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*Unit II*

*Aural Social Narratives*

*11:00-15:00 minutes (5-7 pages of text)*

***Unit Goal:*** Students will be able to better understand and explain the rhetorical affordances, rhetorical complexity, and technological skills to compose within the aural mode.

After having written your Unit I ‘Social Narrative,’ wherein you retold an interaction or event that helped you better understand your own identity, social status, social interactions etc. we will be using that same narrative for Unit II. Instead of turning in and presenting (yes, we will be presenting these projects) a traditional written text, we will be turning in an eleven to fifteen minute aural recording of your revised Unit I narratives. The aural mode is the way in which we compose and communicate through spoken words or musical compositions rather than printed verbal text.

This aural recording will be you’re reading of your revised Unit I narrative that has music and/or special effects edited into the recording, so as to add rhetorical and narrative depth. Accompanying this aural recording will be a 4-7 page *Statement of Goals and Choices* paper that will be a space for you to discuss the “what,” “how,” “why,” and “for whom” of your recording. In your *SOGC* you will discuss and reflect on the process of producing your text, the rhetorical choices you made, the deliberate choices you made, the non-deliberate choices you were forced to make due to the technologies, methodologies, and content you utilize, and ultimately, what your rhetorical/social goal for the recording is. At the end of this unit, we will be grading each other’s recordings and posting them on Ohio State’s Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives, so as to circulate our experiences and our texts to a wider audience. The classwork and class-time of the unit will be structure in five parts so as to best prepare you to develop this composition project complexly and effectively.

***The five parts of the unit:***

1. Historicizing and contextualizing aurality

2. Rhetoricizing aurality

3. Personalizing aurality

4. Socializing aurality

5. Working with audio-editing software and best practices for recording.

***The objectives for this unit:***

1. To better understand the socio-cultural and socio-academic hierarchy of modes

2. To better understand how the mode affects—positively and negatively—the communication and reception of the composition and its message

3. To better understand the power of aurality as a rhetorical tool to make meaning and shape identities

4. To better understand how cultures are shaped by and shape aural compositions

5. To better understand how aurality is deeply social and rhetorical

***Course Goals:***

1. Rhetorical flexibility

2. Understanding of how your rhetorical choices need to accommodate different modes, audiences, and public contexts.

 The assessment of these compositions will come in three parts, which is different than our previous unit. Your recording will be graded by your instructor and your classmates when you present the composition to the whole class. Your classmates’ assessment will be averaged and then will count as 25% of your overall grade, and then my own assessment of the recording and paper will count as 75% of your total grade. Also it is important to note, that your aural recording and your *Statement of Goals and Choices* are going to be graded equally; so the recording is 50% and your *SOGC* is worth 50%.

 With your permission, I will be posting these on an online archive *for future class purposes only*. You are in no way obligated to put your narrative on the archive. I simply want to keep a record of your fantastic work so other students can experience and analyze your compositions.As always, we will be working through the process of this composition throughout the entire unit so you will have assignments and meetings that will count toward your final unit grade.

***Important Assignment Due Dates:***

1. ***2nd week 🡪*** Analysis of Personal Social Aural Usage

2. ***3rd week🡪*** In-class workshops for Audio-editing software

3. ***4th week🡪*** Conferences and draft due in conferences

4. ***Composition due at the end of week 4 with presentations for 2-3 class periods***

***Presentation Assessment Sheet (for Students)***

Composer/Designer\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Overall effect of the aural narrative

**|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|**

**Impact of the aural Impact of aural Impact of aural**

**narrative is low narrative is moderately effective narrative is highly effective**

**I don’t understand I think I understand the message I definitely understand the message**

**the intended message**

**Explain your grade:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Overall effect of the special/musical effects

**|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|**

**Sound fx took Sound fx moderately Sound fx greatly**

**away from the added rhetorical depth added rhetorical depth**

**composition or to the composition to the composition**

**none were added**

**Explain your grade:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Overall rhetorical structure of the narrative

**|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_|**

**The story was very I had some trouble I had no trouble**

**difficult to follow following the structure at all following the**

 **of the story structure of the story**

**Explain your grade:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Any further comments?:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Assigned numerical (0-100) grade:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*Class Schedule*

