Communication Design Quarterly

Communication Design Quarterly
https://sigdoc.acm.org/publication/

SIGDOC
Special Interest Group for Design of Communication

acm
Association for
Computing Machinery

Advancing Computing as a Science & Profession

Communication Design Quarterly

Communication Design Quarterly (*CDQ*) is the peer-reviewed research publication of the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) Special Interest Group on Design of Communication (SIGDOC). *CDQ* is in the ACM Digital Library.

We invite you to contribute in any of the following areas:

- *Original research.* Articles that cross disciplinary boundaries as they focus on effective and efficient methods of designing and communicating information.

- *Experience reports.* Reports presenting project- or workplace-focused summaries of important technologies, techniques, methods, pedagogies, or product processes.

- *Book reviews.* Short reviews of books you think may be of interest to the communication design field. Please query ahead of time before sending.

All submissions except book reviews are peer-reviewed. Book reviews are reviewed by the Book Review Editor.

By submitting your work for distribution in this Special Interest Group publication, you hereby grant to ACM the following non-exclusive, perpetual, worldwide rights:

- to publish in print on condition of acceptance by the editor

- to digitize and host your work on the CDQ website

- to digitize and post your work in the electronic version of this publication

- to include the work in the ACM Digital Library and in any services related to the Digital Library

- to allow users to make a personal copy of your work for noncommercial, educational or research purposes

As a contributing author, you retain copyright to your article or review, and ACM will refer requests for republication directly to you. ACM asks all authors to include their contact information in their submissions. Opinions expressed in published works are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily express the opinions of the ACM or SIGDOC. Author(s) should be contacted for reprint authorization. For more information, please see the ACM notice to contributing authors at http://authors.acm.org.

Special Issues

We are also interested in proposals for guest editing special issues. As a guest editor, you would be responsible for soliciting three to five peer-reviewed articles on a specific topic along with an article-length introduction to the issue's topic. You may propose a special issue individually, or as a group. Your proposal should demonstrate expertise on the topic being proposed and demonstrate the topic's current interest to members of the communication design community. Each proposal should include a résumé/CV for proposed guest editors and a draft call for submissions. Guest editors are responsible for publicizing calls for papers, recruiting subject matter experts as peer reviewers, coordinating double-blind peer reviews, corresponding with authors and reviewers, editing final drafts, and submitting final drafts and any necessary forms to the *CDQ* editor.

***Communication Design Quarterly*'s Statement on Inclusivity and Ethical Data Visualization**

Communication Design Quarterly invites work by authors of all ethnicities, colors, faith identifications, genders and sexualities, abilities, and levels of academic and professional expertise. Work will be considered for publication based on its potential value to our readership population, as primarily illustrated by members of the Association for Computing Machinery's Special Interest Group for Design of Communication (ACM SIGDOC), and the article's methodological, intellectual, and ethical rigor, as appropriate. Submissions will be assessed by peer-reviewers chosen by the Editor based on how potential reviewer's expertise relate to the submitted work's area of focus.

Communication Design Quarterly is committed to publishing inclusive and ethical work, and expects that any work on or with human subjects meets Institutional Review Board or Ethics Board approval, as appropriate. We also respectfully request that authors consider the ethical implications of data visualization, including accessibility issues. Many articles in *Communication Design Quarterly* are fundamentally based in examination of visuals created by a person or persons external to the author(s), contain visuals created by a person or persons external to the author(s), contain visuals created by the author(s) or in service to the author(s) work, or some combination of the above. We ask that, as authors, you please respect the rights, needs, and expectations of those whom you portray in your work. We also ask that you respect the rights, needs, and expectations of your audience. We at *Communication Design Quarterly* recognize that this statement cannot address all potential vulnerabilities, but ask that you, as readers, authors, and editors in your own right, carefully consider the implications of your work for those whom it engages as both subject and audience.

Communication Design Quarterly

Experience Report

Unlikely Allies in Preventing Sexual Misconduct: Student Led Prevention Efforts in a Technical Communication Classroom

Avery Edenfield, PhD
Utah State University
avery.edenfield@usu.edu

Hailey Judd, MPH, CHES
Utah Department of Health
hjudd@utah.gov

Emmalee Fishburn, MPH, CHES
Utah State University
emmalee.fishburn@usu.edu

Felicia Gallegos, MSW
Utah State University
felicia.gallegos@usu.edu

ABSTRACT

Students' participation in relevant service learning can have a unique impact on their institution of higher education, if provided the opportunity. This article explores student-designed sexual misconduct prevention efforts taking place in an undergraduate project management course at one institution of higher education. We found that involving students in particular kinds of campus communication design and implementation simultaneously improved those efforts and offered students the opportunity to participate in impactful civic projects. In our article, we first examine the most common approach to sexual misconduct prevention, while considering its limitations. We then introduce a nontraditional collaboration—technical communication student involvement within prevention work—which resulted in new efforts. Finally, we illustrate how instructors can integrate similar collaborations.

CCS Concepts

CCS →Social and professional topics → Professional topics → Computing education→ Model curricula

Keywords

student involvement, pedagogy, service learning, violence prevention

INTRODUCTION

Sexual misconduct is an umbrella term for sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, and stalking. Sexual misconduct, particularly sexual assault, is prevalent within the college-aged population (18-24 years), with 13% of individuals in the United States experiencing it while being a college student (Cantor et al., 2020). And, while sexual misconduct has long been recognized as a problem for college campuses (McMahon et al., 2019), the implementation of student-designed prevention efforts is lacking and its successes less studied.

In 2019, a unique collaboration involving sexual misconduct prevention professionals and one technical communication professor began. This collaboration foregrounded student knowledges and experiences to uniquely situate students as experts in prevention efforts. Rather than focusing on only majority identity students, who are often white, heterosexual, and able-bodied (refer to Coker et al., 2016, 2017; Jozkowski, 2015; Peterson et al., 2018), the results of this ongoing collaboration have produced projects that more effectively consider and reach students of many backgrounds.

In this co-authored reflection, we overview relevant student involvement, service learning, and sexual misconduct prevention literature. Second, we share the results of a national survey we conducted to better understand existing collaborations and service learning efforts around sexual misconduct prevention within institutions of higher education across the country. Then, we describe our collaboration and outcomes, ending with takeaways for those seeking to develop their own partnerships with prevention professionals.

Admittedly, in telling the story of our collaboration, our goals are not merely instrumentalist or hyperpragmantic (Scott, 2004), but activist in nature. In other words, as Clark (2004) and Scott (2004) wrote, technical instructors should not only seek to describe the work we engage in with our community allies, but rather we should also seek partnerships that result in action and critiques of power. We hope by bringing forward this burden our institutional colleagues are working with, others can be inspired to work with

their respective prevention professionals in a similar manner. Our ultimate goal is to reduce sexual misconduct and empower survivors to come forward for justice and healing.

Before we begin, following Natasha Jones, Kristen Moore, and Rebecca Walton's (2016) prompt for researcher reflections of positionality, privilege, and power (p. 220), we want to acknowledge our own in relation to our research. As a team, we are white researchers situated at a predominately white institution (PWI) and we occupy differing identities: some of us are abled and some dis/abled, transgender and nontransgender, queer and straight, working class and economically privileged. Further, we represent a spectrum of institutional power as faculty, staff, and students. As we occupy these various positions of privilege and marginalization, we also want to call attention to the unique fit of this collaboration within the Technical Communication and Rhetoric program at Utah State University (USU), as it has been designed to incorporate such social justice concerns and community engagement, making this intra-university partnership a fitting place for such a pilot.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNITY-ENGAGED LEARNING IN SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION: A BRIEF HISTORY

In 2019, one of the authors on this paper (Edenfield) published in Communication Design Quarterly an article comparing institutional modes of sexual misconduct prevention to grassroots, peer-to-peer modes in the form of zines, specifically queer zines. Through his investigation, he came to understand that technical communicators should become invested in sexual misconduct prevention (Edenfield, 2019, p. 1). After the article was published, to leverage his research into the change called for in the paper, he shared it with sexual misconduct prevention professionals, Gallegos and Fishburn, at his institution, which resulted in a meeting to dialogue about how those changes could be brought about through their offices. This collaboration was born in that first meeting. Additionally, with the generous support of USU's Center for Intersectional Gender Studies and Research, we were able to retain a student researcher to help us situate our collaboration within national prevention efforts. This national research was crucial to understanding whether what we were trying to accomplish was unique and whether our collaboration could address concerns with the efficacy of existing sexual misconduct prevention efforts that survey participants identified.

To begin, such a collaboration is not new to the field of technical communication, which has a long history of engaging students in service- and community-engaged learning (Allen & Benninghoff, 2004; Clark, 2004; Kimme Hea & Wendler Shah, 2016; Scott, 2004; Shah, 2018). In 2004, J. Blake Scott described the benefits of service learning for students.

