

### General Education Course Information Sheet

*Please submit this sheet for each proposed course*

Department & Course Number Anthropology 98T  
 Course Title Literacy, Technology, & Globalization

1 Check the recommended GE foundation area(s) and subgroups(s) for this course

**Foundations of the Arts and Humanities**

- Literary and Cultural Analysis X
- Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis X
- Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice \_\_\_\_\_

**Foundations of Society and Culture**

- Historical Analysis X
- Social Analysis X

**Foundations of Scientific Inquiry**

- Physical Science \_\_\_\_\_  
*With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)*
- Life Science \_\_\_\_\_  
*With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)*

2. Briefly describe the rationale for assignment to foundation area(s) and subgroup(s) chosen.

The course approaches technology and globalization through the lens of culturally patterned ideas about language and literacy in social and historical context, thereby touching on all the above ticked areas.

3. List faculty member(s) who will serve as instructor (give academic rank):

Rachel Flamenbaum, teaching fellow/ Dr. Elinor Ochs, faculty mentor

4. Indicate when do you anticipate teaching this course:

2014-2015 Winter \_\_\_\_\_ Spring X  
 Enrollment Enrollment

GE Course Units 5

5. Please present concise arguments for the GE principles applicable to this course.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Knowledge | Students will be exposed to ‘theories, methodologies, and ways of knowing’ central to several disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, including anthropology, education, linguistics, and science & technology studies. |
|--|--|
  
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrative Learning | The course itself is designed to push students to synthesize many different kinds of evidence, including starting every class by putting an op-ed argument in conversation with the weekly readings. |
|---|--|
  
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ethical Implications | Considering print and technological literacies in a global context unavoidably raises issues of structural barriers to access and participation, and our responsible response to these constraints as privileged mediated actors. |
|---|---|
  
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Diversity | Considering varied cultural and place-specific implications of literacies and their uptake is central to the course. |
|---|--|
  
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Thinking | Similarly to integrative learning, students are expected to consider a range of perspectives and frameworks and ‘talk back’ to effectively argue the resulting position they come to. |
|--|---|
  
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rhetorical Effectiveness | Students are expected to hone their academic argumentation skills in the extensive class discussions and written assignments that form the core of the course. |
|---|--|
  
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Problem-solving | This is applicable to the extent that every written argument involves an element of problem solving in synthesizing one’s sources and ideas. |
|--|--|
  
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Library & Information Literacy | As forms of literacy is the topic of the course, it would be a major failing if students were not given opportunities to improve their information literacy in fulfilling course expectations. |
|---|--|

**(A) STUDENT CONTACT PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)**

- |   |            |         |
|---|------------|---------|
| 1. Lecture:   | <u>1.5</u> | (hours) |
| 2. Discussion Section:                                  | <u>1.5</u> | (hours) |
| 3. labs   | <u>0</u>   | (hours) |
| 4. Experiential (service learning, internships, other): | <u>0</u>   | (hours) |
| 5. Field Trips:   | <u>0</u>   | (hours) |

**(A) TOTAL Student Contact Per Week** **3** **(HOURS)**

**(B) OUT-OF-CLASS HOURS PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)**

- |                                     |            |         |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---------|
| 1. General Review & Preparation:    | <u>1</u>   | (hours) |
| 2. Reading                          | <u>4</u>   | (hours) |
| 3. Group Projects:                  | <u>n/a</u> | (hours) |
| 4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams: | <u>n/a</u> | (hours) |
| 5. Information Literacy Exercises:  | <u>1</u>   | (hours) |
| 6. Written Assignments:             | <u>5</u>   | (hours) |
| 7. Research Activity:               | <u>4</u>   | (hours) |

**(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week** **15** **(HOURS)**

**GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal at least 15 hours/week** **18** **(HOURS)**

Rachel Flamenbaum, M.A. | Doctoral Candidate, UCLA Anthropology  
Collegium of University Teaching Fellows Application

## Proposed Course: Literacy, Technology, & Globalization

**DESCRIPTION** | From the tech-utopian claims of the one laptop per child movement to the dystopian laments about social media's supposed negative impact on our personal relationships, much of the discourse around technology in the modern world rests on the invisible assumption that once a person has access to a given technology, the skills to use it are universally accessible and universally the same. This course instead explores the critical role of languages and literacies in the uneven distribution and uptake of emerging screen-based technologies around the globe. The seminar is an exercise in collaborative research, and will be of particular interest to students in anthropology, sociology, applied linguistics, STS/information studies, and education.

