23

More Connected and More Divided than Ever

Toward a Cosmopolitan Ethics of Digital Literacies

David B. Sabey and Kevin M. Leander

In this chapter, we consider the relations of ethics, digital literacies, and education. On a personal level, the occasion for these considerations was the contentious 2016 presidential election in the United States. Though we have somewhat different political orientations, we were both disturbed by the election—and as scholars of digital literacies, we realized that our subject matter was profoundly implicated in the discourse and outcome of the election. At the same time, we recognize that the 2016 election is not an entirely unique or isolated phenomenon, but is symptomatic of ongoing global dynamics with extensive histories, economies, and politics. These broader global dynamics have come to be, for us, the broader situation of this chapter—its occasion. After sketching this context, we approach questions of digital literacies, ethics, and education in two key ways. First, after a brief foray into ethical considerations in literacy studies, we review relatively recent work that draws on theories of cosmopolitanism (an ethical framework which will be introduced subsequently), most of which was published since the previous edition of this volume. In this review, we outline an emerging theory regarding ethical (digital) literacy practices. Second, we apply this framework to a projective description of topics in digital literacies that we believe to be important, and we raise questions for literacy research and practice.

Globalization and Digital Literacy

In sketching a backdrop for this chapter, we turn to the work of Arjun Appadurai, a leading theorist of globalization. In his seminal work, Appadurai (1996) asserted that, in processes of globalization, there is a central tension between cultural homogenization and heterogenization which responds to five different "flows": ethnoscapes (migration of people), mediascapes (use of media that shapes our imagined world), technoscapes (cultural interactions due to the promotion of technology), financescapes (flux of capital), and ideoscapes (global flow of ideologies). As he later suggests, one response to the massive change and intensified anxiety accompanying these flows is a sometimes violent swing to the extreme political right (Appadurai, 2006). Amid the radical circulations of globalization, the tension between homogenization and heterogenization

easily shifts toward homogenizing paradigms like nationalism and xenophobia. One of the strange ironies of globalization is that, as the world becomes increasingly connected via these global flows, it is simultaneously becoming increasingly divided.

Digital literacies are present everywhere we look in the course of these tensions and flows, and in the politics that accompany and drive them. How might we understand these relations, especially in so far as they might inform education? Broadly speaking, we posit two different approaches to considering how the homogenizing and heterogenizing responses to globalization are tied up with digital literacies. First, everyday uses of literacy—as social practices (Gee, 1989; Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Street, 1984)—produce localizing and globalizing movements (Brandt & Clinton, 2002). New technologies have connected us as never before across social, cultural, and national boundaries. Many of us have experienced how social practices with everyday technologies—Instagram, commercial websites, games, e-mail, and Zoom—have become related to other movements as well, including opportunities to make and spend money ("financescapes"), or opportunities to move about the world more frequently, contributing to the creation of new "ethnoscapes". At the same time, social practices that include digital literacies have also been routinely marshalled to create and harden boundaries. Online literacy practices on Facebook and Twitter, for instance, have been used as effective means for consolidating and organizing groups around different ideological positions—the use of literacy toward new and often competing "ideoscapes". As social practices, digital literacies may open up and expand our ideologies just as they may reassert traditional orthodoxies or give birth to radicalized movements; they connect us globally and also create particular cultural networks and boundaries of social formation (e.g., de Haan, Leander, and Ünlüsoy, 2014).

In addition to focusing on the work of digital literacies as social practices, a second approach to the co-production of digital literacies and globalizing flows is to consider how digital literacies have been used to create stories with homogenizing or heterogenizing tendencies, or new forms of the "global imaginary". We use this term to refer to a socially and culturally produced realm of interpretation—the values, symbols, and narratives through which people understand themselves and their society. This expanded conception of literacy practice as having meaning and value in relation to a shared imaginary was argued by Bartlett and Holland (2002). For instance, "functional illiterates," "good readers," and other categories of "readers" are invoked and deployed in schools as participants in the narratives of school literacy. These partially imagined worlds—realms of interpretation—also connect digital literacy practices within political, social, and cultural realms of interpretation. The "figured worlds" (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998) reified by a single President's tweet, an individuals' Facebook feed, or an entire online media outlet (e.g., Breitbart, Huffington Post), shape both simplified models of the world and also more expansive cultural imaginaries, operating at individual and collective scales.

