

12. SOUND AND FURY: STUDIED RESPONSE(S) OF CURRICULUM AND CLASSROOM IN DIGITAL TIMES

INTRODUCTION

It is a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury. Signifying nothing.

Enter a messenger.

Thou com'st to use thy tongue – thy story quickly. (Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, V.v.)

In Faulkner's *Sound and Fury*, perspective is everything. Moments happen quickly and changes come slowly. The same may be stated for classrooms and curricula in a digital age, with a shift in perspective that recently has thrown many modernist educational boundaries and underlying assumptions into doubt—including constructs of learner and teacher, and schooling itself (Gee, 2004; Knobel & Lankshear, 2007). This shift is due, in part, to young people's own fluid, de-territorialized meaning-making afforded by the consumption and, perhaps more importantly, the production of digital texts. These texts often occur in social platforms such as MySpace, Twitter, YouTube, and the like, which are adapted to, and adapted by, young people in an ever-emergent cascade of screens. In online places, students' ways of knowing and representations of their meaning-making circulate widely across time and space. Digital texts, as created by young people, become sites of action and agency. Arguably, brick and mortar classrooms are not.

The implications of evolving digital platforms for educational product and process are beginning to drive curriculum theory more pointedly, particularly within the situated discourse of English language arts (ELA), or language and literacy education. Stoicheff and Taylor (2004) declared, "Today digitization has opened up endless possibilities for visual and acoustic innovation, but our understanding of what constitutes a text remains rooted in the traditions of the medieval page. The architecture of the page has not changed significantly since then, a result of its tremendous economy and functionality" (p. 8). Yet Bolter (2001) declared that we are living in the "late age of print" (p. 2). This evolution of textuality, just as changes to education as a whole, is complex. Within books themselves, Lewis (2001) has likened textual and reader relationships in a manner that we may adapt to view teacher, learner, and the text of curriculum – as an ecology: "Word and image, organism and environment, mutually shape each other but there is no reason to suppose that the dynamics of this relationship remain the same from page to page, let alone from book to book" (p. 48). Much of the contemporary textual landscape in which young people are developing their

“literate habitus bubbles up and flows around popular and consumer culture and emergent electronic texts, often out-manoeuvring or subverting the supervisory gaze and control of adults” (Carrington, 2005, p. 45). The spaces of classroom and educational digital texts create complex dialogic “contact zones” (Bakhtin, 1981), where we may witness the representation of learner, teacher, and curriculum in interesting, complex, and nontraditional ways.

This chapter, through its suite of three situated writings, examines the responses of curriculum and classroom to the sound and fury that informs the discourse of evolving literacy and learning in new times. These writings emerge directly from two qualitative studies, “Reading the Writer” (Nahachewsky, 2003) and “At the Edge Reason” (Nahachewsky, 2009), that inquired into the experiences of students and teachers in a virtual, and a traditional English language arts classroom in two Western Canadian Provinces. These two studies provide a situated, yet longitudinal perspective which reveal the complexity of teaching and learning in a digital age; complicating subjective “presentism” (Pinar, 2004) in theory and practice. The first section of this chapter is a critical reading of the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol (WNCP), which provides a common curricular outcomes-based English language arts framework for the two provinces in which the classroom studies were conducted. As we shall see, this common curriculum framework strives to define and perhaps limit the perspective(s) of who students and teachers are.

THE CURRICULUM

When Father gave it to me he said I give you the mausoleum of all hope and desire; it’s rather excruciatingly apt that you will use it to gain the *reductio ad absurdum* of all human experience which can fit your individual needs no better than it fitted his or his father’s. (Faulkner, 1929, p. 76)

Language—can never be neutral, it imposes a point of view not only about the world to which it refers but toward the use of mind in respect of this world. (Bruner, 1986, p. 29)