> Service-learning also provides students opportunities to develop, reflect about, and enact civic responsibility. This emphasis on civic responsibility can be motivating to students, leading them to look beyond their career preparation or their success in the course, and prompting them to engage with others in community problem-solving. (p. 289)

Though the pedagogical practice of service learning has been well documented, the impacts and complexities of working with community stakeholders is less understood. In 2016, Kimme Hea and Wendler Shah reported, "[T]here is a dearth of research on the silent partners of these projects: the community partners" (p. 48). The remainder of this section will examine this understudied area, in our case, prevention professionals. In the sections below, we endeavor to raise awareness to the struggles many prevention professionals experience and to the reason why student-involved design offers a potential remedy to those struggles.

SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION RESEARCH

With steady rates of sexual misconduct and an increase in national attention, institutions of higher education are experiencing more calls for action regarding their response to sexual misconduct (McMahon et al., 2019). However, sexual misconduct prevention research has not moved at the same speed as these demands (Jozkowski, 2015; McMahon et al., 2019). The majority of prevention and education efforts in the United States that are focused on the college student demographic address a small number of sexual misconduct elements (i.e., sexual assault and dating/domestic violence) and centers on bystander intervention programs (Crooks et al., 2019; Vladutiu et al., 2011).

The shift in priority to bystander intervention programs is most likely attributed to federal mandates, such as the Campus SaVE Act, which require their inclusion in order to receive federal funding (Coker et al., 2016). Most sexual misconduct prevention efforts use a combination of risk reduction and bystander intervention strategies and may also include additional topics, such as consent and alcohol education (Cooper & Dranger, 2018; McMahon et al., 2019; Moynihan et al., 2015). Contrary to "traditional" risk reduction interventions, the bystander approach treats participants as potential allies, which eliminates feelings of defensiveness and victim blaming (Coker et al., 2017; Kleinsasser et al., 2015). Bystander intervention programs have reduced violence perpetration and victimization rates in women and have decreased overall interpersonal violence (Coker et al., 2015, 2016, 2017). Although research supports the effectiveness of bystander intervention programs (Coker et al., 2015; 2016; 2017), less has been written about the efficacy of other prevention and education efforts, such as consent workshops or healthy relationships messaging and efforts that address other forms of sexual misconduct. Research data about the impact of using peer educators to deliver sexual misconduct prevention trainings is also available (Vladutiu et al., 2011), but little has been written about using students in other ways.

The push to include bystander intervention programming in institution-wide prevention efforts has increased prevention professionals' knowledge and understanding regarding the effectiveness of bystander programs, *yet there are still few clear best practice recommendations for other sexual misconduct prevention efforts, particularly ones that center student involvement in their design and/or implementation.*

The lack of established best practices has created dependence on other "traditional" methods of implementing prevention and education efforts. For instance, both risk reduction and bystander intervention programs primarily use facilitative approaches, such as in-person presentations and workshops, role-plays, and skill training. However, the greatest effects are achieved when participants are allowed to participate in multiple ways (DeGue et al., 2014; Paul & Gray, 2011), as in our collaboration.

The recruitment of bystanders as allies is also a challenge, as recruitment is a rhetorical (persuasive) act that clearly must be adapted to changing rhetorical situations; for example, what is applicable to a married woman with children may not apply to an unmarried woman who is a freshman on campus and just beginning to date (to be clear, consent is a relevant concern for both of these women). The delayed response to all of these challenges presents its own issues as sexual misconduct does not wait for institutional responses. Prevention professionals must be able to respond to the current situation and also be future-looking to anticipate coming needs, an activity that requires active research.

The recipients of sexual misconduct prevention programs have also become customary. Gender-focused interventions are common among risk reduction strategies (Cassel, 2012; Gidycz & Dardis, 2014) and tailoring sexual misconduct programs to first-year college students is well documented (Austin et al., 2016; Berkowitz et al., 2014; Coker et al., 2016; Gidycz et al., 2011; McMahon et al., 2014; Moynihan et al., 2015; Peterson et al., 2018). Additionally, recruitment of student participants in studies assessing the efficacy of these programs has primarily drawn upon those in related disciplines, such as social work, psychology, and public health fields (Bennett et al., 2014; Gidycz et al., 2008). Given that the participants in most studies assessing the efficacy of these programs are white, able-bodied, cisgendered, heterosexual, 18-19-year olds, current prevention efforts largely center the needs and experiences of individuals with those identities, who are less likely to experience sexual misconduct while in college as compared to their marginalized peers (Coker et al., 2016, 2017; Jozkowski, 2015; Peterson et al., 2018). The almost nonexistent prevention efforts in the research literature outside of "traditional" prevention efforts is alarming. Rather than searching for interventions that fit the minimum qualifications for institutions to remain compliant with federal mandates, emphasis should be placed on creating meaningful and lasting impact through a variety of strategies that relate to the entire student body.

Each of these challenges can be addressed—in part—by student design and implementation. By designing prevention efforts using a social justice praxis, students can research, design, and implement programs that embrace a wider range of student experiences—including their own and that of their peers—that involve participants in the learning and that go beyond bystander intervention training. If institutions of higher education want to address sexual misconduct within their campus communities, they need to approach the issue holistically and creatively and not rely solely on approaches that have been formally analyzed.

THE NATIONAL NEED FOR COLLABORATIVE PREVENTION EFFORTS

To more fully situate our collaboration in the context of national trends about collaborative sexual misconduct prevention efforts, we created a national survey (IRB #11283) to gather from other institutions of higher education information about their prevention efforts outside the realm of bystander intervention programming. Specifically, the desire was to learn whether and how institutions incorporate student involvement in their prevention and education efforts.

We distributed the survey nationally using the Campus Advocacy & Prevention Professionals Association's (CAPPA) listserv. CAPPA

was chosen to recruit responses because their work is focused on creating a network for campus-based professionals involved in sexual misconduct efforts (CAPPA, n.d.). The inclusion criteria for being able to complete the survey were for respondents to self-identify as a professional whose role involves sexual misconduct prevention and to have an education from an institution of higher education.

The survey consisted of 15 questions including general demographic and employment information, experiences tailoring sexual misconduct prevention efforts, and experiences with student involvement in prevention efforts. A total of 25 unique participants completed the survey, and 24 were included in the analysis (one was excluded due to the respondent not being over the age of 18). Unsurprisingly, survey results aligned with the research, revealing sexual misconduct prevention efforts are developed and implemented through "conventional" means of design, delivery, and content.

Participants identified the following challenges student involvement brings to prevention efforts:

- Training is always a challenge; they need to know the material and master the skills to deliver it.

- Our Title IX office often treats student engagement and feedback as unnecessary or treats it as an obligation.

- It is challenging to recruit students to participate.

- Staff need extra capacity for supervision and training.

- Sometimes things take longer, such as getting feedback, as we are competing for time and engagement against other commitments.

- Some faculty/staff feel our student staff presenting is less legitimate than professional staff.

- Making sure students are compensated—right now my office has about 3 paid positions; the rest of them are volunteer, so I created a for-credit training course so the volunteer peer educators can at least get course credit for it.

- There needs to be a significant amount of training for them, and with only .5 FTE focused on prevention & education, that is a lot to ask.

- It can be a challenge to give consistent, accurate information across stakeholders and various faculty/staff.

- Students do not get access to administrators who make the policies, many times they share feedback with staff who are not decision makers.

Many of the cited challenges focused on logistics, such as recruiting students, feeling students need to be extensively trained, needing additional staff to conduct those trainings, and students being seen as less credible. These challenges should not deter prevention professionals from finding creative solutions to engage students. Prevention efforts that not only involve students but also allow them to take the lead in developing solutions have the potential to have the greatest impact (Cooper & Dranger, 2018).

One opportunity for institutions to address these challenges and to expand the impact of their efforts is through partnerships between academic units and staff responsible for coordinating prevention and education. We believe embedding sexual misconduct

prevention and education into an academic course gives students exposure to the efforts, enables them to contribute to projects not available through the institution's "formal" student engagement channels, and addresses the other challenges indicated above, such as the challenge of targeting diverse audiences.

Student involvement benefits not only the students but also the institution. Students develop thinking and problem-solving skills as well as empathy and personal ethics, all while contributing to the served communities (Berman, 2006). Student design in prevention efforts centers their knowledge and experiences, builds bridges between professionals and students, and encourages tailoring to the specific communities to which students belong. Engaging students in the problem-solving process of an issue that directly impacts them often creates greater buy-in to the larger cause in the process.

To summarize, in the above sections, we have outlined the existing literature and shared the challenges of sexual misconduct prevention and the benefits of student design in addressing those concerns. The sections below share our collaboration experiences, ending with takeaways for educators and prevention professionals who want to develop similar collaborations.