Appadurai (1996), who was influenced by Anderson's (1983) notion of the "imagined community," writes that the "imagination has become an organized field of social practices" which acts as a powerful homogenizing and/or heterogenizing force (p. 31). Implicitly responding to some of the extreme homogenizing movements that have emerged recently (e.g., the "alt-right"), Appadurai (2006) underscores this idea saying, "It requires some serious effort and attention on how to shape the imagination and this imaginary in a constructive manner, so as to not make it a terrain only of fear, anxiety, hate, anger" (np). In this chapter, we hope to offer this kind of "serious effort and attention" regarding digital literacy studies. In particular, we consider how digital literacy education might be shaped through a broad ethical vision that is responsive to present social, cultural, and political dynamics. We begin addressing these questions by considering the relationship between ethics and literacy.

Ethics and Literacy

The field's "social turn" has taught us that literacy is always situated within particular social contexts and tied up in relationships between people (e.g., Gee, 1990). But what is true of literacy in general is becoming increasingly evident in an age of social media: We read, write, remix, and share texts in relation to other people, and we read, write, and imagine people into being through social practices. This understanding of the social nature of literacy leads rather straightforwardly to ethical considerations. Once we acknowledge that literacy mediates/constitutes self-Other relationships, we must consider the qualities of those relationships. Indeed, ethics and literacy can be viewed as largely co-constitutive. While there may be some ethical obligations that transcend language, by and large we relate and respond to the Other semiotically and discursively.

The profound relationship between literacy and ethics has always been a part of the field—we need look no further than the classic notion of "ethos" as a rhetorical appeal. More recently, critical theorists have pointed out how literacy is always entangled in questions of politics and power. Consider how Freire and Macedo (1987) implicitly connect literacy and ethics when they say, "Reading the world always precedes reading the word, and reading the word implies continually reading the world" (p. 35). From this perspective, to read is to trace, respond to, and transform asymmetrical social relations. Street (1984) similarly argues that literacy is not "autonomous," but "ideological"—models he uses to distinguish between a view of literacy abstracted from sociocultural practice, and one that situates literacy in the dynamic and often troubled social world. Social practice theory and its ideological critique of literacy (e.g., Collins & Blot, 2003; Larson, 2001) is but one branch of literacy studies that has considered relations of identity, power, access, and equity in literacy studies—all questions of profound ethical meaning. Thus, we see a more direct engagement with ethics in literacy research as the development of a line of inquiry with a rich history, but which, in a field dominated by psychological and sociological perspectives, foregrounds philosophical resources and conversations.

But what kind of ethics might guide our digital literacies practices? To be clear, critical theory, critical race theory, cultural studies, and poststructuralisms have by now substantial histories of raising questions of ethics and value with respect to texts, the socio-cultural imaginary, identities, and relationships. But with our Janus-like assignment in this tense socio-political moment, we sense the field of digital literacies as needing a more explicitly worked out prospective ethical stance—a robust vision that includes, but also moves beyond, ideological critique. We want to consider how literacy education and scholarship can engage more directly with the development of ethical social practices, including how to create just and humane publics in which a pluralistic "we" can come together. One promising line of theory development and early research that offers such a prospective vision, and that has recently emerged in the field, draws on and expands a renewed vision of cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitanism and Literacy

The term "cosmopolitanism," though contested, generally refers to one's ethical responsibility toward distant and different others. Because of the relative novelty of the theory in educational research, many of the authors who draw on cosmopolitanism provide a brief history of the concept, tracing it back to the iconoclastic Cynic, Diogenes, who declared himself a "citizen of the world" (cosmopolitan) and not a single city-state. Although Diogenes' provocative questions about one's obligations toward distant others and toward humanity in general, in addition to/transcendence of more local loyalties, were by no means unique, his term stuck. The typical genealogy of the idea skims over Diogenes' immediate successors, the Stoics, and highlights

Enlightenment philosophers such as Immanuel Kant (1903) and more recent thinkers who grappled with these ethical questions (e.g., Derrida, 2001), as well as others in business and politics who have invoked "cosmopolitanism" as an ideal. With such a long and predominantly Western and masculine history, it is no wonder that some articulations of cosmopolitanism are problematic. As educational theorists and researchers have sifted through this history, they have tended to situate their versions of cosmopolitanism in contrast to Enlightenment era and contemporary neoliberal versions of cosmopolitanism, which they cast as elitist, essentializing, universalizing, and/or ahistorical for the way they invoke privileged and uncritical visions of humanity and a unified world (see Stornaiuolo and Nichols (2018) for a critical review and reframing of cosmopolitanism in education research).