***Week 1***

Monday: *What are modes and how do we use them? A History of the Aural Mode in Academia*

*Due for today:* Read Chapters 1 and 2 in *Writing and Designing*

Wednesday: *Typical conventions of the aural mode: What does the aural mode “look” like?*

*Due for today:* Read Chapter 3 in *Writing and Designing*

Friday: *Group Work🡪 Rhetorical Analysis of Assigned Aural Compositions*

*Due for today*: A rhetorical analysis of an aural composition

***Week 2***

Monday: *Analyzing our Personal Use of Aural Modes*

*Due for Today:* Unit I narrative revisions

Wednesday: *Analyzing Social Uses of Aural Modes*

*Due for Today:* Listen to Sefa Mawuli’s “Greetings” “This I believe” podcast and listen to *Good Will Hunting* “Plagiarizing History” Speech (http://americanrhetoric.com/MovieSpeeches/specialengagements/moviespeechgoodwillhunting.html). Bring in a hardcopy of a 300-450 word rhetorical analysis of ***only*** the aural interaction ***not*** the visual interaction.

Friday: *Comparing rhetorical analyses—comparing our lived experiences.*

*Due for Today:* Analysis of Personal and Social Aural Usages

***Week 3***

Monday: *Learning how to use the tools of audio-editing software pt. I*

*Due for Today:* Bring 6-10 questions in that you have regarding audio-editing tools, skills, and/or software

Wednesday: *Learning how to use the tools of audio-editing software pt. II*

*Due for Today:* Bring remaining questions from day one of software workshops and a complete voice recording of your social narrative

Friday: ***Conferences***

*Due for Today:* First draft due

***Week 4***

Monday: ***Conferences***

*Due for Today:* First draft due

Wednesday: *In-class peer review*

*Due for Today:* Revised Draft of recording and *SOGC*

Friday: *Presentations*

*Due for Today:* Composition to turn in

***Week 5***

Monday: *Presentations*

Building Upon the Sounds We Hear and Feel: Refocusing FYC to Centralize Aurality

The first year composition classroom endures as a space that is meant to foster variegated literacies for the purpose of “churning out” communicative citizens of a post-modern social-scape who are capable of communicating in diverse ways. While the goal of FYC is very much the ideal, this goal—often—remains only that, an ideal. In FYC, students are—almost exclusively—accustomed to working within, turning in assignments, and being assessed in the traditional print-text medium and linguistic mode (i.e. just reading and writing) despite the discipline’s turn toward new media tools that are meant to promote a myriad of communicative modes and media. This enduring emphasis on print-text has concurrently emphasized the evasion of studying and working within alternative modes and media; so students are often creatively and intellectually constrained within the print-text, thus their meaning making and communication is inhibited. Consequently, I suggest a dissimilar model that cultivates student agency through teaching sonic literacy through an FYC unit writing-project.

The shift to primarily focusing on print-text occurred in the 19th century when North American and European universities shifted to focusing on scientific endeavors (Selfe 116). Institutionally focusing on fields of science necessitated that the primary mode of communication also shifts from oral to written, in order to record experiments and findings within these fields. While this communicative alteration seemed benign enough, there were also social implications produced by the oral-to-writing shift. Focusing on print-text only permitted already-marginalized identity groups to be further marginalized through racist, misogynistic, and hegemonic “social codes. In the 19th century writing was—and still is—very much conflated with university learning, an environment in which, “[m]any women…were discouraged from pursuing a university education…Blacks, Hispanics and [Latinxs[[1]](#footnote-1)], and American Indians…were, for prolonged periods, persecuted for learning to read and write (Gere; Royster, *Traces*; Richardson)” (Selfe 119). This was—and is—a blatant attempt to “gate-keep” the university and social hierarchies because the university is an institution wherein successful (read: institutionally sanctioned) students can achieve upward social mobility. However, even those permitted in the university—too—were persecuted through print-text-only pedagogies because, ultimately, “power and aurality are closely linked…Indeed, that enactment of authority, power, and status [especially in] composition classes is expressed, in part, *through* aurality: how much one is allow to talk and under what conditions” (emphasis in original; Selfe 128). So, this static system of communication can intellectually constrain university students, perpetuate a racist hegemony, and limit us to only *one* way of *knowing*, only *one* method to *make meaning*.