UNLIKELY ALLIES BETWEEN PROFESSIONALS AND STUDENTS

In the summer of 2016, following an internal inquiry, USU began to implement several research-based sexual misconduct prevention efforts through newly formed prevention specialist positions. Over the next three years, the institution implemented evidence-informed bystander intervention programming as well as a peer educator program through the institution's sexual misconduct advocacy and therapy office.

These programs were effective in beginning a campus-culture shift, but several gaps in prevention efforts remained. First, most of the institution's prevention efforts lacked tailoring towards specific student populations and instead broadly addressed the entire campus community. Second, students were not involved when designing the education and prevention materials, and even when students were involved, the freedom for creativity was limited because of the need to comply with federal mandates. Thus, students were instructed by prevention professionals to stick close to the research-based curriculum that had already been developed, resulting in a curriculum that was less applicable to the target community. Finally, these students largely came from departments within education and social sciences; the perspective of students in other areas was severely limited. Ultimately, the prevention efforts were either too broad or became narrowed to fit students who were already well-informed about sexual misconduct topics. Our collaboration sought to address these concerns as well as the typical challenges we identified above.

Project Background

In Fall 2019, we began planning our collaboration for an upper-division course— Project Management for Technical Communicators—to begin in Spring 2020. Housed in an English department, the selected course is required for students seeking a technical communication emphasis with their English degree. This class was a great fit for our pilot collaboration for several reasons. The project management course was already designed around a semester-long project using Agile methodology, which emphasized collaboration, client involvement, and iterative design.

As an advanced course in the Technical Communication and Rhetoric program, the enrolled students were well versed in design technologies and practices, teamwork, and professional writing. Many of them had been placed in internships or were working part time as designers or writers. Lastly, as noted in the introduction, the program at USU is unique among national programs in that the undergraduate and graduate curricula are designed to inform and motivate students to social justice action in the forms of practice, research, and pedagogy.

And, while any field could be involved, we believe a technical communication classroom is uniquely well-suited for student involvement in sexual misconduct prevention efforts. For one, sexual behavior is all about communication, both explicit and implicit, verbal and nonverbal. Individuals may weaponize or overlook a lack of communication by ignoring or misunderstanding verbal and nonverbal messages of nonconsent or the withdrawal of consent (Jozkowski, 2014; Levand, 2020). Second, as discussed above, student involvement through service learning, experiential learning, and applied writing has a long history in technical communication pedagogy (Clark, 2004; Kimme & Wendler Shah, 2016; Matthews & Zimmerman, 1999; Scott, 2004). Third, this work helps students gain practice in the technical aspects of communication design, workplace research, professional writing, accessibility, and skills with various tools. Finally, this project may help students identify professional skill gaps and may provide them with the opportunity to fill in those gaps.

Understanding social justice as technical communication is important to our collaboration for several reasons. First, as discussed above, upper-division students who attended this class had already been exposed by their earliest classes to conversations about diversity, equity, and technical communication as social justice praxis. Many of these courses included some kind of client project in which groups partnered with community organizations within the university's main campus in Logan. Through this work, students were prepared to collaborate with clients around sensitive topics and to recognize the role technologies and communication play in maintaining or undoing discrimination and oppression. Further, students were primed to see their own student work as promoting social change in their communities. As a land grant institution, the university itself has taken a public stance to support public good:

> The mission of [the university] is to be one of the nation's premier student-centered land-grant and space-grant universities by fostering the principle that academics come first, by cultivating diversity of thought and culture and *by serving the public through learning, discovery and engagement*. [USU, emphasis ours]

To further emphasize this mission, the university recently adopted a new IDEA course goal, "Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good," (IDEA Faculty FAQs, n.d.). Though we stated earlier how research makes it clear that community partnerships and service learning are central activities for preparing students for meaningful work, *service learning can also be a key activity for specifically socially-just technical communication pedagogy*.

A 2016 Programmatic Perspectives' Program Showcase article discussed the programmatic redesign to incorporate activist technical communication practice toward justice aims (Walton, Colton, Wheatley-Boxx, & Gurko, 2016). To demonstrate the connection

between social justice, service learning, and our collaboration, we draw from those guidelines. From the beginning, each course is explicitly framed around social justice concerns through readings that orient the students to social justice and community work. They then incorporate practice in which students apply what they have learned to a project with a community partner. Finally, reflexive writing situates what they have learned in the context of their career goals and the field of technical communication (Walton, et al., 2016). Additionally, their course work prepares them for effective writing for a variety of audiences (nontechnical, semi-technical, and technical), a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods, effective and inclusive UX and design, and constructive client communication. This context makes an upper-division course an optimal location for involving students in this collaboration.

Project Implementation

The first collaboration took place in the spring of 2020. Working with student advising and department leadership, students were informed of the partnership with prevention professionals when they signed up for the class. The English Department provided a paid teaching assistant for the course.

Through our planning sessions, we identified several potential projects in which student design would be particularly beneficial:

- Research and creation of consent/sexual violence prevention/ sexual health zines, including a mock-up and distribution. This project was designed as a way to share peer-to-peer information outside of the institution's purview and to allow them to discuss taboo or illegal topics, such as drug use and consent.

- Research, audit, and overhaul of relevant webpages and/or social media accounts. This project required students to draw on UX skills and to collaborate with various peer groups for feedback.

- Design materials in support of the sexual misconduct advocacy and therapy office's "It's Enough" Spring 2020 campaign. This project required students to draw on communication design skills and to interview their peers in order to tailor it to different groups.

- Design materials in support of the sexual misconduct advocacy and therapy office's annual "Start by Believing" April campaign—digital and in-person pledges. This project also required students to draw on communication design skills and to interview their peers in order to tailor the campaign to different groups.

Each project included pedagogical objectives critical to the course, such as timely and regular client communication, progress reports, quality control, time and budget management, iterative design, mock-ups, and teamwork.

On the first day of the class, students were introduced to the course partnership, objectives, syllabus, and framing. The prevention professionals attended the second class and introduced themselves and their office missions. They also provided important background information regarding their efforts, noting the specific importance at USU. Finally, they discussed and answered students' questions on each project. For homework, students ranked their project choices in a survey and were then assigned by the instructor to a group of four to five.

Important for the class and aligned with project management methodology, each project was framed as addressing a particular problem. Understanding the problem each project was designed to address was key to students having room to be creative and invested and for them to produce something that was ultimately useful for the prevention partners. Practical, doable outcomes were also important for graduating students who were in the process of putting together portfolios of their work for interviews.

Once teams were assigned, students worked in those teams for the entirety of the class. In line with Walton et al.'s (2016) recommendation to require explicit framing through readings early on, teams were required to read documents on sexual misconduct prevention. In addition, students read the most recently published campus climate survey on sexual misconduct experiences, Utah State University 2019 Sexual Misconduct Survey Data Report. These readings were important because they helped students to have both a general understanding of the national problem and some activities to address it, and to localize their work to their particular environment of which they are a part. This last point demonstrates the critical importance of student design in sexual misconduct prevention: students were not designing for a community they had little to no knowledge of; rather, they were invested in and part of their audiences. Prevention professionals repeated this refrain throughout the course and, by doing so, directly addressed the perceived problem identified in the national survey of prevention professionals that we conducted: student expertise.

The campus climate survey report was fundamental in student research and was supplemented by additional research: conducting stakeholder interviews, researching and creating personas, and running stakeholder focus groups. Librarian support and regular involvement was extremely helpful in identifying primary and secondary sources. Additionally, a student LGBTQ panel attended the class to answer questions about sexual consent experiences and education. Students integrated their research into their project designs and final reports.

The course itself was designed to be a hybrid of in-class and out-of-class work. Classes functioned as a "lab" where materials students needed to complete the work were provided in the class while the instructor, Edenfield, and the teaching assistant acted as "coaches" to the projects, helping students to troubleshoot or acting as a sounding board for challenges or questions. Edenfield also helped teams to build and maintain healthy group processes for decision making and delegation. These processes included training in consensus decision making and moderation techniques. Students were provided with explicit instructions on how to run a healthy meeting and practiced these techniques in class, including time and agenda management. This in-class working time was critical to providing busy students the space and time to finish these lengthy projects.

Regular meetings with the prevention professionals were built into the course schedule in advance, including regular progress reporting. Students engaged with the prevention professionals in class and were also given "field trip days" to meet with stakeholders, e.g., the office web design team, their assigned prevention specialist, social workers on campus, the Inclusivity Center's director, a professional from the Disability Resource Center, and other important stakeholders. Field trip days required a small report out of insights and takeaways.

Ultimately, each team worked toward three scaffolded

deliverables—a proposal, a draft of their project, and the final deliverable—each paired with a general rubric. In between each major deliverable students submitted "steppingstone" documents, including a work breakdown structure, a Gantt chart, vision statements, and progress reports in two different formats: a paper format and an "ad hoc" presentation to their class and prevention professionals. In this presentation, students were encouraged to use the time to solicit feedback from their peers and the professionals.