**OBJECTIVES** | Students will be exposed to a broad scope of ethnographic, theoretical, historical, and fictional engagements with the notions of 'literacy' and 'orality,' and should be able to engage critically with current debates about the role and effects of screen-based mobile technologies globally through the framework of literacies. Seminar participants will collect ethnographic data on the mediated literacy practices of peers, collaborate on the analysis of this shared data, and produce a cumulative final project that includes both a final paper and a print op-ed translating the findings of their research into an argument for public consumption.

**REQUIREMENTS** | Seminar meets twice a week for 1.5 hours.

Note that there is no midterm or final exam for this class. Instead this seminar is built around collaboration, critical analysis, and cumulative writing. As such it requires *substantial participation* from each member of the class:

- active contributions to class discussions
- weekly posts of relevant articles, op-eds, or video clips on the course website
- cumulative research and writing milestones, culminating in a final paper *and* an op-ed

Please see the end of the syllabus for details on each of these requirements.

Most readings will be provided via the course website, but the following texts are also required:

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Invitations to Love: Literacy, Love Letters, and Social Change in Nepal. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.

Burrell, J. (2012). Invisible Users: youth in the Internet cafes of urban Ghana. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Gershon, I. (2010). The Breakup 2.0: disconnecting over new media. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

GRADING | Breakdown is as follows:

- 20% Participation
- 10% Reflection paper
- 10% Ethnographic data collection
- 20% Papers 1.0 & 2.0
  - 5% In-class presentation
- 15% Op-ed
- 25% Final Paper

## WEEK ONE | Introductions to Literacy & Orality

The first week will be spent introducing the themes & objectives of the course. In class two, students will be introduced to foundational frameworks for studying literacy anthropologically, especially the work of Jack Goody, as well as some of the limitations of this approach. These include 1) the tendency to see literacy and orality as separate, 2) as tied to modernity and pre-modernity respectively, and 3) as being responsible for cognitive and social developments. One and two will be given cursory treatment here and elaborated in following weeks. Students will be introduced to the work and findings of Scribner and Cole (1981) that literacy alone cannot be definitively shown to initiate major psychological or cultural changes, and we will apply that thesis to Goody & Watt's classic claims, as well as to the case studies outlined in Collins & Blot.

### class one

No reading.

*\*Discussion of how reflecting on personal repertoires feeds into choosing a fieldsite.*

### class two

Collins, J. and R. K. Blot (2003). Chapter 1: Introduction: texts, power, and identity. & Chapter 2: The literacy thesis: vexed questions of rationality, In, Literacy and literacies: texts, power, and identity. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Goody, J. and I. Watt (1968). The Consequences of Literacy. In, Literacy in Traditional Society. J. Goody. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 27-68.

*\*Discussion of choosing a fieldsite and getting consent.*

## ASSIGNMENT | Reflecting on personal literacy repertoire.

## WEEK TWO | The Great Divide & the Digital Divide

This week's readings explore the similar assumptions underpinning well-intentioned but ultimately problematic policy efforts to overcome print- and screen-based literacy divides. In the first half, we will explore Gupta's (2012) claim that literacy, while it can be responsible for state violence by barring the poor from written representations of themselves, cannot itself empower the poor. He suggests therefore that programs to bridge the Great Divide in India through teaching literacy have failed because they do not taking into account other structural barriers to power and representation. The second half of the week will put these issues into the digital context. We will first look at Warschauer (2003) and Lemke (2002), whose works highlights the myriad skills needed to make comprehensive use of screen-based technologies, and question whether ensuring access alone to technologies is adequate. Following this theme, we will analyze the claims made by Sugatara Mitra in his TED talks and on the website for the Hole-in-

the-Wall Project together as a class to work through the issues of ethics, representation, and access the project raises. The project insets basic computers into walls in New Delhi slum neighborhoods to test the hypothesis that providing access alone to technology is enough for local children to gain self-directed computer literacy skills. This highly touted project is seen as a way to bring education to marginalized areas and won a TED award for challenging classic classroom models. Given that the children tend to use the computers for very limited purposes when undirected, can we call this literacy? Does this count as participation? How can we apply Gupta's insights on the dynamics of poverty and print literacy to a screen-based literacy context?

