



## **Multimodal ≠ Multivocal: Incorporating an Ethic of Inclusion to Facilitate Critical Framing**

Erica Cirillo-McCarthy<sup>1</sup>  
Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

### **Abstract**

Multimodal ways of composing are increasingly important in how students craft their identities and the ways with which they interact and engage the world (Selfe). But while multimodality offers a way for students to make new meaning, educators must design a curriculum that frames multimodality through rhetorical, critical, and ethical lenses. Incorporating concepts from disability studies, such as an ethic of inclusion, in multimodal curricula can serve this end. In this article, I examine a common writing assignment—the research-based argument—and discuss moments where students grapple with and eventually employ an ethic of inclusion. I explore the pedagogical challenges of moving students towards an ethic of inclusion in research and composing practices that reflect the multivocality of stakeholders. Ultimately, I argue that an ethic of inclusion can function as a type of “critical framing,” (New London Group) useful in helping students develop their practice of engaging and critiquing not only the discourses that regulate language and agency, but also the relationships between discourses that value and legitimize ways of knowing.

### **Keywords**

Multimodal Pedagogy, Inclusive Pedagogy, Curriculum Design, Multivocality, Accessibility.

### **Introduction**

Cynthia Selfe (2009) has argued that both the history and current practices in composition pedagogy, which values the written work, limit opportunities for students to critically engage with their world and thus “...deprive students of valuable semiotic resources for making meaning” (p. 617). Instead, writing teachers should consider multimodal approaches to

---

<sup>1</sup> Erica Cirillo-McCarthy teaches first and second-year undergraduates in the Program in Writing and Rhetoric at Stanford University. Email: [ecirillo@stanford.edu](mailto:ecirillo@stanford.edu)

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

teaching as well as multimodal ways of composing, ways that are increasingly important in how students craft the self and the ways in which that self interacts and engages with the world. Selfe (2009) has further argued that:

[T]he identities that individuals are forging through such hybrid communicative practices...are key factors in composing the cultural and communicative codes that will characterize coming decades. Students are intuitively aware of these related phenomena, being immersed in them, but they need help understanding the implications of such cultural trends as well as managing their own communicative efforts in ways that are rhetorically effective, critically aware, morally responsible, and personally satisfying. (p. 642)

In other words, multimodality offers a way for students to make new meaning, of themselves and of their world. Selfe has encouraged the creation of a curriculum that engages students in multiple modes of communication, “so that they can function as literate citizens in a world where communications cross geopolitical, cultural, and linguistic borders and are enriched rather than diminished by semiotic dimensionality” (p. 618). Selfe’s call is an ethical one; writing teachers must craft multimodal curricula which position students to not only function in more engaged ways with their world but to also critique their world. In order to do so, educators must build curricula that frame multimodality through rhetorical, critical, and ethical lenses.

Selfe is calling for curricula that can transform composing practices so that students approach research, writing, and representation in more inclusive and ethical ways. Incorporating concepts from disability studies, such as an ethic of inclusion, in multimodal curricula can serve this end. This article seeks to examine a common writing assignment—the research-based argument—and find moments where the ethic of inclusion can be woven through multimodal curricula in order to meet Selfe’s (2009) call for encouraging student-crafted multimodal work that engages the student and the “codes” they live among (p. 642); further, it explores the usefulness of translation in this traditional writing class assignment. Moving students towards an ethic of inclusion has the potential for them, as researchers, to reconsider the ways in which they represent multiple voices of stakeholders in their written work and multimodal projects.

Key concepts in disability studies can inform inclusive curricula and subsequent learning goals. As Brenda Jo Brueggemann, Linda Feldmeier White, Patricia A. Dunn, Barbara Heiffler, and Johnson Cheu (2001) have argued, disability studies intersect in generative ways with writing pedagogy; the writing classroom is a natural space for students to engage with disability studies concepts. The authors have correctly argued that writing teachers often create a curriculum that chooses to “make the invisible visible,” and create spaces where students can challenge language that constructs “the Other;” further, writing classroom curricula often critique binaries and dichotomous structures, which align with disability studies’ challenge to the limiting binaries of disability and difference. Finally, disability studies concepts in the writing classroom have the potential to “return us squarely to issues of practice that both interrogate and enrich our theories about literacy and empowerment” (Brueggemann et al., 2001, p. 371). It appears that writing pedagogy and concepts from disability studies share similar goals and ways towards these goals.