The common curriculum text we consider in this chapter is somewhat of an anomaly in a country that gives the responsibility for the education of its young people to each province and territory. In 1993, an agreement for the development of the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education was signed by the Ministers of Education from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, and the North West Territories. Nunavut signed on to the project 7 years later. In the preamble to the 1993 protocol, the Ministers of Education acknowledged that, although education is a provincial jurisdiction in Canada, common expectation and concerns regarding basic education among Canadian provinces could be addressed through a collaborative coprovincial process. Further, the ministers agreed the WNCP should establish high standards for education and ensure students access to an array of educational opportunities. The primary issue the ministers identified in the agreement was *the need to optimize the limited resources of the provinces in improving education*. To that end, the

provinces agreed to collaboratively create new curricula and to work together to develop both standards of student performance and student assessment programs. Reaction panels composed of teachers, administrators, parents, postsecondary educators, business representatives, and members of community organizations provided feedback on the process and the product. This collaborative effort resulted in the identification of common educational goals and student learning outcomes designed to prepare students for present and future language requirements:

Clear student learning outcomes and high learning standards in the ELA curriculum Framework are designed to prepare students for present and future language requirements. Changes in society and technology have affected and will continue to affect the ways in which students use language to think, to communicate, to learn. Students must be prepared to meet new literacy demands in Canada and the international community. The ability to use language effectively enhances students' opportunities to experience personal satisfaction and to become responsible, contributing citizens and lifelong learners. (WNCP, 1998, p. vii)

Foundational to a critical understanding of the WNCP is an understanding of its conception of *language*. The WNCP ELA framework grounds its understanding of language in a Vygotskian perspective. As such, it defines language as a tool. It recognizes that skill in applying this tool is developed within social contexts. The protocol links this tool directly with understandings of thought, and it acknowledges that skills needed to apply this tool are transferable across contexts. Multiple purposes are also suggested throughout the document. These purposes include the following: to facilitate thinking, define culture, develop personal identity, build interpersonal relationships, extend experience, facilitate reflection, contribute to a democratic society, construct and convey meanings, and facilitate metacognitive awareness. Each of these purposes, however, begs a larger purpose, identifiable in the question, To what end? For example, to what end do we use language to facilitate thinking or to construct meanings? This larger purpose is not clearly defined in the framework.

In *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*, Bruner (1986) suggests that our use of language has a constitutive role in creating social reality and concepts of our *selves*. This has important implications for the culture of education and the concepts of self that teachers and students co-construct particularly through readings of and engagement with curricula in digital times. Bruner believes that much of education has lost this sense of wonder and exploration by merely transmitting culture and knowledge. Students are seen as participants in this culture but as participants who are given a role "as performing spectators who play out their canonical roles according to rule when the appropriate cues appear" (p. 123). This role causes "the child to only identify himself as owner, as user, never as creator; he does not invent the world, he uses it; there are prepared for him actions without adventure, without wonder, without joy" (p. 124). Bruner would rather that students have a role in making and remaking the culture of education, in negotiating meaning, and opening a sense of wonder.

If students are allowed, through openness in the curriculum and their teachers' language, to become part of a negotiation, facts then are created and become interpreted understandings shared by teacher and students, rather than transmitted by teachers as predisposed 'truths'. The students become "at once an agent of knowledge making as well as a recipient of knowledge transmission" (Bruner, 1986, p. 127). The role of teachers, then, in part, is to use language to negotiate meanings in relation to the texts of the students' lives, the curriculum, and educational culture. Bruner believes that only through opening curriculum's possibilities, through an understanding of the importance of language, can teachers allow students to help create that culture:

If he [a student] fails to develop any sense of what I shall call reflective intervention in the knowledge he encounters, the young person will be operating continually from the outside in—knowledge will control and guide him. If he succeeds in developing such a sense, he will control and select knowledge as needed. If he develops a sense of self that is premised on his ability to penetrate knowledge for his own uses, and if he can share and negotiate the result of his penetrations, then he becomes a member of the culture-creating community. (Bruner, 1986, p. 132)

In Bruner's view, learning becomes a constructed experience within a community that can respond to, and perhaps transform, the challenges and changes of static curricula in a digital age. We must look to real classroom experiences to consider the response of teachers and students to the sound and fury of this digital age.