Teams collaborated carefully with their prevention client in their project's area to outline specifications for their deliverables, keeping in mind two constraints: the deliverable had to be useful to the prevention specialist and achievable for the team.

Project Outcomes

Each team produced content unique to their project as described below. In addition, each team also created two personas, a report of the research conducted during their project, and a report of recommendations for the implementation and future iterations for their project. Finally, and in line with Walton et al. (2016), each student wrote a memo reflecting on their project activities, teamwork, and project context. This memo was also framed as providing artifact discussion points for their professional portfolios and job interviews.

Consent/sexual violence prevention/sexual health zines

The final deliverable for this team was a mock-up including layout and content (sourced and original) for a sexual consent informational zine designed for a general public (off-campus) audience. This project is a direct result of Edenfield's (2019) "Queering Consent: Design and Sexual Consent Messaging" that kicked off this collaboration in the first place, bringing to fruition the plans from those initial conversations referred to above.

Students drew from a range of existing zines and created some of their own content. The motivating factor for their project was to engender within the town and among fellow students conversations around sexual consent, particularly topics relevant to them and that the official prevention programs were hamstrung to discuss. Excluded topics included subject matter such as consent under the influence of drugs or alcohol and anonymous "hook-ups."

Social media and website audit and overhaul

The final deliverable for this project was a comprehensive review of relevant websites and social media. Over time, students found that a website review was a robust enough of a project to eliminate social media from their concern. This pivot was seamless because they were working closely with their professional client. Their overview included a comprehensive audit of information and a recommendation report for changes to language with consideration to diversity and equity. They also created a comprehensive usability testing package complete with instructions. They were originally going to conduct the testing themselves, but they faced unforeseen challenges (discussed below) that prevented them from doing so. However, they included clear instructions for peer student workers to take up the testing. They also researched and created additional personas for the website redesign.

"It's Enough" campaign

The final deliverable for this team included five video scripts featuring experiences of their peers demonstrating different survivor narratives: verbal harassment in the workplace, a nontransgender man abused by nontransgender woman through manipulation, a nontransgender woman's attempted assault, gender-neutral online stalking and harassment, and sexual assault within a lesbian relationship. Within each narrative the underlying message was that survivors may feel like their experience was not "bad enough" to seek help. Each script ends by stating no matter what an individual's experience is, it's enough to seek help. This team also included a sketch of a poster that could be used in conjunction with the videos.

"Start by Believing" campaign

The final deliverable for this team included five social media graphics and captions to be shared on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter as a countdown to Start by Believing Day, a national day encouraging pledges to believe survivors when they come forward. They also created graphics to be shared via the Instagram and Facebook story features on the actual Start by Believing Day, as well as detailed instructions on when to include interactive features (polls, swipe ups). This project was implemented in April 2020, resulting in a significant increase compared to previous years in social media interaction for Start by Believing Day.

Challenges

Students faced several challenges while working on these projects. First, as the deliverables were defined in collaboration with prevention professionals, initially students were unsure of where to start. The prevention professionals worked with each team to build trust and show they were responsive to student experiences and expertise. Project management methodologies provided a clear framework for their projects and scaffolded deliverables in a way that made them achievable. Tasking students to begin with a clearly defined problem statement also helped give them direction. We imagine with a less attentive prevention team or unclear scaffolding, some students might struggle to find their footing.

The most significant challenge students faced was the outbreak of COVID-19, which sent the entire course online mid-March 2020. Though students were already collaborating on their documents using shared web spaces and cloud storage, for many reasons students found continuing the projects difficult. Some were dislocated from residence halls and needed to find new housing; some returned to family housing without reliable internet; some were housed with difficult family members or where their time was consumed with watching younger siblings; some experienced mental health issues related to the stress of the pandemic; and some lost their jobs. The pandemic forced us to re-evaluate the collaboration process and deliverables and to recognize that projects needed to be scaled back. For example, the zine project originally included creating a mock-up and a distribution map, but COVID lockdowns meant they could no longer distribute it. Necessary interviews or focus groups had to be moved online. Usability testing needed to be completed remotely or with people who already lived with the students.

Despite the global climate and the challenges students faced, the projects were still completed on time and within (revised) specifications, clearly demonstrating the level of student dedication and buy-in to the projects. Though there are aspects of the collaboration within USU that made it a unique opportunity (i.e., social justice programmatic commitments), we believe there are other aspects, which we explore in the section below, that are generalizable to other courses.

PROJECT TAKEAWAYS AND APPLICATIONS

This collaboration and the survey of other sexual misconduct prevention professionals demonstrate that creative prevention and education is possible and important within institutions of higher education. Student involvement is critical in recruiting students as allies, centering student experiences, and tailoring materials to various audiences. Prevention professionals, like all other college and university employees, are limited in what they can accomplish on their own. Collaborating with an academic course can expand the amount and type of sexual misconduct prevention and education efforts that happen. It also engages students in efforts without needing to formally train or supervise them, which would be required by a peer-educator program, student internship, work study, and practicum placement.

Takeaways for Prevention Professionals

This section is addressed to prevention professionals who are considering this collaboration at their institution. Prevention professionals should be willing to consider prevention and education methods that have not been formally assessed, but that are still rooted in best practices. Academic course collaborations allow prevention professionals to bring a problem to students and then give them the opportunity to address it. This results in prevention and education efforts that are student-driven and student-created, which creates more buy-in amongst students, especially those outside of "traditional" fields like psychology, social work, and gender studies. A collaboration like this also gives prevention professionals the chance to receive feedback from students relating to which efforts are impactful for their communities.

We particularly want to highlight the importance of involving in sexual misconduct prevention and education efforts students who are diverse in ways beyond identity characteristics. Not all students are social work, psychology, or public health majors, nor do all students take such courses while in college. Solely relying on these types of students for design and implementation of prevention and education efforts could create skewed efforts. It would benefit all students at an institution if prevention professionals were intentional about tailoring opportunities for specific and various academic programs, especially academic programs that do not have prevention inherent within their curriculum (i.e., business, engineering, and computer science). The more students are able to see how sexual misconduct issues intersect with all aspects of their education and lives, the more likely they will be to use the skills central to sexual misconduct prevention including healthy relationships, consent, boundary setting, respect, and communication.

Takeaways for Faculty

For technical communication faculty, our experience and data collected demonstrates the possibilities of student involvement and classroom collaborations in courses not traditionally associated with prevention. We encourage faculty to be creative and identify possibilities for how course objectives may overlap with prevention professionals' goals. Though a range of disciplines are possible for this kind of collaboration, we understand technical communication courses to be well suited for it as it is framed by Walton et al. (2016) and for the reasons discussed in the sections above. However, our experience also points to at least three areas of concern when designing a collaborative course project.

First, preparation is key to successful collaboration. In this case, because of the programmatic focus on social justice and division of the course, students were already informed of issues of diversity, activism, and community engagement. Collaborating in another course in another program may require additional framing, such as readings, lectures, or speakers on the topics of community engagement, equity, social justice, and/or diversity, to orient students to the material. Like Walton et al. (2016), we found that orienting students towards this perspective was critical to successful collaboration and the recruiting of students as allies. Preparing students in such a way also enabled them to work more independently, a concern noted by the reported data on working with students.

Second, having a close relationship between the prevention professionals and the instructor was crucial to the collaboration's success. Professionals were able to attend class a number of times and scheduled team meetings in which students would present their work-to-date for feedback. These interactions were critical to students' success. Students trusted their clients and took their feedback very seriously in their redesigns. Likewise, prevention professionals trusted students with creative choices and perceived them as knowledgeable in their respective areas. This relationship resulted in projects that transcended the classroom; students felt a tremendous sense of responsibility and ownership over their work.

Third, the projects needed to be constrained enough to allow the work to be completed in a firm timeframe. When deciding on the projects for the course, we considered how much time students could realistically devote to their project. Project Management for Technical Communicators is a 16-week course. Even with an entire course designed around this collaboration, time was limited. Though students had decided on projects by the beginning of the second week, they still needed time to learn project management methodologies and associated skills, orient themselves to the context and problem their projects were addressing, identify stakeholders, decide appropriate research methods, conduct research and analysis, and so on. Crucial to the success of this collaboration was identifying projects that could be completed in about 12 weeks. Otherwise, students would be frustrated, graduating seniors could not include the completed projects in their portfolio, and the prevention professionals would receive incomplete or rushed work.

CONCLUSION

This was the first time this type of formal collaboration happened between this institution's sexual misconduct prevention professionals and an academic course. Since this course is only taught in Spring semesters, we have time after each course to debrief and revise for the next one.

For the Technical Communication and Rhetoric program, this kind of collaboration is a fulfillment of its commitment to teaching technical communication as social justice praxis. For students, they exit the course with practice in project management and associated skills and with important portfolio pieces and talking points.