Jay Dolmage (2012) has similarly argued that writing pedagogy and disability studies share the same concerns: expanding access to the institution “while responding critically to the demand for ever more narrow interpretations of the bodies within it” (2012, p. 15). This shared focus on language, power, access, inclusion, and critique of the status quo aligns these two

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

interdisciplinary fields in significant ways. Therefore, it makes sense to incorporate disability studies' concepts into writing courses' student learning goals. Doing so, in careful, thoughtful ways, can provide students with the opportunity to consider access, voice, representation, and multivocality as they draft their multimodal research projects.

In this case, since I wanted to focus on multivocality as a value, the ethic of inclusion works well. Melanie Yergeau, Elizabeth Brewer, Stephanie Kershbaum, Sushil Oswal, Margaret Price, Michael Salvo, Cythia L. Selfe, & Franny Howes, (2013) have specifically argued for an ethic of inclusion in drafting multimodal compositions, stating “[w]e need to pay attention to the teaching of composition through the lens of disability studies to remind ourselves of just how much our profession has to learn, and just how much we have been content to ignore” (para. 2). Implied in the ethic of inclusion is ethical representation of stakeholders. Students should be made aware of the rhetorical power of representation, in particular in research projects. Students, as writers and researchers, choose which stakeholders to represent and how to represent them. In a writing class, there often is not enough time to explore, in depth, the ethics of research and representation, or time to go deep into historical erasures of peoples from research. Therefore, the multimodal curriculum needs to be crafted in such a way that encourages students to first move past familiar approaches to research projects that often do not challenge them as rhetors vis-à-vis ethical questions of representation; second, to challenge their composing processes through the action of translating their work from one genre to another.

Lisa Bickmore and Ron Christiansen (2010) have argued that the potential constraints on students' work come directly from curriculum design; as such, curriculum design must consider “the widest possible, and the most forward-thinking, parameters for our classroom practice, in order to create the widest possible range of responses” (p. 231). Selfe has also argued for teachers to increase the “bandwidth of composing modalities” in our curriculum to allow for increased instructional efficacy (p. 618). Students should not be limited by teaching boundaries; instead, “different compositional modalities carry with them different possibilities for representing multiple and shifting patterns of identity, additional potential for expression and resistance, expanded ways of engaging with a changing world” (Selfe, 2009, p. 645). If writing curricula can open up spaces for students to express and explore the multitude of identities and constructs they embody, they will be better able to negotiate the power structures they encounter and are asked to reproduce. More significantly, this approach of widening the possibilities of communicative modes also widens the inclusivity of the curriculum.

All of this leads to my questions: how can writing teachers create a multimodal curriculum that is wide enough to transform typical composing practices in college writing? If transformed composing practice is an overall goal in a writing course, then learning goals that will transfer to students' future practices need to be created and implemented; in order to facilitate these goals, writing teachers need to design curricula, as Gunther Kress (1998) explained, for “future human dispositions” (p. 79). Writing teachers can consider a curriculum that positions students as “active designers—makers—of social futures” (New London Group, 1996, p. 64). Writing classroom curricula should encourage habits of mind that consider technology and multimodal communication as moments of inquiry. At the same time, students should not be limited by a particular rhetorical role or genre. By giving students the opportunity to translate from a traditional mode (a written research-based argument) to other modes, students can resist a reliance on more familiar ways of writing.

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

The New London Group (1996), Kress (1998) and Joddy Murray (2009) have addressed the importance of building or designing a curriculum that does more than just bring technology into already established writing assignments. Instead, a curriculum that asks students to engage in argument or composition in multimodal ways has the potential to transform practices and thus leads students towards “critical framing,” what the New London Group (1996) has referred to as useful in helping students “frame their growing master in practice...and conscious control and understanding...in relation to the historical, social, cultural, political, ideological, and value-centered relations of a particular systems of knowledge and social practice” (p. 86).

Situated practice leads to critical practice, in the sense that students are able to understand particular “cultural locatedness of practices” which allows for a student to “critique a system and its relations to other systems on the basis of the workings of power, politics, ideology, and values” (p. 84). Situated practice, in order to be most effective, “must crucially consider the affective and sociocultural needs and identities of all learners...” as well as provide a safe space for taking risks and establishing trust (New London Group, 1996, p. 85). Multimodal curricula can offer students transformative opportunities for crafting multimodal projects that position them to critically frame their practices, both their composing and communicative practices, resulting in an embodied understanding of multiple modes of communicating. Students are then poised to critique practices through a deeper understanding of particular discourses and the relationships among them to power and agency.