### class one

Gupta, A. (2012). Chapter 5: "Let the Train Run on Paper": bureaucratic writing as state practice & Chapter 6: Literacy, Bureaucratic Domination, and Democracy in, Red tape: bureaucracy, structural violence, and poverty in India. Durham, Duke University Press.

*\*Discussion of observational methods & fieldnotes*

### class two

Warschauer, M. (2003). Chapter 1 & 2. Technology and social inclusion: rethinking the digital divide. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Hole-in-the-Wall founder Sugatara Mitra's TED talks about the project:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dk60sYrU2RU>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y3jYVe1RGaU>

Website of the Hole-in-the-Wall research project: <http://www.hole-in-the-wall.com/>

## WEEK THREE | **Situated literacies**

Numerous ethnographies have demonstrate that there is indeed nothing inherent in the technology of texts or literacy practices that leads to their uptake in particular ways, and that their use and meanings are rather conditioned by socio-historical circumstances, extant communicative strategies, and existing symbolic and material hierarchies of value—in other words, "literacy is not a neutral, unidirectional technology" (Ahearn, 2001: 7). In the second half of the week we will focus on Laura Ahearn's ethnography about the uptake of literacy in Indonesia and its consequences in romantic relationships; in the second half, we explore the genres of rumor and secrecy that inflect Ghanaian youth's engagement with the internet in Jenna Burrell's ethnography of internet café culture in Accra.

### class one

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Invitations to Love: Literacy, Love Letters, and Social Change in Nepal. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press. Parts 1 and 2 (ch. 1-6)

*\*Check-in re: progress on site visits, discussion of recording methods*

### class two

Burrell, J. (2012). Invisible Users: youth in the Internet cafes of urban Ghana. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

**ASSIGNMENT | Observational data fieldnotes****WEEK FOUR | Literacies as Forms of Communicative Competence**

This week's readings explore the notion of 'communicative competence,' that is, normative conventions for appropriate communication in a given speech community, in relation to the idea of 'literacy,' looking first at writing and then at other forms of mediated communication. After exploring Basso's (1979) call into include writing as part of what is studied in the ethnography of *speaking*, we fast forward in time to Lemke's (1998) early call for considering how the combination of visual, textual, and hyperlinked interactivity makes meaning-making in digitally-mediated settings functionally distinct from print literacy contexts. Schieffelin (2000) and Cody (2011) push us to also take into account how local ideologies of reading and orality influence performance and perception of literacy, and vice versa. Taken together, these studies demonstrate that orality and literacy cannot be thought of as stable, separate, bounded categories, but rather interconnected skillsets that are meaningful only in context—and indeed that literacy and orality alone no longer comprise the full panoply of mediated communicative skills in our everyday lives.

**class one**

Basso, K. (1974). The Ethnography of Writing. Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. R. Bauman and J. Sherzer. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 425-432.

Lemke, J. L. (1998). Metamedia Literacy: Transforming Meanings and Media. Handbook of literacy and technology: transformations in a post-typographic world. D. Reinking. Mahwah, N.J., L. Erlbaum Associates.

**class two**

Schieffelin, B. (2000). Introducing Kaluli Literacy: a chronology of influences. Regimes of language: ideologies, politics, and identities. P. V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe, NM; Oxford, School of American Research Press.

Cody, F. (2011). "Echoes of the teashop in a Tamil newspaper." Language & Communication Language & Communication **31**(3): 243-254.

**ASSIGNMENT | data collection.****WEEK FIVE | Workshop: Communicative Competencies, Mediated Literacies**

This week builds on the previous week's exploration of the literacies as mode-specific forms of communicative competence. In all three of the readings, we can see the emergence of new norms of communication that creatively combine existing conventions for spoken, signed, and written language in novel forms. How do individuals shift their communicative strategies when they don't have recourse to gaze, body language, tone, and so on, to make sense of their interlocutor's intent? How might these emerging strategies for managing non-face-to-face modes be thought of as the communicative competencies, or literacies, required of those modes? The entire week will be organized as a workshop: the discussion in class one will involve looking at actual data from all three articles and collaboratively working through the analysis as a class, and class two will be set aside for group perusal and analysis of the first round of submitted data. What patterns do we see across the data set? In what ways do the data mirror the findings of the authors we read this week and in what ways do they differ?

**class one**

Jones, G. M. and B. B. Schieffelin (2009). "Enquoting voices, accomplishing talk: Uses of be+like in Instant Messaging." Language and Communication 29(1): 77-113.