Another issue with print-text-only in FYC, is that it simply contradicts our realities insofar as, “students consider their sonic environments [fundamentally important]—the songs, music, and podcasts they produce and listen to; the cell phone conversations in which they immerse themselves; the headphones…that accompany them wherever they go…the audio blogs, video soundtracks, and mixes they compose and exchange…and share with anyone…who will listen” (Selfe 113). Renowned rhetoric and composition scholar, Cynthia Selfe, succinctly reminds us that we are endlessly immersed by sound (albeit, granted we have the biological function of hearing); so to ignore the aurality and its rhetoric creates a cultural “blind spot” (Mulder qtd. Comstock sec. 2 par. 4). Arjen Mulder posits,

“[o]ur ease of hearing is the true reasoning why it is so frequently said that we live in a visual culture, but the increase in the number of images over the past century is insignificant compared with the rise of sound levels in the city and countryside”…the problem…for a critical sonic literacy is creating enough silence to hear the increasing rumblings of our cultural soundscape (Mulder qtd. Comstock sec. 2 par. 4).

These scholars highlight the concept that aurality is massively cultural and social insofar as, our cultures are steeped and perpetuated through aurality and cultural citizens—too—share aurality to create social connections with others. Primarily, we heavily use aurality to create social relationships through our voices; through music we share, through laughter, through our inflections etc. So then, if we sit in silence we become aware of all of the little rumblings that shape our environments, our identities, and our cultures. To create that silence we need to not only remain quiet, but we also need to remain vigilant to the sounds and aurality that we hear. This unit project aims to accomplish that task of shaping aurally literate and flexible citizens so they will not become victims of the “cultural blind spot” Mulder discusses (qtd. in Comstock sec. 2 par. 4). In order to develop complexly literate citizens, I intend on investigating the social and cultural nature of aurality throughout the unit to engage the undervalued rhetoric of the sounds that are common within our sociocultural sphere(s). To foster sonically and socially literate students, I interwove social, cultural, and pop-cultural rhetorical analyses of speeches, music, and environmental noises etc. in order to begin realizing how sonically immersed we truly are.

In order to break away from the seemingly static system of traditional print communication, I suggest that sonic literacy ought be a focus in FYC to allow for cognitive, communicative, and cultural diversity in classrooms as well as outside of the university walls. It is important to note that I’m not arguing for aural-only in FYC; instead, I am arguing for *both* print-text *and* aural-texts. Both modes can inform and enrich each other, instead of reifying the stagnant, print-text only culture. Jody Shipka affirms this notion by explaining “we must take these [new] forms of communication to be at least as important (and often more culturally relevant) than singly authored papers arguing a single, clear point forcefully over the course of five, neatly typed, double-spaced pages” because communicating and composing is far more complex that only a linear argument on material pages (Johnson-Eilola qtd. in Shipka 6). Through this unit project, I am calling on FYC instructors to engage/teach both linguistic and sonic literacies to democratize FYC and non-academic communicative exchanges, which can promote rich personal, professional, and academic “linguistic borders…rather than diminished [communications]” (Selfe 114).