In this article, I first explore the relationships between multimodal pedagogy, discourse, and discursive practices, which provide the exigency for a multimodal curriculum that offers students the opportunity to critically frame their multivocal composing practices. I outline particular arguments regarding translation, or moving between genres, sometimes referred to as re-purposing, as the second component in my multimodal curriculum; finally, the ethic of inclusion and the potential space that disability studies concepts can provide in this pedagogy leads into my example of a student’s research project. These concepts, multimodality, the act of translation between genres, and concepts from disability studies, all build upon and inform each other. They complement each other in a way that has helped me consider an open and expansive curriculum that does not limit students’ approaches to composing multimodally; these guiding concepts weave in and out of each other, braiding together to form a particular perspective of multimodal pedagogy that encourages students to consider their composing practices through ethical lenses.

### **Multimodal Discourse and Discursive Practices**

When students engage in multimodal composing, they engage with the larger context in which these modes of communication were created, valued, and continue to be understood; by doing so, they engage with the communities that use these particular modes of communication and genres both now and historically. Understanding the affordances of each rhetorical decision in a multimodal project connects students to the particular genre, to their message and to the audience, or as explained by Kara Poe Alexander, Beth Powell and Sonya C. Green (2011), affordances are “the unique representational abilities of a mode” (p. 2). Students, while considering their choices as multimodal composers, come to understand the affordances each technology offers as limitations or potentials as it pertains to their message, the mode, and the audience. As New London Group argued, “[a]vailable Designs also include another element: the

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

linguistic and discursive experience of those involved in Designing, in which one moment of Designing is continuous with and a continuation of particular histories” (p. 75). Finally, New London Group posited that “Available designs” also implies the relationship between what they call “discourses” (p. 74). For example, when students engage with and in Silicon Valley discourse, concerned with start-ups and disruption, they engage with the relationship this particular discourse has with the discourse of free enterprise, the discourse of libertarianism, the discourse of entrepreneurship, and the discourse of a homogeneity and elitism. In other words, “[e]ach discourse involves producing and reproducing and transforming different kinds of people” (New London Group, 1996, p. 74). Students function within these discourses in order to reproduce the discourses’ particular ways of communicating, and thus reproduce particular ways of knowing.

Further, when writing in a classroom setting, students must engage in institutional discourses, which function alongside, sometimes aligning with and sometimes opposing, other discourses. Institutional discourses, however, have a particular defining effect on classroom practices, the instructor, and the student (Luke & Gore, 1992, p. 2). Both students and teachers, through classroom practices and rhetorical action, embody these discourses. Luke and Gore’s construction of the subjugated student and teacher *vis-à-vis* institutional discourse aligns with Foucault’s (1969) concept of discursive practices and knowledge. Here I wish to extend the New London Group’s concept of discourse and knowledge, which, they argued, is “embedded in social, cultural, and material contexts” (p. 82), and is developed collaboratively through, what Foucault called, discursive practices, and I apply that to a multimodal curriculum design.

Michel Foucault (1969) defined knowledge as arising from and supported through discursive practices, practices which in turn are then defined by the knowledge created. He first defined discursive formation as “[w]henver one can describe, between a number of statements, such as a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations)” (p. 38). Discursive formations are formed and defined by (and in turn form and define) what Foucault calls “the rules of formation” (p. 40). These rules of formation, to which all involved in the discursive practice are bound, form concepts which then become accepted truth, or knowledge within the discursive formation (pp. 56-57). Consider this within the framework of teaching students multimodal composing, in particular argument and research: how do we reconsider ways to create new knowledge within the discursive formation of the institution considering the traditional and restrictive “rules of formation” to which we must adhere? How do students understand the rules of formation or add their particular truth to their argument? When we understand how particular roles in a discursive formation are formed and maintained, we are more able to change our roles as rhetors within that system and to explore options for changing other roles that create particular kinds of knowledge as well (Foss & Gill, 1987, p. 397). By attempting to understand how knowledge, the accepted truth within a discursive formation, is perceived and enacted within discursive practices, students can be prompted to discover disjunctions but also the intersections between institutionally sanctioned ways of knowing and ways of knowing that exist outside of the institution. Further, if multimodal curriculum goals have this in mind, students will be in the position to critique existing power structures both inside and outside of the institution.