Spilioti, T. (2011). Closings and Relational Work in Text Messaging. Digital Discourse. C. Thurlow and K. Mroczek. Oxford, Oxford University Press, USA.

Keating, E., T. Edwards, et al. (2008). "Cybersign and new proximities: Impacts of new communication technologies on space and language." PRAGMA Journal of Pragmatics 40(6): 1067-1081.

**class two**

No reading. Data analysis workshop in class.

**WEEK SIX | Literacy & Mediation in Historical Context**

This week's readings further note the historical similarities in the ways new literacies come into being as new technologies of communication emerge—and the similarities in the ways people react to these emerging literacies. Richard Bauman's piece explores early sound recordings that captured the bumbling and confused use of telephones soon after their adoption by 'backwards' rural callers. Intended for an elite urban audience who could revel in their own newly acquired telephonic literacy and mitigate their anxieties about telephones' purported negative impact on social cohesion, the example is not so different from contemporary websites such as [www.parentsshouldn'ttext.com](http://www.parentsshouldn'ttext.com), or the 'first day on the internet kid' meme, which allows savvy viewers to laugh at the technological disfluency of novice adopters. Gershon's 'Media Ideologies' reminds us that Cicero decried early forms of writing as destructive to social cohesion, as well—putting contemporary concerns about smart phone use in proper perspective.

In Ella Cheever Thayer's early feminist novel about a romance that blossoms over the telegraph wire, we see similarities to the experiences of teens negotiating romance over facebook in Gershon's monograph—calling the novelty of these experiences into question as well as usefully highlighting what newer technologies do make possible.

**class one**

Bauman, R. (2010). 'It's Not a Telescope, It's a Telephone': Encounters with the Telephone on Early Commercial Sound Recordings. Language ideologies and media discourse texts, practices, politics. S. A. Johnson and T. M. Milani. London; New York, Continuum.

Gershon, I. (2010). "Media ideologies: an introduction." Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 20(2): 283-293.

**class two**

Thayer, E. C. (1970 [1879]). Wired love a romance of dots and dashes. New York, W.J. Johnston. Available in html and various e-reader formats at the Gutenberg Project: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/24353>

Gershon, I. (2010). The breakup 2.0: disconnecting over new media. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

*\*Discussion of synthesizing first paper with op-ed strategies for second paper assignment*

**ASSIGNMENT | PAPER 1.0**

**WEEK SEVEN | Literacy, class, & globalization**

This week will explore the fact that access to highly valued communicative competencies are unevenly distributed, both across class boundaries and across global fault lines. We will look at these issues first in Shirley Brice Heath's classic investigation of how being socialized into non-standard forms of literacy and language practice have tangible consequences for students' lives and livelihoods in the American South. Blommaert's *Grassroots Literacy* contends that there is a *global* standard which devalues and marginalizes 'non-standard' situated literacy practices—so while the texts and performances produced through such practices may be mobile, the African speakers and writers he focuses on are typically not meaningfully understood outside of their local context of production because they only approximate the global standard. We then look at cross-disciplinary exploration of choices around technology across class in Northern California, and pose questions of the text such as: how might the values articulated in and around Silicon Valley in the article inform the global standard for communication that Blommaert discusses?

**class one**

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Chapters 3-6.

**class two**

Blommaert, J. (2008). *Grassroots literacy: writing, identity and voice in central Africa*. London; New York, Routledge. Ch.

Ames, M., Go, et al. (2011). *Understanding Technology Choices and Values through Social Class*. Proceedings of the ACM 2011 conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work. Pp 55-64.

**WEEK EIGHT | Literacies on the move**

While the literature from the previous week could be seen to suggest that individuals are trapped by their non-standard literacy practices, this week's readings explore cases where social actors' creative, hybrid combinations of literacy practices and cultural frameworks index the local and elsewhere simultaneously. The first half of the week explores hybrid literacy practices in family settings, and the second half explores how young adults in Belgrade and Accra use technologies and literacies to imagine and construct possible selves in online settings.

**class one**

Duranti, A. and E. Ochs (1997). *Syncretic Literacy in a Samoan American Family*. *Discourse, Tools, and Reasoning*. L. Resnick, R. Saljo and C. Pontecorvo. Berlin, Springer-Verlag: 169-202.