This work continues for the prevention professionals, as well, who plan to identify other academic colleges, majors, and courses in which this type of formal collaboration would be possible. They particularly want to focus on colleges and majors that are not "traditional" collaborators, such as STEM and business courses. It is important to the prevention professionals that sexual misconduct prevention and education efforts are relevant to all students, not just to those who are involved as peer educators, interns, and practicum

and work study students. For that to be true, going beyond "traditional" methods and actively engaging a diverse group of students is essential.

Given a lack of resources and personnel, it can be easy for campus prevention professionals to rely on "traditional" methods (i.e., risk reduction education, bystander intervention programming) as their sole forms of sexual misconduct prevention. It is often intimidating to try new efforts, especially given the delicacy in which conversations around sexual misconduct must happen. We believe universities should empower students to have a creative voice in sexual misconduct prevention efforts, which starts by actually giving them such opportunities. We encourage prevention professionals to utilize the student voices available to them at their institution and to connect with faculty who are willing to provide their students with a program development opportunity that will result in impactful implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Allen, N., & Benninghoff, S. T. (2004). TPC program snapshots: Developing curricula and addressing challenges. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 13*(2), 157–185. doi:10.1207/s15427625tcq1302_3

Austin, M. J. M., Dardis, C. M., Wilson, M. S., Gidycz, C. A., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2016). Predictors of sexual assault-specific prosocial bystander behavior and intentions: A prospective analysis. *Violence Against Women, 22*(1), 90–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215597790

Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 476–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505210

Berkowitz, B (n.d.). Assessing community problems. Retrieved https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/analyzing-community-problems/main

Berman, S. (2006). Service Learning: A Guide to Planning, Implementing, and Assessing Student Projects (second edition). Skyhorse Publishing.

Campus Advocacy & Prevention Professionals Association (CAPPA). (n.d.). About CAPPA. http://www.nationalcappa.org/ourwork

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., Lee, H., Kranz, V., Herbison, R., & Madden, K. (2020). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and misconduct. Westat. https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/Revised%20Aggregate%20report%20%20and%20appendices%201-7_(01-16-2020_FINAL).pdf

Cassel, A. (2012). Are you the problem, or the solution? Changing male attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual assault. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 17*, 50–58. doi:10.24839/2164-8204.JN

Clark, D. (2004). Is professional writing relevant? A model for action research. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 13*(3), 307–323.

Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the green dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. *Violence Against Women, 21*(12), 1507–1527. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214545284

Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2016). *Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 50*(3), 295–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.034

Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Cook-Craig, P. G., DeGue, S. A., Clear, E. R., Brancato, C. J., Fisher, B. S., & Recktenwald, E. A. (2017). RCT testing bystander effectiveness to reduce violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 52*(5), 566–578. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.01.020

Cooper, S. E., & Dranger, P. N. (2018). Building a culture of respect across genders: Eliminating sexual misconduct. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 32*(2), 129–150. https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1080/87568225.2017.1353896

Crooks, C. V., Jaffe, P., Dunlop, C., Kerry, A., & Exner-Cortens, D. (2019). Preventing gender-based violence among adolescents and young adults: Lessons learned from 25 years of program development and evaluation. *Violence Against Women, 25*(1), 29–55. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077801218815778

DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(4), 346–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004

Edenfield, A.C. (2019). "Queering consent: Justice in sexual consent messaging design." *Communication Design Quarterly, 7*(2). Retrieved https://bit.ly/2TANHyO

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., King, C. R., & Rich, C. L. (2008). Sexual victimization and health-risk behaviors: A prospective analysis of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(6), 744–763. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507313944

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women, 17*(6), 720–742. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211409727

Gidycz, C. A., & Dardis, C. M. (2014). Feminist self-defense and resistance training for college students: A critical review and recommendations for the future. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,*

15, 322–333. doi:10.1177/1524838014521026

IDEA Faculty FAQs (n.d.). Office of Analysis, Assessment and Accreditation. Retrieved from http://www.usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm

Jones, N. N., Moore, K. R., & Walton, R. (2016). Disrupting the past to disrupt the future: *An antenarrative of technical communication. Technical Communication Quarterly, 25*(4), 211–229.

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Beyond the dyad: An assessment of sexual assault prevention education focused on social determinants of sexual assault among college students. *Violence Against Women, 21*(7), 848–874. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215584069

Jozkowski, K. N., Peterson, Z. D., Sanders, S. A., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Gender differences in heterosexual college students' conceptualizations and indicators of sexual consent: Implications for contemporary sexual assault prevention education. *The Journal of Sex Research, 51*(8), 904–916.

Kimme Hea, A. C., & Wendler Shah, R. (2016). Silent partners: Developing a critical understanding of community partners in technical communication service-learning pedagogies. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 25*(1), 48–66.

Kleinsasser, A., Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., & Rosenfield, D. (2015). An online bystander intervention program for the prevention of sexual violence. *Psychology of Violence, 5*(3), 227–235. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037393

Levand, M. A. (2020). Consent as Cross-Cultural Communication: Navigating Consent in a Multicultural World. *Sexuality & Culture, 24*(3), 835–847.

McMahon, S., Allen, C. T., Postmus, J. L., McMahon, S. M., Peterson, N. A., & Lowe Hoffman, M. (2014). Measuring bystander attitudes and behavior to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of American College Health, 62*(1), 58–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2013.849258

McMahon, S., Wood, L., Cusano, J., & Macri, L. M. (2019). Campus sexual assault: Future directions for research. Sexual Abuse: *A Journal of Research and Treatment, 31*(3), 270–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217750864

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Cares, A. C., Potter, S. J., Williams, L. M., & Stapleton, J. G. (2015). Encouraging responses in sexual and relationship violence prevention: What program effects remain 1 year later? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(1), 110–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514532719

Paul, L. A., & Gray, M. J. (2011). Sexual assault programming on college campuses: Using social psychological belief and behavior change principles to improve outcomes. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 12*(2), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838010390710

Peterson, K., Sharps, P., Banyard, V., Powers, R. A., Kaukinen, C., Gross, D., Decker, M. R., Baatz, C., & Campbell, J. (2018). An evaluation of two dating violence prevention programs on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(23), 3630–3655. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516636069

Scott, J. B. (2004). Rearticulating civic engagement through cultural studies and service-learning. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 13*(3), 289–306.

Utah State University 2019 Sexual Misconduct Survey Data Report. Office of Equity.

Shah, R. W. (2018). The courage of community members: Community perspectives of engaged pedagogies. *College Composition and Communication, 70*(1), 82–110.

Vladutiu, C. J., Martin, S. L., & Macy, R. J. (2011). College- or university-based sexual assault prevention programs: A review of program outcomes, characteristics, and recommendations. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 12*(2), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838010390708

Walton, R., Colton, J.S., Wheatley-Boxx, R., & Gurko, K. (2016). Social Justice Across the Curriculum: Research-Based Course Design. *Programmatic Perspectives, 8*(2), 119–41.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Avery C. Edenfield (he/him/his) is an assistant professor of rhetoric and technical communication at Utah State University. His research agenda works at the intersections of technical, cultural, and public rhetorics with attention to the technical writing strategies marginalized communities employ for self-advocacy. His work has appeared in *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *Technical Communication*, and *Nonprofit Quarterly*.

Hailey Judd (she/her/hers) is an Epidemiologist and Program Evaluator in the Cancer Genomics Program at the Utah Department of Health. Prior to her recent entry into the state sector of public health, her work focused on developing evidence-based curricula to facilitate community education and drive programming through community based participatory research. Her previous research centered on health promotion pedagogy, opioid use disorder, stigma reduction, and vape prevention. She is passionate about empowering individuals and communities toward healthier, sustainable futures through collaborative partners and data-informed practices.

Emmalee Fishburn (she/her/hers) is the Senior Prevention Specialist in the Office of Equity at Utah State University. In her role, she coordinates sexual misconduct and discrimination prevention efforts for faculty, staff, and students at all 32 USU campuses. She has her Master of Public Health degree in Professional Health Education and is a Certified Health Education Specialist. Emmalee has been providing education about healthy sexuality, bystander intervention, and sexual misconduct prevention to various populations for over 7 years.

Felicia Gallegos (she/her) is the Outreach and Prevention Coordinator for the Sexual Assault & Anti-Violence Information Office at Utah State University. Felicia began her work in the field of gender-based violence as a survivor's advocate and has spent the last 6 years educating the campus community about consent, healthy relationships, and trauma-informed response through workshops, campaigns, and events. She has her Master of Social Work, is passionate about promoting social justice, and is dedicated to exemplifying the dignity and worth of every individal.