The emphasis on critical here echoes Paolo Freire (1979) and his concept of education, in particular problem-posing education, as a means towards critical consciousness: “people develop

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

their power to perceive critically *the way they exist* in the world *with which* and *in which* they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation” (1979, p. 83, author’s emphasis). Problem-posing education is a shared praxis in which both educator and students work toward critical inquiry and challenge existing power structures. Clearly, this approach to multimodal curricula goes far beyond just adding a Tumblr to the classroom website or asking students to compose their research in Power Point. A carefully constructed curriculum situated in multimodal practice leads students to writing more rhetorically (Murray, 2009, p. 164). When students have the opportunity to engage with both their digital and non-digital worlds, in rhetorical, critical ways, they have the potential to transform their practice (New London Group, 1996). If a curriculum can do that, then it has met Freire’s call for “critical consciousness.”

### Translation

Curriculum design can encourage assignments and writing that are both traditional, print-based and multimodal, and the opportunity to move between the two offers great potential for growth. Translation, the movement between genres, positions students to further understand the affordances within each genre, and thus moves students to become more rhetorically savvy. As Angela Rounsaville has argued, “as writers travel across literacy domains and encounter new rhetorical situations, they not only carry generic conventions but also the attendant field of practices, ideologies and activities that they have come to associate with that genre over time” (para. 9). As the process of translation moves students through different genres, they encounter and, more importantly, uncover, practice, and ultimately critique multiple genre conventions and affordances.

As Carolyn Miller has argued (1984) that particular genres, if considered practice, have the possibility to illuminate epistemological values within a discourse. Genres are so much more than simple conventions strung together to create a particular form; instead they provide affordances for interlocutors and offer possibilities. As Adler-Kassner, Majewski, & Koshnick (2012) have argued:

[Genres] are the mediating tools (Vygotsky) that bind academic and disciplinary communities. They reflect the values of those communities; at the same time, they shape, contribute to, and perpetuate the values associated with them, as well (Smart). In order to participate in these genres, writers must understand how writing, in this regard, represents more than just “works on a page”—writing is how individuals gain entry and membership in communities of discourse (Lave and Wenger; Soliday). Writers must thus develop an understanding of the roles of purpose, audience, and context in the formation, consumption, and perpetuation of genres and the conventions from which they are constituted. (Adler-Kassner, Majewski, Koshnick, para. 7)

Moving or translating between genres has the ability to highlight the affordances within each genre, and it is through careful consideration of these affordances that students can better engage with their argument, the stakeholders, and reconsider the audience in rich ways. As Anis S. Bawarshi & Mary Jo Reiff have explained, “genres situate and distribute cognition, frame social identities, organize spatial and temporal relations, and coordinate meaningful, consequential actions within contexts,” and that by engaging different genres through the act of translation, “we

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

enact context as we function within it” (p. 95). Through the process of translation, students begin to understand how knowledge is created and valued within each genre, which has the potential to lead to critical framing. New London Group argued that critical framing can further students’ understanding of learned concepts if they are reframed, a distancing process which has the potential to lead to transformed practice. Translating the print-based argument into a multimodal presentation facilitates critical framing, i.e., their “conscious control and understanding” of their newly constructed knowledge (p. 86).

Others have labeled this translation practice “repurposing” (Anderson 2003; Strasma 2007) or “recontextualization,” which Bawarshi & Reiff have described as a process through which narrative becomes “imbued with a different ideological use and exchange value, setting up different social relations, and performing different social actions” (p 93). Translation allows for students to see their work with new eyes as it creates a space for objectivity. Translation between genres also has the potential to help students who are challenged with seeing writing as anything other than a linear process. Instead, translation, by its nature, is discursive and, as such, facilitates writing practices that are discursive. Composing and translating between genres cannot be discrete activities, and students can be encouraged to see the act of translation or composing in different genres as informing each other.

This space for objectivity affords students multiple moments to re-assess their argument, to incorporate and synthesize sources, and, significant to my argument, to represent stakeholders. Often times when students explore a controversy or map out a public discussion, they only map the voices that are present and valued through the discourse and its discursive practices. It is a challenge to map out voices that are not present or legitimized. As I have stated earlier, writing teachers constantly push students to examine not only what is visible, but also what is invisible, or what is missing from a discussion, text, or argument. This also applies to representing stakeholders in research projects.

