think about *The Beat* facilitators? How are they different from teachers, or probation staff?

IV. REHABILITATION
8. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here?
9. Does writing for *The Beat* change for you what it means to be at _____ (facility), or how you think about the past?
10. How do you think writing for *The Beat* changes your relationship with family/community/the Law?
11. Where do you think you're headed next? Do you think you'll keep writing once you get out of here? Why or why not?

V. PUBLICATION
12. So, what parts of *The Beat* do you read, and why?
13. Who else do you think reads *The Beat?*
14. What do you think of *The Beat's* responses to your work? Do you read it? Does it ever make you think or do things differently?

12. What do you think makes something good enough to be published?
13. Does it *do* something to somebody when they get published?
14. What do you think it means to society to have writing published from behind bars? What do you think people should know?
15. Why do you think the Beat takes the time to respond to what you write, but not the people who write into "*The Beat* Without?" What makes them different?
16. A while back, *The Beat* asked how you would want to change the world; do you think writing about issues like that in a publication like *The Beat* (or somewhere else) can make actual changes in the world? Why or why not?
17. Is there anything you'd like to change about *The Beat,* either the workshop or the publication*?*

<p style="text-align: center;">INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - VOLUNTEERS</p>

I. WORKSHOP

1. Why did you join *The Beat*? How long have you been working with the kids?
2. How would you describe what you do for *The Beat?*
3. How would you describe what *The Beat* does for you?
4. What are some of the things that you say to the kids when you're trying to get them to write?
5. In your experience, what kinds of writing prompts do the kids like to write or talk about, and which ones do they avoid?

II. EMOTION

6. What happens when someone writes about their feelings, and why do you think it's important?
7. (For facilitators who evaluate *Beat* submissions, and write responses): According to *The Beat* writing rubric, the best pieces are "emotional," and "honest." Why do you think emotional honesty is an important factor for these kids' submissions? How do you think it helps further the goals of *The Beat,* Probation, or the kids themselves?
8. How do you think expressing your emotions in writing helps someone "become a functioning part of society?"

III. MENTORSHIP

9. How do facilitators for *The Beat* differ from other authority figures, e.g., Probation staff, teachers, and counselors?
10. Do you ever share your own truths with the kids about your life experience? How do you think that changes your relationship to them?

IV. REHABILITATION

11. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here, and to circulate the newsletter?
12. How do you think writing for *The Beat* changes how they think about the past, or future goals?
13. How do you think writing for *The Beat* changes their relationship to family, community, and the law?

14. What do you think it means to have your writing published in general? What does it do *to* or *for* the writer?

15. Why do you think it's important for *The Beat* to respond to each submission in the newsletter, and what kinds of things should a response do?

16. A while back, *The Beat* asked the youth to write about how they would want to change the world; do you think writing about issues like that in a publication like *The Beat* can make actual changes in the world for these kids? Why or why not?

17. How do you think *The Beat* affects these kids' likelihood for community engagement or political participation later on?

18. Is there anything you would change, either about the workshop or the publication?

19. Is there anything you'd like to add that I haven't asked about?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - COUNSELORS

I. WORKSHOP

3. How long have you been sitting in on workshops for *The Beat*?
4. What happens when *The Beat* comes in the room? Do you notice that the kids change behavior, either during the workshop, or afterwards?

II. EMOTION

3. What happens when someone writes about their feelings, and why do you think it's important?
4. To be published in *The Beat,* pieces need to be "emotional," and "honest." Why do you think emotional honesty is an important factor for these kids' submissions? How do you think it helps further the goals of *The Beat,* Probation, or the kids themselves?
5. How do you think writing about their feelings helps the youth "become a functioning part of society?" What does becoming a "functioning part of society" mean to you?

III. MENTORSHIP

6. How do you see the role of *The Beat* facilitators differ from other adult figures, e.g., teachers, and counselors?

IV. REHABILITATION

7. Why do you think Probation gives permission for *The Beat* to be here?
8. How do you think *The Beat* workshop changes what it means for kids to be at _____ (facility), or change how they relate to family, their communities, and the law?

V. PUBLICATION

9. Do you ever read *The Beat*? If so, what parts do you read, and why?
10. What do you think it means to have your writing published in a public forum in general, whether in a newspaper, or an online blog? What does it do *to* or *for* the writer?
11. Some of the weekly prompts focus on self-reflection, while others focus on issues happening in the outside world, such as when they ask kids to express opinions

about the legalization of marijuana, or sentencing laws. What do you think about these different kinds of questions?

12. A while back, *The Beat* asked the youth to write about how they would want to change the world; do you think writing about those issues in a publication like *The Beat* can make actual changes in the world? Why or why not?

13. How do you think *The Beat* affects these kids' likelihood for community engagement or political participation later on?

14. Is there anything that you'd change, either about the workshop, or the publication? Why?