Empirical work related to cosmopolitanism in language and literacy studies has thus far been entirely descriptive and ethnographic; it has focused on articulating an appropriate version of cosmopolitanism for educational research and on identifying, describing, and characterizing its various manifestations "on the ground" as young people interact with others and communicate across difference of various scales and kinds (e.g., transnational, linguistic, cultural). As one might expect with a relatively early body of research, much of this work has focused on developing analytical frameworks that help to operationalize cosmopolitanism and illuminate its constituent parts and multiple permutations. Although the scholars cited below develop a variety of such frameworks, they are united in proposing cosmopolitanism as an ethical touchstone for communicating across differences in an increasingly globalized world, and they aspire to understand and encourage dynamic relations in which self and Other, the known and the new, the local and the distant are imagined, represented, and responded to with an ethic of hospitality and dialogue.

Although these are undoubtedly high standards, a common conclusion underscored across this literature is that young people are already "cosmopolitan" in many ways—and that they can enact and further develop their cosmopolitan dispositions and literacies when they are positioned as competent (e.g., Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Juzwik & McKenzie, 2015; Vasudevan, 2014), empowered to draw on the multimodal semiotic resources available to them (e.g., Canagarajah, 2012; De Costa, 2014; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sterponi, 2013; Stornaiuolo, 2016), and provided with appropriate scaffolding and forms of reflection as they attempt to communicate with those who seem different or distant in some respect (e.g., Hansen, 2014; Hawkins, 2014; Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2014; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010). This work asks researchers and practitioners to begin with the assumption that young people, even (and perhaps especially) those that are traditionally marginalized, already possess the seeds of "cosmopolitan genius" (Campano & Ghiso, 2011).

This asset-based orientation does not, however, preclude the possibility that young people may require pedagogical support for their cosmopolitan genius to flourish. Indeed, as described below, the desire to pedagogically cultivate cosmopolitanism is continually present in this research, if not always explicitly so. While we agree with Hull and Stornaiuolo (2014) that "We are still a distance away from knowing how to foster a cosmopolitan citizenry" (p. 40), looking across this literature, we see a field-wide emergent theory about the contexts and conditions in which cosmopolitanism emerges and is manifest. In our synthesis of this literature, we suggest that much of the field's discussion of the emergence of cosmopolitanism resonates with three broad practices, which we label as "unsettling encounters," "critical reflections," and "hospitable dialogues." These practices will be discussed more fully below, but as an initial articulation of this nascent theory, we might say that cosmopolitan interactions and dispositions emerge and develop in and through these "cosmopolitanizing practices," especially as they are brought together in concert.

Cultivating Cosmopolitanism

What follows is a synthetic review of the educational research literature that draws on cosmopolitanism, with sections corresponding to each cosmopolitanizing practice. While we will discuss these practices in separate sections, they should not be considered as entirely distinct or related in stepwise fashion; rather, as will become evident, they are overlapping, interrelated, recursive, and rhizomatic. In offering this synthesis, we will refer to digital literacy, but not exclusively. The principal focus here is on outlining an ethically-inflected framework and illustrating its constituent parts in hopes that this will catalyze and channel efforts to further understand and cultivate the kinds of (digital) literacy practices that are increasingly urgent in this moment of simultaneous connection and division. Following our review, we will use this framework to explore more directly possible directions for reimagining digital literacy studies and pedagogies.