### **Ethic of Inclusion**

“Nothing about us without us,” captures the spirit of the ethic of inclusion. It implies that people with disabilities will be represented in disability-related discussions and decision-making processes, such as policy creation. . This concept can be broadened further when applied to multivocality in multimodal projects. When writing teachers employ the ethic of inclusion as a learning goal in multimodal projects, the result is multivocal work. Including multiple voices when composing research projects also situates students within the practice of ethical representation. Moreover, the ethic of inclusion also serves as a form of critique. It is not just inclusivity for the sake of inclusivity. As Yergeau et al. (2013), argued, the ethic of inclusion, by its nature, questions power structures and challenges existing limiting relationships (para. 1.). By transgressing boundaries, the very boundaries that are set up to exclude, students can critique said boundaries through the process and practice of embodying the ethic of inclusion.

Scaffolding in an ethic of inclusion in a writing class’ learning goals, particularly for a research-based argument where student writers synthesize sources and stakeholders, leads to inclusion becoming a situated practice that allows for students to critique the discourses in which they participate, including but not limited to institutionally legitimized discourses. These discourses often function as exclusionary boundaries. Students are also closer to the “critical framing” promoted by New London Group (1996), where students develop “control and

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

understanding” of “value-centered relations of particular systems of knowledge” (1996, p. 86). Students can better understand the discursive formations within a particular discourse, and through that understanding, begin to resist or formulate new discursive formations as they create new knowledge.

### **A Multivocal, Multimodal Pedagogy**

Writing teachers often tell students who are conducting research: be sure to explore all sides of the argument! Sometimes teachers even take that a step further and encourage students to give space in their final draft to all perspectives. This is a useful approach, for ideally, if students do give space to all perspectives, they often challenge their own long-standing assumptions about issues. But what if writing teachers want students to challenge long-standing assumptions outside of themselves, long-standing assumptions that function and are reproduced within institutions or particular discourses? A multimodal curriculum that weaves through a learning goal concerned with the ethic of inclusion has the potential to give students the practice and the agency to challenge assumptions situated within discourses.

In my writing course, a course wherein students research, write, then present their research multimodally, one student was in the process of creating a wonderful rhetorical analysis of the discussion surrounding the MMR/Autism link controversy, or as it is more commonly known as, the vaccine controversy. This is a pretty big issue here in the Bay area; we have some of the highest amounts of non-vaccinated children coinciding with the highest academic achievement and income. Corinna,<sup>2</sup> a pre-med student, wanted to understand how each side of the controversy crafted its argument and appealed to its audience. She explored news stories, public anti or pro-vaccine statements made by famous people, medical journals, including Andrew Wakefield’s original and subsequently retracted article in *The Lancet*, and online community forums. She synthesized these voices, analyzed them through a rhetorical lens, and categorized them through a taxonomy she created that drew upon systems theory. When she translated her traditional, print-based argument into a multimodal project, she considered the affordances of each particular mode. She included snippets of sounds from news programs, videos of anti-vaccine proponents, visual rhetoric that represented the multiple perspectives, and created a collage of headlines and forum posts from the variety of stakeholders: the medical community, parents, and policy makers.

There was one community that was missing, however -- a community that is typically left out of these discussions -- those who identify as autistic or on the autism spectrum. When I asked Corinna why those voices were absent in her project, it was clear it did not occur to her to include their voices. She rightfully claimed that the public discussion does not include voices from those who identify as autistic, so it did not occur to her either. This makes perfect sense. It is easy to hear the voices that are legitimized to participate, and in this case it was voices that identified as or promoted the neurotypical perspective; it takes a trained ear to hear the silent voices. But while this is a challenge for students, to identify, see, and hear who is excluded and furthermore work to resist that silencing, a multimodal curriculum has the potential to help students do exactly this. Multimodal projects that are translated from traditional written projects assist in facilitating the ethic of inclusion as a situated practice, which leads to critical framing. It

---

<sup>2</sup> Student work used by permission. Corinna is a pseudonym.



*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

first does so by the student employing the complex process of translation itself, which leads to the process of considering and negotiating the different affordances in multimodal projects, including but not limited to aural, visual, and spatial. Different affordances in turn create a space for further consideration of multiple stakeholders—those who have something to lose and/or gain in this public discussion. Finally, by identifying, through these multiple processes the multiple stakeholders, students can begin to seek out these voices to examine and evaluate which ones are legitimized and which ones are silenced.