In an attempt to democratize the classroom and empower students by means of communicative diversity, I constructed a Unit II assignment wherein students are asked to digitally record and edit their own social narrative, in their own voice. Through editing their own recording they are required to infuse musical and/or special effects so as to create a more rhetorically complex composition. This recording process is meant to foster a rhetorical and social appreciation for and a flexible understanding of the aural mode, which—despite its quotidian, sociocultural ubiquity—is neglected in FYC. The Unit II writing project needs to be preceded by a Unit I writing project, a traditional, written “social narrative,” in which students will illustrate and interpret a social event or interaction that helped them understand, situate, and define their own identity in relation to others and/or social reality/

The Unit I social narrative serves as a springboard into Unit II because in the print-text narrative students will have to depict certain details, scenery, emotions etc. so the intended audience can visualize and “know” the storyteller’s reality and identity that she’s communicating. Therefore, a decipherable voice is imperative so the audience can get a rhetorically complex representation of the author. In Unit II, the complex representation of identity will be communicated through an audible voice, which is “like a fingerprint, each voice carries its own inflection, its own texture and grain. In writing, voice acts as a metaphor for how a persona created in the text ‘sounds,’…[however,] there’s a personality and also a personal feeling to a recorded voice” (Comstock ch 5, par. 5).The voice that is present in the print-text version can be considered the touchstone of developing voice for Unit II because the reality and identity communicated in the projects will be relatively similar, however, print-text voice and aural voice are not always seamlessly translatable.

For instance, Michelle Comstock documented a student’s process of writing a script for her aural composition project and then attempting to aurally produce that same script. The student, Miku, elaborated on her process, “I was originally satisfied with my script,” she said, “The script seemed to represent what I wanted to say in the manner I intended to. However, once I started to do the voice over my script became unbearable. There was no flow…[a]wkward word choices suddenly screamed from the text” (7.7). Miku illustrates the disconnection between print-text “voice” and aural “voice,” which is a key aspect of the unit project in order to emphasize the difference between the two modes’ unique affordances. Instead of print-text voice, the voice communicated through the aural mode (i.e. speech) “conveys a great deal of meaning through pace, volume, rhythm, emphasis, and tone of voice as well as through words themselves” (Selfe 127). So then, this specific mode not only encourages students to develop a new kind of literacy, but working within this mode attempts to promote impactful, communicative flexibility through learning and observing the effects of implemented rhetorical strategies through using the aural mode. Therefore, the students assigned this unit project will need to engage with aural texts and compositions in order to realize the diverse dialogic strategies they can employ when designing their own aural compositions. In order to achieve rhetorical literacy in the aural mode, I intend for students to engage with aural texts, is by having students rhetorically analyze the audio of speeches, monologs, songs, and common American dialects because for students to be rhetorically effective composers of aural texts, they first need to be rhetorically effective “readers” of aural texts.

Highlighting the vocal difference between modal affordances remains only one feature of sonic literacy’s rhetorical complexity. Developing aural literacy also means investigating the rhetorically temporal quality of sound. “Walter Ong famously argues that despite…[sound’s] evanescence, [it’s] ‘more real or existential than other sense objects’ and ‘related to present actuality rather than to past or future’” (Ong qtd. in Comstock sec. 2 par. 3). This immediacy of sound is conflated with “authenticity” because speech and sound is quickly produced and has an impact on audiences that is difficult to control (Comstock sec. 2 par. 3-4). Therefore, this immediacy, authenticity, and uncontrollability indicates that the aural text will have a dissimilar impact on the audience that is more difficult to control so students will need to pay particular attention to aurality’s rhetorical strategies. Recognizing these dissimilarities is fundamental to learning sonic literacy because engaging those affordances encourages audiences to receive the aural text in a deliberately impactful manner, which—consequently—further endorses the composer’s rhetorical message.