Book Review

Awful Archives: Conspiracy Theory, Rhetoric, and Acts of Evidence
Jenny Rice

Luana Shafer
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
lshafer3@vt.edu

Awful Archives presents a timely discussion of controversies and the line between what constitutes "good" versus "bad" evidence within empiricism and the scientific process. Calling attention to the fact that evidence is rhetorically constructed, Rice implores us to interrogate the conception of bad evidence as equally constructed. Blurring the lines between "good" and "bad" evidence, Rice moves away from rhetorical conceptions of evidence as imbued "with a kind of *thingfulness*" (p. 5), as this theory of evidence lends itself to clear demarcations between authentic and inauthentic distinctions. Contemporary conceptions of evidence seen through the thing/object binary deny opportunities for nuanced discussions about the evidentiary process and ultimately ignore evidence's ability to do something as a performative property. Ultimately, Rice inquires into evidence as an act through which we attempt to "figure out what the fuck is happening around us" (p. 11) without the limiting characteristics of validity or empirical fidelity with which evidence is so often concerned. Alongside her analysis of the ways evidence is implemented, and often weaponized, by conspiracy theorists who frequently challenge the more empirical understandings of what evidence represents, Rice makes the rhetorical move from whether evidence is "good/bad" or "valid/invalid" to an alternative foundational rhetorical theory of what is the evidence doing.

Published during the tumultuous advent of COVID-19, and in the aftermath of the 2020 presidential election, Rice's analysis of the far-fetched and out-there claims and conspiracies is timely because it prompts us to question how we perceive and apply evidence,

while encouraging us to be okay with the uncomfortableness of moving beyond contemporary models of acceptable authentic evidence. Conspiracy theories, typically perceived as outlandish or delusional, are often representative of human experience and identity, the very fears, desires, and challenges that permeate navigations of everyday life. Rice argues for the importance of valuing the evidence and discourse of conspiracy theories as examples of "people negotiat[ing] complicated networks of power" (p. 14) and understanding evidence as an affective "living process" inherently intertwined with notions of identity, relationships, and embodied experiences.

Through her deep dive into archival records and artifacts, Rice extends the notion of archival research as it relates to evidence, identity, and memory. She theorizes archives as constructions of public memory through a feminist memory studies approach that often requires recovery work to uncover the obscured or erased narratives and stories missing from archives. Rice's focus on archival research and conspiracy theories leads to her approach of the ongoing conundrum: "Why do traditional modes of argument often fail in the face of claims that rely on bad evidence?" (p. 15). In this question lies the crux of *Awful Archives*: evidence is everyday performances of human experience and life, within and beyond contemporary empirical realms and discourses. Rice ultimately traces the "lifeworld of evidence" (p. 12): how it is constructed and how it weaves in and out of daily life and is thus sustained through public discourse.

Awful Archives' influential quality comes from Rice's presence and characteristic voice within the chapters. Rice's performative narration works to "'de-emphasize the epistemology of evidence' and instead stress its affectivity" (p. 27). Thus, Rice habitually connects her arguments to her personal experiences and weaves personal narrative throughout the book, solidifying the notion that evidence is often closely related to identity or human experience. In Chapter 1, Rice narrates her fascination with the building and formation of archival activity and archival aura. Essentially, Rice perceives activity and aura as deeply intertwined: the activity of archival work moves with a certain aura and intensity that generates

an effect. An archive's only purpose is not to produce some sort of tangible material, but also to pervade into the affective. For example, Rice uses the embodied act of scrapbooking after her father's death to signify embodied moral and ethical virtue—the act of preserving memory and engaging in recovery work produces such virtues, not the tangible scrapbook itself. The lack of presence in archival work is thus remedied through this performance of building and producing an archive and materializes the "auratic something" (p. 38) beyond the fixed memory.

In Chapters 2 and 3, Rice continues to focus on archival aura work. Chapter 2 focuses on evidentiary proliferation, or those instances where "evidence borders on the excessive" (p. 28), while Chapter 3 acknowledges the power of empty archives or missing evidence. Rice poses the question "is proliferation itself evidence of anything?" (p. 66) as she works to break down the conspiracy theories surrounding the events of 9/11 and argues that, within conspiracy discourse, this excessive aggregation of evidence requires us to analyze the smaller pieces of the whole. Comparable to the public materials and posters stacked upon each other in a thick slab in Tel-Aviv, "what emerges is a kind of epistemic aesthetic, where the aesthetic impact of magnitude may actually serve as part of epistemic claims" (p. 69). The aesthetic of magnitude approach asks us to rhetorically respond to the aesthetics of the discourse presented as a legitimate claim. However, when presented with missing or incomplete evidence or archives, the "rhetorical power lies somewhere else besides the archive" (p. 114). Rice asks how empty archives operate rhetorically beyond exactness or authenticity. Rice defines incomplete or missing evidence as "distal evidence" à la the Toulmin model of argument; evidence as not something separate from embodied human experience but a feeling that *something* is there, humming just beneath our grasp. Something registers in our senses and prompts a proliferation of various other divergent claims. Evidence doesn't merely exist out in the ether, but experientially as a bodily phenomenon.

Chapters 4 and 5 respond to the question of how rhetoricians respond ethically to claims that are "invalid, intolerable, or just plain wrong" (p. 15) through the tactic of "disfigurement" and the inventional power of faulty archives. Using the conspiracy surrounding former President Barack Obama's birth certificate, Rice argues that the rhetorical tactic of disfigurement aims for ongoing discourse that "does not take certitude as a measure of success but as a wedge" (p. 151). The claims that Obama lied about his true origins led to a cycle of the White House releasing various forms of counterevidence intended to quell the conspiracy proliferations. Thus, the tactic of disfigurement does not attempt to persuade, but continues the information circulating in and out of public spheres and forestall static conclusions. If conspiracy theories are emblems for human fears or desires, then a fitting response must work to acknowledge those feelings in order to continue the surrounding discourse.

Chapter 5 moves on to tracing the inventional processes: the multiple registers of evidence that archival research often produces. As a way out of the endless loops of discourse, Rice offers us a strategic writing and inventional practice she dubs "demon archives" to answer the question "what can this archive do?" (p. 155). Demon archives respond to awful or absent evidence through inventional processes; they don't focus on clarification of discourse, but rather open the realms of possibility and potential through the different archival trajectories and traces we discover. They are meant to "disturb, tilt, and reorient the one who searches

the archive for answers she already has in mind" (p. 162) and guide the invention of new modes of public rhetorics through writing "*with* those artifacts" (p. 171) that are absent or untrue.

In *Awful Archives*, Rice rejects the notion that there is only one effective strategy for responding to awful evidence. Instead, she pushes our conception of evidence to include evidentiary acts or processes that guide us through rhetorical dead ends and stagnant discourse. As we consider which evidence to include or incorporate in our own research, it's important to recognize not only the tangible *thingness* of evidence, but also the acts of evidence both material and affective that form and construct embodied experience and archival memory. The conceptual shift from whether to what recognizes that evidence should not meet some sort of validating standard but comes in many forms as it acts and performs in everyday life. Conspiracy theories and outlandish claims will continue to proliferate and transform, yet *Awful Archives* provides us with inventional and alternative methods of responding to and addressing theories that, at first glance, appear flimsy or empirically unsound, at best.

REFERENCES

Rice, J. (2020). *Awful archives: Conspiracy theory, rhetoric, and acts of evidence*. The University of Chicago Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Luana Shafer (she/her) is a third year PhD student in Virginia Tech's Rhetoric and Writing program. She teaches First Year Writing for the VT composition program. Luana received an MA in Professional Writing & Rhetoric from George Mason University in 2018. Luana's research interests include the intersection between addiction disorder communities and digital spaces through a material-rhetorical lens. She was also recently published in the proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Design of Communication (SIGDOC 21').

Book Review

Equipping Technical Communicators for Social Justice Work: Theories, Methodologies, and Pedagogies

Rebecca Walton & Godwin Y. Agboka

Walton, R., & Agboka, G. Y. (Eds.) (2021). *Equipping technical communicators for social justice work: Theories, methodologies, and pedagogies.* University Press of Colorado.

Yingying Tang
Auburn University
yzt0056@auburn.edu

Historically, the field of technical and professional communication (TPC) has seen its ethical responsibility in a rather narrow way: TPC has been thought to be related only to precisely and correctly transmitting information, and TPC's ethical responsibilities are more related to either technology creators or users, but less so to technical communicators (Dombrowski, 2000). However, in recent years, with the rapid development and application of science and technology, scientific discourse and technical communication have made greater impacts on society and people's lives than ever before. Our discpline has increasingly realized the "complex, active, and creative" (Dombrowski, 2000, p. 3) roles technical communicators can play. Under the influence of modern theorists (Weaver, Burke, Foucault, etc.), we start to think of science itself as a value and ethical system that involves goals, ethical procedures, and decision making, and more importantly, we realize the power of the language we use for scientific and technical communication. Our ethical decisions relating to the genre, language style, layout design, and inclusion/exclusion of certain information influences readers' perceptions of the fact, shaping their knowledges, values, and beliefs of the world. As Dombrowski (2000) puts it: "as our influecne grows, so do our responsiblities" (p. 3). Now it is the right time for technical communicators to realize our expanded roles and responsiblities in doing our work and to embrace the ethical and social justice turn in our field.