A DIGITAL CLASSROOM

Through the fence, between the curling flower spaces, I could see them.
(Faulkner, 1929, p. 3)

Our emergent digital times, through a cascade of hyper-textual and multimodal possibilities—both textual and pedagogical—challenges the authority of any one author or teacher. Educational theorists have become intrigued by these challenges and changes in relation to classroom practices and literacy curricula such as the WNCP (1998). In this section of the chapter, we visit an online senior English language arts classroom to better understand the interaction and relation of the "classroom" teacher, his students, and changing times. Through this example, one can perceive a challenge to "presentism" through a coauthoring of "curriculum" beyond the page, and "classroom" beyond walls.

Reading the Classroom in First Person

The home page of this educational Web site opens up a unique but highly structured learning environment. It combines static and dynamic text, icons, symbols, and multicolored hyper-text links on a subtly colored background. The page follows a basic left to right, up to down split that made its navigation intuitive according to culturally normative reading patterns. Yet one was not restricted by this orientation. A

flashing keyhole icon, a symbolically sun-drenched "Thought for the day," and multicolored textual links suggested the reader/viewer construct their own path of experience and understanding in this educational hypertext.

Under the heading of "Homeroom for: _____" and a dynamic banner that advertised the school board's online classes, several interactive links as well as static bits of text are located. A blue-colored "English B 30" heading link the reader/viewer to a separate "ELA 30 World Literature Homepage" that consists of the school board's logo in motion, and five other dynamic iconic links titled "Cyber-orientation (read first)," "Calendar," "Course materials," "Communication tools," and "Student tools."

On the Homeroom page directly beneath the course icon, I noticed other linked textual messages such as, "There are new discussion postings," and "There are new assignment postings for you." Across from these messages sits the "Thought for the day," which on this day was somewhat appropriate: "Even if you can control nothing else in your life, you can indeed exercise powerful and effective control over the thoughts that occupy your mind."

At the bottom of the Homeroom page sit two headings, "Bookmarks" and "Personal." Each heading has supporting links for the student, such as "Participating in an e-learning community" and "Ask a homework/research question." These are part of the commercially homogenous Web CT program but could be personalized in content choice for individual reader/viewer's academic needs.

As a researcher and adapting reader, I navigated my way through the web-course and its pages. Questions and concerns kept surfacing for me: What were the students experiencing? How comfortable or uncomfortable were they in this environment? Did they find the text and graphics engaging or boring? Would they set the class up differently than it was? Would they be allowed to make changes to the structure and operation of the class, its assignments, or readings? What were the new reading experiences for them? Perhaps most importantly, I questioned how this environment and its complicated discourse affected their previous literacy practices.

Course/Coarse Expectations

I continued clicking and linking through the presented order of five icons on the home page and skimmed their content. As I continued my online observations I was able to orient myself with this online classroom environment, its structure and operation. The information located through the links was for the students' benefit. It allowed them to get a sense of the functioning of the software, appropriate classroom communication behaviours, classroom routines, as well as prescribed readings and assignments. The information consisted of a combination of policy statements, rules, lists, anecdotes, and textually-aided pictorial demonstrations that originated from the school's administration, course instructor Mr. Rosencrantz (a pseudonym), and previously enrolled students. The multimodality of these layered textual and semiotic messages was intended to create a particular classroom culture with a goal-oriented work ethic and cooperative communication environment:

The ELA B30 course will explore an exciting new delivery system with the implementation of an interactive on-line class. The course design will offer a student-centered approach to learning. Students will be able to interact with the instructor and other students on a continual basis via e-mail, chat rooms, and bulletin boards. The wealth of resources and web-sites on the internet will truly make this course a study of global literature. . . . While there is a certain degree of independence for students, interaction with other students in the class is strongly encouraged. The Bulletin Board, the Chat Room, and the E-Mail provide wonderful opportunities for the exchange of ideas among students. In addition to the assigned tasks using these tools, students are expected to communicate frequently with each other. It is hoped that students will be the lifeblood of the discussion areas. . . . Remember that you won't have all those non-verbal cues that you get in the physical classroom, and neither will your instructor...What does this mean for you? Again, that taking a class online means you won't be sitting quietly in the classroom; participation is essential for everyone involved. . . . As always, effective communication is critical to success.