Unsettling Encounters

Authors drawing on cosmopolitanism repeatedly identify that an important aspect of cosmopolitan interactions is a certain unsettledness, often described in terms of openness and willingness to engage with, learn from, and relate differently to the new, distant, and Other. We use this word with negative connotations intentionally because encounters with otherness can indeed be unsettling in this sense, but we also intend it more positively here as a contrast to sedimentation, ossification, and entrenchment. To be unsettled may be disconcerting, but it can also be enlivening. References from across the field which we would characterize as "unsettling encounters" include decentering the self (Ong, 2009; Rizvi, 2009); destabilizing common sense ways of thinking (Campano & Ghiso, 2011); disrupting stereotypical, pre-determined, or otherwise simplistic perspectives (Choo, 2014, 2016); and reframing/denaturing the world (Cheah, 2008). Within digital literacies, for example, Wohlwend and Medina (2017) analyze how problematic cultural imaginaries are often thickened and reproduced in transmedia children's play, but also how they can be disrupted, making normative ideals visible and available for reworking.

By unsettling understandings of self, other, and world, individuals and collectives make room for the reconfiguration of these relationships (Hansen, 2014) and the imagination of how things could be otherwise (Stornaiuolo, 2015; Yaman Ntelioglou, 2017). While there is broad agreement that some unsettledness is a necessary feature of cosmopolitan dispositions and interactions, these authors do not advocate for entirely open and unrooted ways of being. In one of the most influential articulations of cosmopolitanism for literacy studies, Hansen (2010) glosses "cosmopolitan artfulness" as a reflective loyalty to the known and openness to the new, and clarifies, "It is out of the question to try to be open at all times to everything new, or loyal at all times to everything known. The former posture dissolves life, the latter petrifies it" (p. 5). Unsettling encounters facilitate the productive expression of openness and loyalty, preventing petrification while avoiding dissolution.

While many authors discuss unsettling encounters between people separated by vast geographical distance, Vasudevan (2014) considers the way a theater program for court-involved youth provided scaffolded opportunities to "unsettle" and remediate participants' narratives related to common scenarios in the local community. One of the ways program facilitators did this was to engage participants in improvisation activities built around their lived experiences (e.g., an altercation between two young men) and then to introduce "unsettling" conditions that required participants to question, reinterpret, and reimagine the typical trajectory of these experiences. Vasudevan characterizes this improvisation activity as an example of cosmopolitan pedagogy that, within an environment of belonging, put different perspectives in direct dialogue with each

other, disrupted default ways of being and thinking, and helped participants productively navigate the space between the new and the known.

Saito (2010) discusses a curriculum that, however different from the one discussed above, likewise demonstrates aspects of unsettling encounters. He suggests identifying student interests and then "unsettling" them by tracing the threads that connect them transnationally (à la actor-network theory). For example, he helped grade 2 students in Japan begin exploring their embeddedness in global networks by looking at where their clothes were manufactured. The students were surprised to find out that the clothes they were wearing did not originate in Japan. Saito explained to them that the objects around them, like their clothes, were a "tug of a net … a starting point of connections to the world outside Japan. You pull that tug, you pull it and pull it, and then, you will catch a glance of what's happening outside Japan" (p. 342). This kind of unsettling encounter opened opportunities for (re)considering Japan's relationship to other countries and, more generally, the nature of the world.

Critical Reflections

As illustrated in the above examples, when individuals and collectives unsettle understandings of self, Other, and the world, they become available for critical engagement. Note that, in this literature, the word "critical" is employed in both the generic sense (which we will refer to with a lower-case "critical") to indicate thoughtful reflection upon, for example, similarities and differences between what seems normal to one and what is apparently normal to others; and in the theoretical sense (which we will refer to with an upper-case "Critical"), pointing toward explicitly liberationist and materialist perspectives derived from the Frankfurt School. In the first sense, for example, David Hansen has written eloquently about how a critical reflective distance allows for reconsideration and renegotiation of the new and the known (e.g., Hansen, 2010, 2014). In digital literacy research, a critical stance that stays close to a focal text and to reading process analysis, is well-represented by work on online reading comprehension (Leu et al., 2004; Coiro & Dobler, 2007), examining tasks that include children locating information online, critically evaluating that information, and synthesizing it. In the second sense of the Critical within digital literacy research, scholars are just beginning to consider, for instance, how software operates primarily out of sight, and that new "sub-screnic" literacies are needed to interpret the work of software and the associated interests of software companies that shape literacy practices (Lynch, 2015). Related Critical work on the role of algorithms and big data as relevant to digital literacy practice is also just emerging (Carrington, 2018).