Equipping Technical Communicators for Social Justice Work is such an effort contributing to the social justice turn in TPC. As the editors Walton and Agboka put it, although social justice research has been appearing in TPC conferences and publications for more than two decades, there are still "relatively few resources… available within the field to directly support and inform it" (p. 4). This book is for people who have the question: "We know social justice is important, but how can we approach it?" By providing the most current frameworks, theories, heuristics, and hands-on pedagogical experiences and tools, this book serves for researchers, teachers, and practitioners in our field as a how-to guide on incorporating social justice into our research, curriculums, and workplace practices. Divided into four sections, the book collects the marginalized voices, local and international research projects, and pedagogical best practices to show how we can critically analyze, advocate for, contribute our own voices to, and help our students understand and engage in "decolonial, advocacy, and civic work" (p.4).

Section I, Centering Marginality in Professional Practice, brings forward unheard stories and voices outside of the dominant, white narratives in our field. The beginning chapter focuses on the structural inequality, especially microaggressions, experienced by women of color (WOC) scholars in their research and work. The authors use narratives as a methodology to identify and build alliances within and beyond WOC communities. They provide actionable, contextualized suggestions for both WOC and white accomplices to "support each other in dealing with cultural taxation and aggression in the field" (p. 31). Chapter 2 proposes a marginalized "Indigenist" research perspective. Itchuaquyaq uses the example of NANA, an Indigenous company, to show how Indigenous people preserve and practice their value system by keeping their responsibility to the tribe, their language, and their knowledge of their family tree. By maintaining the Indigenous value system, Indigenous people can resist the cultural erasure imposed by dominant cultures and push back against colonialism through their language and localized knowledges. On the other hand, in Chapter 3, Legg and Strantz show how the lack of respect for local knowledges and the voices of Indigenous communities caused failures in the design of the Hawai'i missile alarm interface. Only focusing on surface-level UXD issues and adopting top-

down design solutions, designers can easily bypass decolonial and social justice strategies for local communities and reinforce the colonization and erasure of local culture and history.

Section II, Conducting Collaborative Research, provides three different tools to help researchers engage participants in social justice research and share agency and power with participants in collaborative ways of knowledge creation. In Chapter 4, Rose and Cardinal propose two heuristics to help researchers evaluate whether their research projects work towards social justice. While the purpose heuristic helps to include and advocate for the voices, needs, interests, and expertise of the marginalized community, the participation heuristic promotes the in-depth participation of the marginalized groups in decision making, turning participants from the traditional representational position and source of information to co-creators of knowledge who share power and agency with the researcher. Rose and Cardinal also emphasize the importance of reciprocity and the collaboration with local organizations to move the research work into real-life advocacy. In Chapter 5, Carlson proposes a Visual Participatory Action Research (PRA) method in which participants reflect on images and create or amend maps to share their knowledge about their community. Visual PRA enables both researchers and participants to consider the material "circumstance surrounding a problem" (p. 99). By co-creating and redefining existing knowledge, participants take back the privilege of defining knowledge and controlling representations of their communities, locating agency within their communities "as they document and interpret their lives" (p. 113). Similarly, in Chapter 6, Hannah, Moore, Lowman, and Alonge propose the Legal Resource Mapping methodology to help participants realize their potential agency and power "through the legal reasoning process and anticipate its constraining and generative effects" (p. 122) to promote "more just, community-driven policing" (p. 123).

Section III, Teaching Critical Analysis, shows a series of pedagogical attempts and failures in teaching social justice in the technical communication classroom. The section starts with Harper's learner-centered pedagogy in which students create class podcasts and social movement maps to understand how seemingly open and democratic online spaces can further reinforce the marginality of marginalized groups. Harper's reflections on where she "fell short" in providing clear terminology and pedagogical explanations of social media and her lack of clear parameters on what to analyze to guide students through the process are especially valuable for newly minted faculties in designing their own projects and assignments. In Chapter 8, Hopton uses Tarot Cards to help students form a different perspective of product design, which concerns the consequences of product use rather than only focusing on the benefits of use. Chapter 9 introduces a feminist rhetorical pedagogy. Adopting user testing as a method to approach social justice, Gilson's classroom shifts students' attention from "user 'failure' to potential weakness in the instructions' writing, design, or presentation" (p. 185). By making students reflect on who is included/excluded in their user group and what they can learn from their non-expert users, the class helps to promote marginalized perspectives and extraordinary users' needs.

The last section, Teaching Critical Advocacy, presents TPC teachers' efforts to help students realize their agency and power in advocating social justice. This section begins with Sanchez, Dorpenyo, and Sano-Franchini's pedagogical innovation of using election technologies to introduce students to social justice issues and cultivate their civic awareness. The Redistricting Game allows student players to explore how political redistricting works and how well-intentioned mapping policies can be misused to reinforce discrimination and marginalization. Finding white students are less likely to perceive racial gerrymandering as a problem, the instructors encourage students to reflect on their own "positionality, privilege, and power in regard to gerrymandering" (p. 206) and how gerrymandering can become a threat to democracy in a networked society where their lives are "intertwined with the lives of" other people (p. 209). In Chapter 11, Lane's students work with local communities to conduct audience analyses and site studies, seeking to address social justice issues within the communities in collaborative ways with the "varying perspectives and creative abilities from all parties involved" (p. 224). The interstitial approach helps students understand how they can engage with complex, wicked problems in society and equips them with "the flexible, creative research and thinking skills" that are becoming increasingly important in the "glocalized" networked world (p. 228). In the last chapter, Grant-Davie introduces two rhetorical concepts from the legal system of classical Greece. While people are reluctant to act in a social justice movement when feeling "no immediate responsibility" or little harm (p. 232), the use of kategorias and apologias can generate the exigence that leads "the public to see an injustice as a crisis" and prepares advocates and activists to anticipate and respond to their opponents' objections (p. 232). Both concepts are useful for case studies in the technical communication classroom because the instructors can divide the class into two opposing sides to practice generating kategoria arguments for denouncing and apologia arguments for defending social justice issues.

Besides providing the theories and tools to prepare researchers, teachers, and practitioners to actively participate in social justice work in TPC, *Ethics in Technical Communication* is a prime example of relational, networked knowledge creation promoted in social justice practice: the authors of the collection frequently cite each other and create knowledge collaboratively based on each other's work. As Hopton puts it in Chapter 8: "Justice takes a lion's heart" (p. 175). Social justice work can be difficult, expensive, and time-consuming, but we still have "the responsibility and power" as designers, users, researchers, and teachers to disrupt design practices that "perpetuate inhumanity, inequity, and injustice" and instead promote designs "for change that is better, not worse" (p. 176).

REFERENCES

Dombrowski, P. M. (2000). *Ethics in technical communication*. Allyn and Bacon.

Walton, R., & Agboka, G. Y. (Eds.) (2021). *Equipping technical communicators for social justice work: Theories, methodologies, and pedagogies*. University Press of Colorado.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Yingying Tang is a PhD student in Rhetoric and Composition at Auburn University. Her research interests include the rhetoric of science and technology, user experience/UX Research, content strategy, human-computer interaction, design thinking, and automated writing. She is currently working as the manager of the LUCIA usability lab at Auburn University.

Book Review

Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age of Misinformation and Disinformation

Edited by Tara Lockhart, Brenda Glascott, Chris Warnick, Juli Parrish, and Justin Lewis

Jess Vázquez Hernández
Ohio State University
vazquezhernandez.1@osu.edu

Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age of Misinformation And Disinformation (2021) joins ongoing engagement with the topics of post-truth rhetorics (Carillo, 2018; McComiskey 2017; McIntyre 2018), evolving technologies in composition (Laquintano and Vee, 2017; Craig, 2017), and literacies pedagogies for our current moment (Colton and Holmes, 2018; Vee, 2017). Stemming from renewed interest in fake news after the 2016 election, the effects of the Trump presidency and its impacts in literacy education are represented throughout. This collection of 18 essays edited by *Literacy in Composition* (LiCS) journal editors Tara Lockhart, Brenda Glascott, Chris Warnick, Juli Parrish, and Justin Lewis continues the work of their 2017 special issue, "Literacy, Democracy, and Fake News." By bringing together "a range of perspectives—from literacy professionals in higher education, K-12, journalism, information technology, and other fields" (p. 2), the collection models a central condition for teaching within this context: to combat misinformation and disinformation, it is necessary to take a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that expands outside of academic settings and brings together a wide range of expertise. Supporting this goal, the collection features six interviews moderated by Tara Lockhart. Each interview engages with a professional and/or educational staff, including social media strategists/curators/editors and curriculum/program coordinators, to explore how misinformation and disinformation is affecting all of us. Thus, *Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age Of Misinformation and Disinformation* "creates a polyphonous interrogation" (p. 6)

to open up spaces and "opportunities for different kinds of literacy workers to hear and learn from each other—a networked approach that echoes the patterns of information ecologies themselves" (p. 6). Readers are invited to engage with the collection through "four essential threats that emerge most urgently from the collection's contributions" (p. 8). These include: 1) keywords and definitions; 2) contextualized praxis and pedagogy; 3) rhetorical analysis; and 4) "citizenship and civic literacies" (p. 13) based on people's different positionalities relating to misinformation and disinformation—as students, professors, journalists, social media specialists, etc. However, as readers will find, other organic pathways emerge based on format (curricular/course design, interviews, etc.) and context (higher education, K-12, online environments, etc.). Ultimately, it is within this complex web that we find a sustained engagement with practical and tangible strategies, pedagogies, and processes to think critically about how we combat misinformation and disinformation inside and outside of the classroom.