 This emphasis on sonic literacy also facilitates students to further develop and understand their own identity and communicative needs. Selfe attests to this notion, “[t]he stakes for students are no less significant [than instructors’ need to be effective teachers]—they involve fundamental issues of rhetorical sovereignty: the rights and responsibilities that students have to identify their own communicative needs and *to represent their own identities…*” (emphasis mine; Selfe 114). Students’ identities are distinct and these distinctions need to be honored inside and outside of the classroom because—again—aurality is closely linked to power (Selfe 117). Therefore, giving students the chance to have their social narratives and identities heard within the classroom can empower students, especially students from marginalized groups that are often silenced in the mainstream cultural. Comstock argues, “how we resonate with our own voice and the voices of others is informed by cultural differences and our ideological positions. For example, it’s still rare to hear an adult female voice over in a Hollywood feature film” (sec. 5 par. 6). Consequently, this unit project can empower students to represent their identity and/or identity group(s) in ways that those identities are not often represented in order to dictate who they are on their *own* terms.

 This rhetorical autonomy to self-define can have enormous implications for student-learning as well as their social situatedness, especially for students that come from culturally marginalized groups. This focus on rhetorical aurality has translingual implications for a handful of reasons. First, aurality, as well as various other modes, played—and still remains to play—a huge role in minority cultures such as Afro-American, Indigenous, Latinxs and Hispanic cultures. Throughout the majority of history in the U.S. there have been de facto literacy rules that these aforementioned groups had to follow, lest they face the consequences of a resentful White person with power.

Blacks, Hispanics and [Latinxs], and American Indians…were, for prolonged periods, persecuted for learning to read and write (Gere; Royster, *Traces*; Richardson), educated outside the schools that males attended, and denied access to white colleges and universities. Although individuals from these groups learned—through various means and, often, with great sacrifice—to deploy writing skillfully and in ways that resisted the violence of oppression, many also managed to retain a deep and nuanced appreciation for aural traditions (Selfe 119).

Selfe underscores the historicity of aural traditions in minority cultures here through understanding the cultural significance of this particular mode. I believe that the cultural significance is—indeed—part of the reason why aurality is eschewed in higher education; so the potential for liberating pedagogical outcomes are tremendous. Selfe asserts, “[t]hese aural traces identify communities of people who have survived and thrived, not only by deploying but also by resisting the literary practices of dominant culture that continued to link the printed word and silent reading, so closely to formal education, racism, and the exercise of power by whites” (Selfe 119). So then using aurality positions our students to reposition their subjectivity to their compositions insofar as, when writing in traditions print-text for academic purposes, students are—more often than not—the objects of the writing rather than the subjects of the writing, especially in the case(s) of minority students, because students have to perform a “voice” that is not their own in order to fulfill the “standard” values of the academy (Royster 30). According to Jacqueline Royster, “subject position is everything. I have come to recognize…that when the subject matter is me and the voice is not mine, my sense of order and rightness is disrupted” (Royster 31). Thus, this Unit II assignment has the potential to produce a space for students to reposition themselves as subjects of their academic texts rather than subjects, because they are telling *their own* socialstories by means of *their own* voices in order to communicate *their own* realities and understandings.

 This unit—too—creates a space for “rhetorical sovereignty,” which is what Scott Lyons defines as, “the inherent right and ability of peoples to determine their own communicative needs and desires…to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse” (139) because this aural mode emboldens students to veer from the norm of stifiling, print-text that has historically been used to perpetuate the culture of power within the academy. This breaking down the culture of power is accessible to all students through my aurality unit because it remains a mode that is very much tied to immediacy, authenticity, and physicality; thus students are more able to determine their “communicative needs and desires” (Lyons 139) because they are developing a new literacy that they can communicate through (Ong qtd. in Comstock sec. 2 par. 3) So then, aurality—and by design, this unit—is subverting cultures of power, especially for students of colors that are often culturally objectified through hegemonic structures and histories.