Critical perspectives on digital literacies informed by cosmopolitan theory are just emerging, although a number of literacy researchers traverse cosmopolitan thinking and notions of Freirean praxis to theorize a Critical cosmopolitanism (Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Choo, 2014; Darvin & Norton, 2017; Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2010; Hull et al., 2010; Lemrow, 2016; Rizvi, 2009; Stornaiuolo, Hull, & Hall, 2017). This Critical perspective is at least in part a corrective response to Enlightenment era and contemporary neoliberal cosmopolitanism, training an analytical eye not on differences per se, but on the histories and material conditions that circumscribe those differences—including the ways one may be implicated in global inequities and other problematic power dynamics. Drawing on feminist and poststructuralist thinking to theorize Critical cosmopolitanism, a notable example of Critical reflections that implicates digital literacies is Whitty's (2017) grappling with dominant and subjugated histories of the University of New Brunswick. Whitty narrates her confrontation with the colonial narrative her university presents on its website, which she recognized as whitewashed, and her subsequent exploration of decolonizing/indigenizing histories and pedagogies. Her underlying approach to cosmopolitanism suggests that it may be necessary to locate what from the past has been "lost, hidden, removed, and written out"

(p. 18) before one can truly change future understandings and relationships. This Critical (un) learning takes place for Whitty as she encounters and enters into dialogue with alternative perspectives that unsettle and problematize dominant ways of thinking and being.

Aspects of C/critical reflections (along with unsettling encounters and hospitable dialogue) are likewise evident in Yaman Ntelioglou's (2017) description of a drama unit in an ELL class. The teacher of the class had students in small groups collectively write and perform mini-plays about Canadian holidays and other holidays students celebrated (e.g., religious holidays not officially recognized by Canada). In one of these mini-plays, students portrayed a family's preparation for the Eid, a Muslim holiday, and represented female characters doing housework while the male characters relaxed. In this performance, a female character confronts her brother about the household division of labor and requests that he helps. The content of this play derived from the social realities of students' lives, and the imaginative scripting and performing allowed them to reciprocally share, explore, and critique aspects of their own cultures. These dramatic productions became opportunities not only to put aspects of students' diverse cultures in conversation with each other, but also to critically consider how they might be otherwise.

Hospitable Dialogues

In characterizing cosmopolitan interactions, authors rely on the sometimes metaphorical, sometimes literal image of an ongoing dialogue in which all participants can express themselves and respond hospitably to each other, and they are optimistic about such dialogues, especially when they are combined with C/critical reflections (Darvin & Norton, 2017; Hansen, Burdick-shepherd, Cammarano, & Obelleiro, 2009; Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2010) and scaffolded to help interlocutors repair inevitable communicative missteps (Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2014; Hull et al., 2010). The first example we offer regards a dialogue as conventionally imagined—a face-to-face discussion—while the second considers hospitality in the context of the private social network Space2Cre8, which has been a digital proving ground for many of the ethical principles and practices we consider in this chapter.

Crampton, Lewis, and Tierney's (2017) analysis of a classroom discussion highlights characteristics of hospitable dialogue. The discussion concerned a photograph of a white couple posing with a Black lawn jockey. The couple, who had adopted a Black son, purportedly bought the problematic item in hopes of demonstrating solidarity with their son and Black culture. As the class explored a variety of justifications and criticisms regarding the parents' behavior, including charges of racism, the authors report that students achieved a "proper distance" in relation to the subjects of the picture: "the students were not so close that they couldn't see and critique the others in the photo for their display of an offensive statue, but they were close enough to extend hospitality to them, conceding their humanity" (p. 185). In this account, students' willingness to share honest opinions and their hospitality toward each other allowed them to collectively demonstrate a critically-informed hospitality toward the subjects of the photograph.