Engaging with how to teach about misinformation and disinformation in the classroom, many of the essays offer case studies on the development of courses and assignments designed to help students reflect on the credibility and intentions of news sources. Angela Laflen's "Quantitative Literacy in the Composition Classroom: Using Infographics Assignments to Teach Ethical and Effective Data Use" and Eric Leake's "The Multiple Lives of News Stories: Civic Literacies and Rhetorical Transformations" offer two sets of assignments for the composition classroom to help students think critically about the creation, presentation, and biases of information online. Laflen helps students move from a two-dimensional view of quantitative data as factual and objective to identifying, analyzing, and understanding the rhetorical manipulation of data and its (un) ethical implications to improve students' *quantitative literacies*. In turn, Leake asks students to track the development of news stories online to advocate for the development of civic literacies through engaging with "critical media literacies based upon rhetorical education" (p. 72) and "critical consumption" (p. 73). In "'Don't Give Me Bullshit': Constructing a Framework of Response to Fake News," Genevieve García de Müeller and Randall W. Monty continue this theme by reflecting on what it means to teach "in

an era of alternative facts" (p. 149). They reflect on the course development of a lower-level composition class and an upper-level discourse analysis course aimed at helping "students of rhetoric to be prepared to respond, to sincerely made claims as well as to fake news and bullshit, in academic, professional, and social contexts" (pp. 153-154).

Thomas Girshin and Tyrell Stewart-Harris and Drew Virtue, highlight the importance of conducting these in-class interventions while also contextualizing this historical moment. Both "Trump's University: Argument and Pedagogy in the 'Post-Fact Era'" and "Historical Literacies: McCarthyism, Edward R. Murrow, and the Television" encourage us to refute a view of fake news and disinformation as a strictly modern concern. Instead, these two chapters advocate for a more complex view of misinformation and disinformation that considers that while the technologies have changed, "the biggest takeaway is simply to know that the distribution of fake news for political purposes is not new" (p. 123).

Moving outside of college and university composition and writing classrooms, Melissa R. Sande and Christine M. Battista's "Developing Critical Consciousness: Literary Theory, Process Pedagogy, and Information Literacy," Shannon M. Pella's "Towards Valuing Evidence: Designing Curriculum for K-12 Students and Beyond," and an interview with Martee Lopez-Schmitt in "International Baccalaureate, Theories of Knowledge, and Misinformation Spotting in the High School Classroom" all expand on strategies and interventions for K-12 students and beyond. Like in other pedagogy-centered chapters, Sande and Battista also offer specific examples for enacting critical literacies; unlike in the others' chapters, they focus on how to transfer these skills into literature courses "in order to reinforce the work that students begin in composition courses" (p. 188). In turn, Pella discusses her experience crafting the curriculum for the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) of the California State University using principles of backward planning, rigor, and the valuing of evidence. Also in this context, Lopez-Schmitt discusses the affordances of the International Baccalaureate (IB) program and the way it centers writing as an interdisciplinary and critical skill central to every subject. In "Keeping Truth Alive: Literacy, Libraries, and Strategies in an Age of Misinformation," Nicole Allensworth contributes to this conversation by advocating for more active collaboration between libraries' ongoing work on the topic of *information literacies* and classrooms interested in addressing misinformation and disinformation. In tandem, these chapters provide starting points for adapting the conversations around misinformation and disinformation to alternative settings.

Helping us move outside of K-12 and higher education environments and into the technological aspects around misinformation and disinformation, Joshua Daniel-Wariya, Tyler S. Branson, and James Chase Sanchez argue for creating more awareness around the software that enables the reproduction, distribution, and spread of fake news in "Making Software Visible in Rhetorical Approaches to Fake News." As they note, "critical software literacy makes clear that fake news is generated, manipulated, distributed, accessed, and analyzed using particular software applications" (p. 20). In her interview, "Civic Literacies, Despair, and Hope: Our Current Information Moment Unfolding," Jennifer Hofmann, creator of the Americans of Conscience Checklist, discusses how undermining thresholds of truth and facts has disrupted our ability to find common ground, the importance of finding the underlying values that can foster better conversations, and use practical online

tools for vetting resources. In the interview "Misinformation, Disinformation, and the Twitter-Sphere," Lockhart engages in conversation with Joanna Geary, Senior Director of Curation at Twitter, who discusses being critical of trending stories and trusting the affective responses to sensationalized news. Further contributing to the conversation of misinformation and disinformation within online spaces, Michael Calore, Senior Editor of Wired, discusses in his own interview how affective responses can manifest through bias, the importance of transparency and trust within journalism, and the possibilities of intelligent machines as tools for primary screenings in "From Product Review to Lack of Common Ground: How Mis- and Disinformation Shape Our Wired World." Building further on this, "Winning the Battle of the Story: Information and Narrative Warfare as Activism," an interview with John Sellers—co-founder of *Other98*—describes the importance of *algorithmic* literacy in helping to move from the affective into more specific skills to understand how and why specific information is visible and promoted.

The last set of essays and interviews starts an important conversation around diversity, inclusion, and thinking critically about the types of literacies that are promoted in the classroom. "Diversity and Inclusive Text: Ed Tech and Misinformation Challenges in Schools" interviews Leyla Akincilar, a former educator and product designer for *Goalbook*, a tool that "is both a software platform for teachers and a professional development program" (p. 170). Through looking at the human bias and limitations beyond the software, this interview raises important questions relating to better engaging with curriculum across grades while being mindful of social justice and representation. Engaging further with social justice and representation, Lava Asaad engages in a thoughtful discussion around the positionality of graduate student educators and classroom dynamics with resisting students in "'I am a refuggee and i am okay:' Instructor Identity in Resisting Classrooms." Finally, Shereen Inayatulla and Michael T. MacDonald give a gentle callback to complicate notions of civic literacy and "global citizenship" (p. 226) in relation to documentation, what it renders (il)legible, and the colonizing undertones of citizenship discourses. Thus, "Sans Papiers: Humanizing Documentation" calls for expansion of and complication of the terms we bring into discussion of literacies and pedagogy.

Through contextualizing and expanding the concepts of misinformation and disinformation, as well as exploring the technologies that facilitate its quick distribution, this collection provides a point of departure to facilitate the many types of literacies authors conjure: information literacies, network literacies, civic and citizenship literacies, quantitative literacies, etc. One of its main strengths is that it serves as a model of critical engagement and collaboration for anyone interested in finding creative solutions and resources to combat misinformation and disinformation at the nexus of social media interfaces, software, communication networks, journalism, and pedagogy. Both practitioners and academics within communication design and technical communication will find interesting connections between pedagogical application, possible areas for future research, and ideas for interdisciplinary coalitions. *Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age of Misinformation and Disinformatio*n provides a key intervention by highlighting the range of experts needed to address misinformation and disinformation and bringing all those voices into one collection. The next step is to see which voices respond and move that collaboration off the page and into practice.

REFERENCES

Carillo, E. (2018). *Teaching readers in post-truth America*. Utah State University Press.

Colton, J.S. & Holmes, S. (2018). *Rhetoric, technology, and the virtues*. University Press of Colorado/Utah State University Press.

Craig, J. W. (2017). Navigating a varied landscape: Literacy and the credibility of networked information. *Literacy in Composition Studies*, 5(2), 24–42. https://doi.org/10.21623/1.5.2.3

Laquintano, T., & Vee, A. (2017). How automated writing systems affect the circulation of political information online. Literacy in Composition Studies, 5(2), 43–62. https://doi.org/10.21623/1.5.2.4

McComiskey, B. (2017). *Post-truth rhetoric and composition*. Utah State University Press.

McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-Truth*. The MIT Press.

Vee, A. (2017). *Coding literacy: How computer programming is changing writing*. MIT Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jess Vázquez Hernández is a second-year MA/PhD student in Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy at Ohio State University. Her academic interests include the teaching of writing, anti-racist and culturally sustaining pedagogies, feminist and gender studies, and the intersections between academic and creative writing.