The goals of this course manifested many postulated theoretical aspects of the New London Group's (1996) concept of multi-literacies. Terms such as "student-centered," "collaborative," "interactive," "exploring," and "global" in relation to "websites," "chat rooms," "e-mail," and "bulletin boards" acknowledged an evolving way of learning as well as an evolving way of communicating. The students were reminded that their literacy practices would be different as well. They would rely exclusively on lexical cues and clues for construction of self and intended meaning: "Words on the screen help the teacher 'see' you...effective communication is critical to success." Other posited multi-literate characteristics were manifest in the inclusion of past students' comments regarding their experiences in the course. These messages, obtained through Mr. Rosencrantz's online survey of students' past experiences in the class, were democratization in the learning process. The class's public bulletin board echoed this perspective. The following communications appear as they were originally posted, with inconsistencies included (pseudonyms are used throughout):

posted by Mr. Rosencrantz on Wed Jan 30 07:46
 Subject Greetings Everyone
 Hi Everyone. If you're reading this, then you've jumped over one of the technological hurdles of the course—you can find a bulletin board message. What I want everyone to do is to post a short little introduction. I'll start.
 I am in my 15th year of teaching. I like strong coffee, the Boston hockey team, and golf. I have 2 kids—Saul is 4, Samantha is 2. I love to read legal thrillers in my spare (?) time. This will be my fourth time teaching this class on the internet. If I've learned a few things

that help students, these are the biggies: 1. Don't get behind 2. There's no such thing as a dumb question (well, there is, but I don't mind if you ask them). I'm looking forward to working with you this semester. :)

posted by Alice on Mon Feb 04 20:46

Subject Hello!

Hey everyone! It took me a while to get here, cause I couldn't figure out what to do and by some miracle I am finally here! yaay! Anyway, apart from that, I am really, really looking forward to cyber school although at the beginning I was pretty iffy about the whole thing. I am 17 years old and attend Trinity and I enjoy listening to guitar solo's and 80's rock music (I am not ashamed to say it either!) I hope I get to know everyone of you guys better and enjoy your second semester!! Alice D.

posted by Mr. Rosencrantz on Tue Feb 05 08:03

Subject Hello!

Finally!!! Someone appreciates 80's music!!! I may have to put some sound tracks into the course for everyone to enjoy— Dexy's Midnight Runners, Soft Cell. Tears for Fears ... (I'm getting a little misty right now) ;)Mr. R.

posted by Sara P on Wed Feb 06 16:16

Subject Hello!

i loooooove 80's music! it's nothing to be ashamed of. you know what else is sweet? 80's movies. The breakfast club, pretty in pink, sixteen candles, weird science...john hughes was a god. -sara-

posted by Rachel L. on Thu Feb 07 09:53

Subject right?

Good Morning!! I hope this is right...I slowly figuring this all out. It sure is different. Have a great day!
~*RL*~

posted by Mr. Rosencrantz on Thu Feb 07 15:37

Subject right?