Because Corinna, her classmates (who served as the audience at multiple moments during the drafting stage), and I were able to have this discussion about those who identify as autistic being excluded from the often heated discussion about a controversial link between vaccinations and autism, the student was able to critique the homogeneity of the legitimized voices, which led to a critique of the discourse itself, the modes of communication, the politics and ideology concerning this conversation, and the legitimizing (or silencing) of particular voices based on their relationship to power, money, prestige, and spatial/geographical location. As a class, we realized that without the voices of those who identify as autistic, Corinna's project served to reproduce the existing power structure that disallows those who do not fit within a neurotypical paradigm to speak on their own behalf.

After agreeing to the value that multivocality could add to her project, Corinna worked hard to find voices that would make her project embody the ethic of inclusion. She was right about the dearth of multivocality in the public domain in regards to this particular topic. For something that, on the surface, has multiple stakeholders and much at stake, only a narrow group of participants have been legitimized to contribute to the discussion. Neurotypical participants have for the most part ruled this discourse and have disallowed any first-hand perspective from neurodiverse participants. Because of this, Corinna was challenged to find voices of those who are affected by the discussion of the link between autism and the MMR vaccine in a variety of ways, unfortunately mostly negative; she further discovered that those voices are delegitimized by the discourse and thus are not invited to participate. So how was she supposed to find those who identified as autistic and include those voices in ethical ways? She could not very well go out on campus and ask people to first disclose their identity as autistic and second, comment on something on which they may or may not have an opinion for the sole purpose of making her project more multivocal.

To complicate things even more, the different genres--the multimodal and the print-based versions--ask for different approaches to multivocality. For example, Corinna could not find any text written by someone identifying as being on the autism spectrum regarding the vaccination controversy. She was in my class during the winter 2014 term, and it was not until a year later, in February 2015, when Sarah Kurchak's response to the discourse, titled "I'm Autistic, and Believe Me, it's a Lot Better than Measles" was published online. In her text, Kurchak explained how it feels to sit sideline to this passionate discussion regarding autism prevention, complete with horror stories by the parents who fear an autism diagnosis, while Kurchak herself identifies as autistic. When Kurchak would confront anti-vaccinators in regards to their insensitivity to those who identify as autistic, she writes, they would tell her that it's not her type of autism they were afraid of; they were afraid of the "other" type of autism (2015, para. 8). Including Kurchak or a similar voice would have helped Corinna's print-based paper become more multivocal, but that was not an option at that time.

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

To address the dearth of published written voices, Corinna's print-based argument focused on ways to change the perception of autism and the conversation around autism in the neurotypical community. For the multimodal presentation, however, she was able to find a short documentary online created by and for young people on the autism spectrum, and she was able to use a clip in her presentation. In the clip, young people spoke about their experience with autism, their challenges and limitations, but they also made the argument that they would not change their identity to fit into a particular normalized version of neurotypical identity. Corinna made the rhetorical decision to start her presentation with their voices, to position them so that their voices framed her argument. After all of the revisions, feedback, peer review, and conferences, Corinna and her audience worked together to include and value the concept of neurodiversity, so that the research-based argument embodied the learning goal of an ethic of inclusion. Because our writing class is a community that is situated within practice, we all moved closer to practicing an ethic of inclusion. But it was Corinna who found herself in a position to critique the discourse in which this topic is typically reproduced and transform her practices of inclusion and multivocality as a researcher and writer.

### **Final Thoughts**

One reason I argue that the ethic of inclusion must be woven throughout curricula and serve as a learning goal is that if inclusion is an afterthought, or a "retrofit," then the course goals and subsequent practices do not meet the goals of inclusivity or accessibility. Jay Dolmage has argued (2008) that retrofitting, making something not originally accessible more accessible, such as adding a wheelchair ramp to a building, will always be seen as an afterthought. It is a "sort of cure, but halfhearted" (p. 21). Yergeau et al., (2013) have also argued that acts of retrofitting:

...are always reactive, responding to situations or problems that arise, rather than seeking to anticipate potential concerns with the design or production of a multimodal text or environment. Unfortunately, by the time a user has complained about a lack of accessibility, the moment of communication has often passed. (para. 1)