 Additionally, another implication of this unit is promoting the pedagogical practice of translingualism within the FYC classroom due to students exercising their own “authentic voices.” While framing students’ aural voices as authentic is moderately problematic, I frame it that way regarding this unit project because—ideally—it will be a chance for students to produce and exhibit *another* facet of their authentic voice. This multifaceted conceptualization of “voice” keeps in accordance with Royster’s notion that “all my voices are authentic, like bell hooks…[it’s perceived as] ‘a necessary aspect of self-affirmation not to feel compelled to choose one voice over another, not to claim one as *more authentic,* but rather construct social realities that celebrate, acknowledge, and affirm differences, variety’” (emphasis added; hooks qtd. in Royster 37). The Unit II composition project, then, engages the variegated “voices” of students in a different way than traditional print-text because of the active, physical, and verisimilar qualities of sound as opposed to the disconnection between the composer/performer and the audience-reception that print-text enables (Ong qtd. in Comstock sec 2 par. 3). So then these different communicative characteristics that arise out of aurality are both translingual and subversive, insofar as, students are encouraged to use their “less academic” voices in order to make and communicate meaning about themselves while eschewing the typical identity compartmentalization that print-text fosters—thus, concurrently eschewing the inherent hegemonic ideologies of traditional print-text.

 The only way for this subversive translingualism to have a productive effect for students is to facilitate students’ cognizance that they are—indeed—acting subversively and sovereignly. Hence, I implemented—what Jody Shipka has termed—a Statement of Goals and Choices (SOGC) paper that requires students to critically analyze their own process and choices with their aural social narrative recording (Shipka 113). This process paper is then a space for students to better understand their own perception and situatedness of their realities by way of delving into what rhetorical choices they made and *why* they made those choices is—in large part—the reason students engage their work and learn from their work (Shipka 116).

 In order to effectively shape Unit II into a “composition made whole,” I have added two aspects that encourage students to realize that the instructor is not the only member of their audience and that their composition can be distributed and circulated among a larger audience (Shipka 131). Consequently, I added a peer-to-peer assessment system as well as an archival aspect to this project. The unit project is comprised of two distinct and equally weighted parts (i.e. the two distinct parts of the paper are weighted 50%-50%): the aural recording and the SOGC paper. At the end of the unit, students are required to present their aural recording to the whole class and the class will evaluate and assess their fellow peer’s social narrative recording. In order to encourage students to take this assessment seriously, I structured the assessment in such a way where student assessments are worth 50% of their peers’ aural recordings and my assessment is worth 50% of their aural recordings; so the overall weight of the assessments are 25% dependent on students and 75% dependent on my own assessment because I am solely responsible for assessing their SOGC papers.

 Another tool I’ve implemented to widen students’ audiences to further “authenticate” their rhetorical situations is an archival aspect, whereby I would—with students’ permission—keep their aural social narratives in order to produce a digital archive of their work so other students can experience and analyze previously turned-in narratives. Archiving student aural social narratives encourages students to engage composition as a “whole” text, comprised of design, process, revision, distribution, circulation, and audience reception. In her book, *Composition Made Whole,* Shipka affirms the pedagogical need to facilitate students’ thinking of compositions as whole *things*, because doing so helps students witness the “multiple external connections” that composing can—and often does—bring about (Prior and Shipka qtd. Shipka 34).

 Throughout designing and composing this pedagogical unit (that I very much intend on implementing in my own FYC classroom) I have come to realize that rhetorical and cultural nuances, critical analyses, and rhetorical flexibilities can only be taken up by students if the writing project creates a space for those concepts to be realized, understood, and engaged. The FYC classroom has the potential to be a poignant hotspot of intermingling realities, identities, academic goals, and literacies that can facilitate both academic and personal student-learning. The university can—and too often, is—a space of propagated hegemonic marginalization; therefore, I find teaching the aural mode and sonic literacy to be imperative so students (and even instructors) and resist the acculturation of oppressive ideologies by means of negotiating their *own* subjectivities through utilizing their literal and figurative voices in political contexts
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1. A developing nomenclature used to refer to Latinos/as without marking gender [↑](#footnote-ref-1)