De Leon, Lourdes. (2012). *Reshaping Generational Boundaries and Selves: Literacy Practices and Authority In a Tzotzil Mayan Family*. American Anthropological Association Meeting San Francisco.

**class two**

George, Rachel. (forth.) "Status Ambivalence: Constructing Serbian Youth Identities On Facebook." Chapter in Doctoral Dissertation.



Flamenbaum, R. (2012). 'And Then He Said (in Twi)...': Practices of Strategic Translation On a Ghanaian Blog. American Anthropological Association Meeting San Francisco.

## **ASSIGNMENT | PAPER 2.0**

### **WEEK NINE | Perspectives on digital literacies from Ghana and Kenya**

Achilles Mbembe famously wrote, “the contemporary African experience is not simply that of economic deprivation. Rather, it involves an economy of desired goods that are known, that may sometimes be seen, that one wants to enjoy, but to which one will never have material access” (Mbembe 2002a: 271). All of the readings this week explore the ways in which youth have turned to mobile and internet technologies as vehicles of alternative forms of self-expression and imagined participation in the ‘economy of desired goods’ represented by global cosmopolitan culture. In the first half of the week, McIntosh’s youthful Kenyan phone users construct imagined sexy cosmopolitan selves free of the duties and obligations of their mobile-shunning elder kin through English-language texting, and Mazrui shows how political and religious stances impact perceptions and uses of Kenyan-language technologies. In the second half, I showcase an aspect of my own dissertation work exploring how aspiring middle class Ghanaian youth realize alternatives to ‘traditional’ notions of hierarchy and respect by bridging on and offline spaces.

#### **class one**

McIntosh, J. (2010). "Mobile phones and Mipoho's prophecy: The powers and dangers of flying language." *American Ethnologist* **37**(2): 337-353.

Mazrui, A. M. (2008). *Globalization & the Sociolinguistics of the Internet: Between English and Kiswahili. Globalization and Language Vitality: perspectives from Africa*. C. B. Vigouroux and S. S. Mufwene. London, Continuum: 191-209.

#### **class two**

Flamenbaum, R. (forth.) 'Are you my co-equal?': #tweaa and the viral subversion of Akan respect hierarchies in Ghana.

### **WEEK TEN | Final Project Presentations/ op-ed peer workshopping + Wrap up**

#### **FINAL PAPER AND REVISED OP-ED DUE BY THE END OF EXAM WEEK.**

**ASSIGNMENTS** | The final paper for this course is based on a semester-long process of reflection, ethnographic observations, and collaborative data collection on the mediated literacy practices of UCLA undergraduates.

There are several preliminary written assignments along the way to guide your work, but plan ahead—you may need to start work on one assignment before the prior assignment is due.

Note in the grading section that these cumulative assignments add up to a greater percentage of your grade than the final product. Process matters!

**DUE 5pm the day before class 1 weekly | Post thought fodder**

Starting in week two, each student is responsible for locating and posting an interesting article, op-ed, video, or other form of ‘thought fodder’ that is relevant to the readings that week. We will start with one of these posted items, dissecting the argument as a class. How does the author frame the argument? What forms of evidence do they use, and are they effective? How does this perspective help illuminate the academic literature? And so on.

This process is meant to help you prepare for your final project, where you will need to make distinctions in your writing between framing an academic argument and taking a stance in your own op-ed.

**DUE start of week 2 | Reflections on personal literacy repertoires**

As members of an elite group—participants in the higher education system—we often take literacy for granted. Not only are our own carefully cultivated abilities to access, interpret, and produce complex texts within a particular set of constraints and expectations normalized, this privilege to traffic in globally-valued languages and registers (academic jargon, professional or technical Englishes, slang, etc.) is often erased. Moreover, when we do think about literacy, it is usually in simplistic terms—the ability to read and write—that ignore the complex of communicative skills brought to bear on a range of genres and modalities, from everyday face-to-face conversation to reading a children’s story or an academic article, to writing a term paper, emailing and texting, or perhaps interpreting the texts of a specialized religious, professional, or political community. In a globalized era where money, labor, technologies, and ideas are increasingly mobile and simultaneously increasingly subject to asymmetrical valuation across local and global contexts, an anthropological focus on literacies illuminates issues of agency and personhood while revealing hierarchies of value and access.