I agree with both of them that the writing classroom has to work harder to anticipate moments of exclusion; writing teachers want to plan for inclusive moments rather than react to exclusive moments with a pedagogical retrofit. I should also admit that the exigency of weaving through the ethic of inclusion as a learning goal was a reaction to Corinna's first few drafts. I instinctively knew voices were missing from her research, but quickly realized that I did not build in learning goals to help students develop that instinct. But by trying on different ways to approach the ethic of inclusion and representational ethics in research projects and by sharing this with the writing pedagogy community, I hope that my moment of reaction becomes transformative, not just for me and my students, but also for other writing classrooms. Instead of being an afterthought, the ethic of inclusion can be part of the curriculum design from the start in other multimodal writing curricula iterations. Further, the weaving together of translation, or moving between genres, serves as a practice that helps students critique these discourses in which they participate. In these ways, multimodal projects can become truly multivocal.

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

**References**

- Adler-Kassner, L., J. Majewski, & D. Koshnick. (2012). The value of troublesome knowledge. *Composition Forum*, 26, Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php>.
- Alexander, K.P, Powell, B. & Green, S.C. (2011/2012). Understanding modal affordances: Student perceptions of potentials and limitations in multimodal composition. *Basic Writing E-Journal, Double Issue, 10(1)11(1)*, Retrieved from <http://bwe.cuny.cuny.edu/alexandermodalaffordances.html>.
- Anderson, D. (2003). Prosumer approaches to new media composition: Consumption and production in continuum. *Kairos*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/8.1/coverweb/anderson/story.html>
- Bawarshi, A.S. & M.J. Reiff. (2010). *Genre: an introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. West Lafayette: Parlor Press LLC.
- Bickmore, L. & R. Christiansen. (2010). "Who will be the inventors? Why not us?" Multimodal compositions in the two-year college classrooms. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 37, 230-242.
- Brueggemann, B. J., L. Feldmeier White, P. A. Dunn, B. A. Heifferon and J. Cheu. (2001). Becoming visible: Lessons in disability. *College Composition and Communication*, 52(3), 368-398.
- Corinna. (March 2014). Controversy to creed: How the MMR-autism theory became the truth for thousands. Unpublished research-based argument submitted for writing and research course. Used by permission with pseudonym.
- Dolmage, J. (2008). Mapping composition: Inviting disability in the front door. In C. Lewiecki-Wilson & B. J. Brueggemann (Eds.), *Disability and the teaching of writing* (pp. 14-27). Boston: Bedford-St. Martin's Press.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition. New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1979)
- Foss, S. & A. Gill. (1987). Michel Foucault's theory of rhetoric as epistemic. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 51, 384-401.
- Foucault, M. (2010). *The archeology of knowledge*. Vintage Books Edition. New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Kress, G. R. (1998). Visual and verbal modes of representation in electronically mediated communication: The potentials of new forms of text. In I. Snyder (Ed.), *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic age*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. R. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Kurchak, S. (February 2015). I'm autistic, and believe me, it's a lot better than measles. *Medium: The Archipelago*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/the-archipelago/im-autistic-and-believe-me-its-a-lot-better-than-measles-78cb039f4bea>.
- Luke, C. & J. Gore. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms & critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Lutkewitte, C. (Ed.). (2014). *Multimodal composition: A critical sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-167.

*Special Issue on Multimodality*  
*Cirillo-McCarthy/JOGLTEP 2015 3(1), 264-275*

- Murray, J. (2009). *Non-discursive rhetoric: Image and affect in multimodal composition*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- The New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60-92.
- Rousanville, A. (2012). Selecting genres for transfer: the role of uptake in students' antecedent genre knowledge. *Composition Forum*, 26. Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/selecting-genres-uptake.php>.
- Selfe, C. L. (2009). The movement of air, the breath of meaning: Aurality and multimodal composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 60(4), 616-663.
- Strasma, K. (2007). Assignments by design. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 34(3), 248-263.
- Wakefield, Andrew J., et al. (1998). RETRACTED: Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children. *The Lancet*, 351(9103), 637-641.
- Yergeau, M., E. Brewer, S. Kerschbaum, S. Oswal, M. Price, M. Salvo, C. Selfe, & F. Howes. (2013). Multimodality in motion: Disability and kairotic space. *Kairos*, 18(1). Retrieved from <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/18.1/coverweb/yergeau-et-al/pages/authors.html#content>.