You got it. It does get easier. :)Mr. R.

posted by Rachel L. on Fri Feb 08 09:18

Subject First Three

Good Morning everyone! How is everyone doing on those

first three assignments? I'm not very good at this part of english. Any pointers? Thanks. ~*RL*~

posted by Cara B on Mon Feb 25 22:07

Subject whats going on

hey everyone my name is cara and i was wondering how cyberschool was going with everyone! and a little note to sara if you read this...80's music sucks i have no clue what you are talking about! love Cara

posted by Sharron on Mon Feb 25 23:16

Subject whats going on

cara, you're cracked. 80's music is the best!!! same with 80's movies!! The Breakfast Club was on this weekend, anybody catch it? sooooo good! Here's something to think about, back in that day, Molly Ringwald, Emilio Estevez, Judd Nelson, Ally Sheedy, and Anthony Michael Hall were super popular actors. Now they're pretty much unheard of. Ever think that Brad Pitt, Ben Affleck, Jennifer Love Hewitt etc. are going to be lost in obscurity in the next 10 years? Think about it. i'm a dork, i know.

The above excerpted strand of writing represents one of the few strings of communication that related to a textual topic beyond the scope of the course's prescribed literature and topics. Although this strand mimics many of the characteristics of synchronous online chat, the participating members, including Mr. Rosencrantz, were writing their responses over several days. This was a high-stakes discourse. The teacher worked to shape a culture and tone for the class through his electronic writing. The students fluidly created their identities, understandings, and relationships in response to Mr. Rosencrantz and other students. One was not assured of a response to a particular posting. Rachel tried to engage members in a discussion on the first three assignments, but no one other than the teacher decided to respond to her. Others decidedly carried on a discourse about 1980s (historical) texts such as music, movies, and personalities. A strong sense of appropriation and cotextuality (Bakhtin, 1981) was established in the public space of the bulletin board. Identities and understanding, such as Cara's, became fluid and coauthored. Through digital spaces, learners and teacher stretched their traditional relationships with the ELA curriculum, their idea of classroom, and each other. The teacher and students were situated, yet they moved through time and text in a fluent manner appropriating words and ideas in a co-construction of understanding and identity that pushed at the edges of page, brick, and mortar. The next section of this chapter provides another perspective—that of a teacher and her students located within a traditional classroom space a few years further into our digital age.

TEACHING IN A BRICK AND MORTAR CLASSROOM IN DIGITAL TIMES

I discovered . . . then, that I had gone through all that I had ever read, from Henry James through Henty to newspaper murders, without making any distinction or digesting any of it, as a moth or a goat might . . . in a series of delayed repercussions like summer thunder. (Faulkner, 1929, p. 218)

Teaching ELA today is like conducting an experiment with too many variables. (Kathy)

Kathy worked as department head and English specialist in a mid-sized high school in a rural community that was quickly becoming a bedroom community to a large urban centre during the recent economic boom and exponential population growth in Alberta. The location of her school meant that other local rural schools fed their middle-year students into Kathy's high school, making the student population of her classes quite homogeneous in its social, political, and religious background. This affected her perception and construction of herself as teacher:

What you do or don't do, everybody notices and knows. The feeder schools—kids come in with a preconceived notion of who you are as a teacher, what your reputation is. So "reputation, reputation, reputation Iago"; it is everything to me and thus I've got to tread those platforms very carefully, and parents have a very strong influence on what happens in this school.

The many allusions that Kathy made during our interviews and in her written responses to the literature that she was studying with her classes revealed a teacher who possessed a strong sense of central canonical texts. She possessed a purposeful authority with literature, and literature served an explicit purpose in her classroom. Yet, her textual and pedagogical choices engaged a plurality of identity and openness to possibility that contemporary ELA teachers seem to need.

I think as companion pieces popular culture works fine; as reference points—the kids understand that. We're doing Hamlet with the 30's and this is her first performance of her mind dissolving and as the kids said at the end "Nobody out crazies Ophelia" and that is Matt Groening, right? So they know it and there is no harm in that. I'm going to be doing *A Street Car Named Desire*. Rather than letting them know about it or showing it as an addendum at the end, I begin the play by showing them that clip from *The Simpson's*, not because it does the story but then because you can contextualize and you can say "based on this perhaps parallel, perhaps parody, perhaps slightly relevant little text, what do you now know about Blanche Dubois as Stella. Let's get your pre-thoughts out there." You know you can use the media in different ways and I don't think there is anything wrong with that but I don't think you can take away from the absolute genuine article. It is so much more profound. You can't teach *Hamlet* unless you teach *Hamlet*. A paraphrase, or a selected reading from does not cover the breadth of it. *Hamlet* scales mountains, not toboggan hills.