In **2-3 double spaced pages**, reflect on your own literacies. Act as an ethnographer of your own repertoire: In what ways are orality & literacy—technologically mediated or not—intermingled in your personal communicative toolbox? What skills, practices, and forms of access do you take for granted—that is, use in a ‘normal’ way without consciously thinking about them? How did you gain these skills? What does your media ecology look like (i.e. what devices or communicative modes do you have access to)? What language(s) and registers do you use? What ideologies underlie your engagement with this ecology? In what ways is your repertoire constrained in ways that others’ are not?

**DUE start of week 4 | Observing literacy practices**

On the basis of your reflections on your own literacy repertoire, choose a site on campus where you can observe mediated literacy practices. This could be your own dorm room, a computer lab, library, or quad study space, a café, or even a lecture hall during class time.\* Make at least two ‘field visits’ and write field notes after each visit, recording your observations.

Remember that an ethnographer brackets his or her own sense of ‘normal’ to try to understand what makes things ‘normal’ for participants in a given context. Describe the setting, participants, and the literacy practices at play. What appears to count as mediated communicative competence in this space? What forms of technology are involved in mediating these interactions? What is the ecology of these devices—who has access to which? Are there any observable social rules or norms governing when and how certain people engage with certain technologies? What ideologies of media and/or language do you imagine might underlie or motivate the literacy practices you have observed? What questions would you need to ask to understand those motivations?

\*NB: If you choose this site, ask permission from a lecturer to observe during a class in which you are not enrolled.

**DUE start of week 5 | Data collection**

While other researchers have explored students' literacy practices in terms of smart phone use (Ito et al 2005, Ames et al 2013), instant messenger (Jones & Schieffelin 2009), our goal as a class will be to make sense of how UCLA students navigate the many communicative modes available to them.

**Each seminar participant is responsible for recording or collecting conversations over at least one of their preferred mediated modes (voice calls, video calls, chat, text, etc.).** Be sure to obtain consent from your interlocutors before recording or saving the data.

Your fellow seminar participants will have access to your observations as data they can rely on for their own final projects. When you upload your data via the course website, be sure to include a description of participants, setting, and any other details of context you think will be necessary for an outsider to understand the meaning insiders would intuitively ascribe to their own actions. If you are submitting audio or video, be sure to include a brief transcript of what you consider the most interesting 30 second portion of the conversation.

### **DUE start of week 7 | Paper 1.0**

In week 5, we will have looked across our shared data set as a class to ask such questions as: What communicative modes are available to students and which are preferred? What skills are needed to make competent use of these modes, and how do students acquire these skills? Using the tools of analysis in the readings from week five, what patterns of language use are visible within and across communicative modes?

Individually, revisit your initial reflections on your own literacy practices. Expand your initial reflections into a **8-10 page double spaced paper** that reframes your own practices in light of a) the main claims of the readings thus far, b) your own observations, and c) a preliminary analysis of a subset of the data we collected as a class. Your analysis of this data must advance beyond our discussion in class, and should be informed by your observations and your own knowledge as a member of the community under observation.

### **DUE start of week 9| Paper 2.0 + Op-ed outline**

All students must make an appointment to meet with me to discuss the 1.0 versions of their paper and their ideas for translating their argument into an op-ed.

Submit a revised and expanded paper that includes 1) expanded data analysis and 2) a section putting this refined analysis into historical and global context. Submit an outline for your op-ed in which you take a stance on your findings and present an argument. **10-15 pages double-spaced.**

### **DUE start of week 10| Presentation + Op-ed draft**

For class one: Bring two copies of a substantial first draft of your op-ed to class. We will use class time for peer workshopping.

For class two: Prepare a 5 minute summary of your final paper argument and your biggest takeaway from the course.

### **DUE end of exam week | Final paper + final op-ed**



## New Course Proposal

### Anthropology 98T Literacy, Technology, and Globalization

**Course Number** Anthropology 98T

**Title** Literacy, Technology, and Globalization

**Short Title** LIT&TECH&GLOBALIZTN

**Units** Fixed: 5

**Grading Basis** Letter grade only

**Instructional Format** Seminar - 3 hours per week

**TIE Code** SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]

**GE Requirement** Yes

**Major or Minor Requirement** No

**Requisites** Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred.

**Course Description** Seminar, three hours. Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred. Exploration of critical role of languages and literacies in uneven distribution and uptake of emerging screen-based technologies around globe. Exposure to broad scope of ethnographic, theoretical, historical, and fictional engagements with notions of literacy and orality to engage critically with current debates about role and effects of screen-based mobile technologies globally through framework of literacies. Collection of ethnographic data on mediated literacy practices of peers. Letter grading.