Kathy was very much a ripper and burner, cutter and paster of multiple texts. She did this not to build a single authoritative truth for her students in the classroom, but rather to socially construct constellations of truth through an appropriation (Bakhtin, 1981) of the myriad textual representations that orbit main canonical works. Kathy also facilitated the “textualization of self” (Richardson, 2006) that is so valued by students through many media—from digital representations to classroom chatter. But she also frequently questioned her effectiveness and identity as language and literacy teacher in digital times. The culture of the local community affected Kathy’s perspective on teaching, on both the power and powerlessness of teachers. Her colleagues and students affected her evolving understandings of what a literate individual is. Her 15 years of teaching experience grounded her considerations of teaching in digital times, especially the complex nature of it. Within the changes and affordances of learning and teaching in digital times, Kathy remained aware of competing discourses and forces for her students’ attention and her own energies:

It is things—competing forces: the kids needing to go out to practice for a play when I need them here for a conversation. The kids needing, up until recently, time for CTS projects, some of which you see around the room—and now you have to teach them the technology when you don’t know it yourself. The students needing to be able to access power point [*sic*] in your classroom or wanting to do exams on the computer and how do you deal with that? There’re just so many details. Like the companion pieces that I needed this morning—my email file wouldn’t house them, but then I opened my email to do attendance after the class had started and the file had made its way through the system and it is there and I couldn’t print it and I started this process yesterday morning. So technology is wonderful but it is also terrible....The fact that I spend all weekend here and come to school at 6 in the morning seems irrelevant. What more do you need? Where does it all come from? And yet the perception of it is simplicity. Remember the science teacher who said I wish I could just pick up a book and read it to the kids. Teaching ELA is the simple and the complex.

Throughout my classroom observations, Kathy demonstrated a willingness to, and adeptness at, engaging the students in multitextual conversations. She used digital texts such as DVD movies, Photoshop representations, information from the Internet on myth and archetype, as well as canonical texts to allow for an exploration of theme. She did this in part because she believed that

These kids are used to thinking in ways that we never were. We were taught in rote fashion, in demand fashion . . . so while they are maybe not as methodical or as organized as we would have been, they can multitask and see a variety of influences coming into a main concept. Their paradigms are different. Rather than seeing things linearly on paper they open up their computer and like a hyper text there is another window that opens up and inside that and so on; you know it is Robert Frost’s poem “way leads on to way” knowing you will never come back so you lose a thread from here but

you gain another thread from there. And that's the way their brain must be hardwired—mine is not hardwired that way. I sometimes cannot follow the dynamics the way it goes—I think that's not the way I was going but okay I'll live with it. I don't know but I might be becoming perhaps a bit better at trying to house that conversation in a central stream but it's all just hit and miss. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't.

Kathy's sense of her self as teacher in digital times was above all else emergent, just as her pedagogy and textual choice was. This impacted directly on her notions of literate individuals and her consideration of ELA teacher as coauthor rather than authority in the classroom.

I feel emerging literacy. It is a perpetual quest. I hope that I'm better at it than I used to be, but I hope I'm not as good at it this morning as I will be this afternoon....I think what I author in this classroom is a platform or way to be more than the specific text itself. I publish a lot of things, I talk to them, I write to them, I write with them. But am I the author of this classroom? Absolutely not. We are co-authors—I hope so anyway....Like Lear, until I face(d) my (pedagogical) storm I remain (was) so very weak and pitifully blind; that doesn't (didn't) so much "happen" as it is perpetually happening—the verb tenses are thwarting my intentions.

The act of teaching ELA in digital times, for Kathy, was not only like conducting an experiment with too many variables; it became an ellipsis of many emergent texts and moments in a coauthoring of subject area content and self as literate and learned. What does this emergent process mean for curriculum and educational theorists?