**Justification** Part of the series of seminars offered through the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows.

**Syllabus** File [Anthropology 98T syllabus.pdf](#) was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.

**Supplemental Information** Professor Elinor Ochs is the faculty mentor for this course.

**Grading Structure** 10% participation; 10% reflection paper; 10% ethnographic data collection; 20% papers 1.0 & 2.0; 10% in-class presentation; 15% op-ed; 25% final paper

**Effective Date** Spring 2015

**Discontinue Date** Summer 1 2015

<b>Instructor</b>	Name	Title
	Rachel Flamenbaum	Teaching Fellow

**Quarters Taught**  Fall  Winter  Spring  Summer

**Department** Anthropology

<b>Contact</b>	Name	E-mail
	CATHERINE GENTILE	cgentile@oid.ucla.edu

**Routing Help**

### ROUTING STATUS

**Role:** Registrar's Office

**Status:** Processing Completed

**Role:** Registrar's Publications Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (LHENNIG@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 56704

**Status:** Added to SRS on 8/5/2014 2:37:17 PM

**Changes:** Requisites, Description

**Comments:** Edited course description into official version.

**Role:** Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (DTHOMSON@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 51441

**Status:** Added to SRS on 7/3/2014 3:18:48 PM

**Changes:** Title, Short Title

**Comments:** No Comments

**Role:** L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 7/2/2014 7:42:32 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Palmer, Christina (CPALMER@MEDNET.UCLA.EDU) - 44796

**Status:** Approved on 7/1/2014 7:54:01 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** No Comments

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/25/2014 4:20:55 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Christina Palmer for FEC approval.

**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998

**Status:** Approved on 6/24/2014 2:03:28 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** instructor has submitted revised syllabus.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/17/2014 10:07:02 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Cathie. Please attached updated syllabus that includes the info requested by the FEC chair.

**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998

**Status:** Approved on 6/17/2014 9:20:20 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** I shall pass on the information to the instructor. thank you.  
Cathie

**Role:** L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/17/2014 8:39:43 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Cathie. See FEC comment below.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Palmer, Christina (CPALMER@MEDNET.UCLA.EDU) - 44796

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/15/2014 5:10:34 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** To answer the instructor's question, it will be fine to indicate the class sessions where research methods and ethics will be discussed.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/12/2014 11:38:02 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Christina Palmer for FEC approval.

**Role:** Department/School Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998

**Status:** Approved on 6/11/2014 11:36:37 AM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** the instructor is currently doing field work in Ghana and will address the research methodology as soon as she can. In the interim, she has this question: "could you ask them to clarify if they want to see time set aside (i.e., fewer readings, class sessions devoted exclusively to methods) for this training, or is indicating the class sessions where methods will be discussed in advance of milestone deadlines acceptable?"

**Role:** L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/5/2014 3:44:18 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Cathie. See FEC comment below.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Palmer, Christina (CPALMER@MEDNET.UCLA.EDU) - 44796

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/4/2014 6:08:44 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** This is a very interesting course. It involves primary data collection using an ethnographic methodology and submitting recordings of conversations on campus and other details of the setting etc to a class website for collaborative data analysis. I commend the instructor for including a statement on the syllabus that consent should be obtained for recording conversations. But since the students will be engaged in ethnographic research without training I think the syllabus should explicitly include a section that describes the research methodology they will be using and discusses research ethics, specifically ethical conduct of ethnographic research.

**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040

**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/2/2014 4:11:31 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** Routing to Christina Palmer for FEC approval.

**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998

**Status:** Approved on 5/14/2014 5:18:42 PM

**Changes:** No Changes Made

**Comments:** on behalf of Professor Kathleen L. Komar, chair, CUTF Faculty Advisory Committee

**Role:** Initiator/Submitter - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998

**Status:** Submitted on 5/14/2014 5:17:22 PM

**Comments:** Initiated a New Course Proposal

[Back to Course List](#)

[Main Menu](#) [Inventory](#) [Reports](#) [Help](#) [Exit](#)  
[Registrar's Office](#) [MyUCLA](#) [SRWeb](#)

Comments or questions? Contact the Registrar's Office at  
[cims@registrar.ucla.edu](mailto:cims@registrar.ucla.edu) or (310) 206-7045