WE TOO ARE COMPOSED OF MANY MOMENTS

But to have the school authorities think that I have no control over her, I can't. (Faulkner, 1929, p. 180)

Can I?

We are composed of many moments, from waking through sleeping, in our personal and professional lives. Experience, memory, and theory intermingle. They provide the conglomerated aesthetic and efferent aspects of educator which alternate between very public and then cloistered stances. We are, perhaps as Kathy feels, composed of too many moments amid the binary flow of digital technologies and times. What may be most important to realize, though, is that we as educators and curricular theorists are not defined or authored during this digital age by any one moment, curriculum, or understanding of teacher and learner. As we have seen from the two studies above, teachers' and students' understandings are coauthored within the educational spaces of digital times. Perhaps curriculum, both what it contains and what it strives to constrain through presentism, can be coauthored as well.

The examples of the two classrooms, and the experiences of learners and teachers located there, clearly point to a reconsideration of individual learner and teacher, and a challenge to author(itative) knowledge as defined by curricula such as the WNCPC (1998). The realm of digital spaces “makes possible—indeed, makes normal—the radical convergence of text, image, and sound in borderless ways that break down the primacy of propositional linguistic forms of ‘truth bearing’” (Lankshear, 1996, p. 16). Teacher and student may be re-visioned. Understanding becomes a process engaged by many in a cascade of personal, social and historical “contact zones” (Bakhtin, 1981) rather than within one subjective individual. This perspective invites a connection to Barthes’s (1977) notion of the “death of the author”:

We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single “theological” meaning (the “message” of the Author-God) but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from innumerable centers of culture . . . the only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them. (Barthes, 1977, p. 146)

This is not sound and fury. The subjectivity of “presentism” (Pinar, 2004) is challenged through an intertextual relationship of the historical past to this moment and beyond. The theorist, practitioner, and learner “contradict presentism by self-consciously cultivating the temporality of subjectivity, insisting on the simultaneity of past, present and future, a temporal complexity in which difference does not dissolve onto a flatted social surface” (p. 240). Through this deep cascade of text and experience our perspectives as educators and curricular theorists is changed. In re-visioning teacher(s) and learner(s) during these emergent digital times through a vast hypertext, skein, web, appropriation, meme, quotation, or mash-up, certain privileged texts such as mandated curricula, classroom structures, and a myopic sense of authority are relinquished to complete the sense of “self” and world so valued by teachers and students.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text*. New York: Hill.
- Bolter, J. (2001). *Writing space: Computers, hypertext, and the remediation of print*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carrington, V. (2005). New textual landscapes, information and early literacy. In J. Marsh (Ed.), *Popular culture, new media and digital literacy in early childhood*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Faulkner, W. (1929, 1984). *The sound and the fury*. New York: Random House.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. London: Routledge.
- Governments of AB, BC, MN, NWT, SK, and YK. (1998). *The common curriculum framework for English language arts: Kindergarten to Grade 12*. Retrieved December 2009, from www.wncpc.ca
- Kermode, F., et al. (Eds.). (1997). *The riverside Shakespeare* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Knobel, M., & Lankshear, C. (2007). *A new literacies sampler*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Lankshear, C. (1996). Critical pedagogy and cyberspace. In H. Giroux, C. Lankshear, P. McLaren, & M. Peters (Eds.), *Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces* (pp. 149–188). New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, D. (2001). *Reading contemporary picturebooks: Picturing texts*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Nahachewsky, J. (2003). *Reading the writer: Multilayered literacy experiences in an online senior language arts classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Nahachewsky, J. (2009). *At the edge of reason: Teaching language and literacy in a digital age*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multi-literacies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–91.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richardson, W. (2006). *Blogs, wikis, podcasts and other powerful web tools for classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Stoicheff, P., & Taylor, A. (Eds.). (2004). *The future of the page*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

James Nahachewsky
University of Victoria

David Slomp
University of Ottawa