While dialogue remains the image par excellence of cosmopolitan exchange, it implies a certain oppositional relationship between interlocutors—not necessarily a contentious one, but one in which participants diametrically face each other. Although this kind of exchange may often be beneficial, it is also limited insofar as it maintains a relationship of distance and opposition. Reimagining the "shape" of this exchange, some authors encourage a move away from dialogue per se toward dialogic collaboration (Rizvi, 2009; Saito, 2010; Yaman Ntelioglou, 2017), a move that reconfigures the interlocutors' relationship, and figuratively places them on common ground in joint service of a shared cause. We note here that this reimagining of dialogue is especially fitting for digital contexts, where conventions (e.g., turn-taking), scale, and mode of communication transcend the two-way verbal exchange of face-to-face dialogue.

Stornaiuolo (2016) illustrates many of these ideas in her description of the hospitable dialogues among the international group of teachers involved in Space2Cre8 and the learning opportunities (for both teachers and students) that emerged from these conversations. She describes how these teachers discussed the complications of allowing students to write about sensitive topics (e.g., sexuality) and their desire to "deepen" engagement between students. In these discussions, teachers had to be willing to make explicit their differences of opinion, collaboratively develop shared goals, and sustain these challenging conversations over time. As they did this, they ultimately decided to allow students to write about sensitive topics, but also to provide some training about cultural differences among participants in Space2Cre8, including different understandings of what topics are appropriate to share publicly. They also decided to engage students in collaborative video exchanges in addition to single-author text messages as a means of "deepening" their interactions. The resulting video exchanges involved collaborative work at various scales as Space2Cre8 participants began to remix and respond to each other's videos. While Stornaiuolo is careful not to suggest that teacher collaboration or video exchanges alone will always yield hospitable dialogues, she asserts that they can be (and were, in the cases she highlights) conducive to cosmopolitan interactions.

Reflections on Digital Literacy Studies and Education

Taken together and sustained over time and space, unsettling encounters, C/critical reflections, and hospitable dialogues engender (and are largely constitutive of) cosmopolitan interactions and dispositions. This broad tripartite framework represents our field's current theory about the nature and emergence of cosmopolitanism and, as such, provides a useful onramp for elaborating the implications of cosmopolitan theory for digital literacy education. We attempt, in what follows, to consider some of the implications for digital literacies through the ethical lens that cosmopolitanism provides. As we do so, we attend to dimensions of digital literacies that are emergent and that we feel will play an increasingly significant role, and that, hence, should be the focus of further research and practice. For each part of the cosmopolitan framework, and in light of our own perceptions of how digital technologies and practices are changing, we have offered a new direction or re-orientation for the field, along with some discussion of related practices and tools.

Unsettling Encounters by Reading Networks

The page has long held a central place in our imagination within literacy studies and pedagogical practice. Even digital literacy technologies have often been informed by the idea of a (web)page as being designed and organized as a certain amount of content to read in one instance. For literacy, the page is perhaps the most comfortable place to settle in our imagination of what a "text" is. On the one hand, literacy scholars for some time have been attempting to disrupt text- or page-centered approaches to literacy, in particular through work on intertextuality and multivocality (see Baron, this volume). Yet, digital literacy texts and practices offer still further opportunity to unsettle the page and the common sense ways of reading and thinking it implies.

In digital media, every text is always already a "site" that is brought into relation with other sites. Internet firewalls cut some things out and bracket some things in, money and advertising boost sites in search rankings, and algorithms do their work behind the scenes. While the authors we have reviewed, in line with much of the broader field, recommend practices such as pairing thematically-related canonical and marginalized texts as a promising means of cultivating cosmopolitanism (e.g., Choo, 2016), online digital texts demand that we attend not only to the way different authors/texts treat a common theme, but also the ways in which money, power,

discourses, and material goods move across networks (see Mackey, this volume). This suggests a movement from reading "pages" to reading networks.

A networked image of the practice of reading might attend to the position of the text in relation to other connected texts, reading these connections in terms of how, together, they create cultural, historical, ideological, racial, or other differences. Yet, differences are read (or written) not merely as "positions" coming into contact; rather, networked lines may be imagined as creating movements or lines of flight that are neither one text nor the other. Reading networks, in this sense, means finding ways to read the (actual and imagined) lines between texts—to see reading as not merely a resting place for the collection of meanings in situ, but as travel between them. In this sense, network readers are "wayfarers," understanding that (digital) lives are led "not inside places but through, around, to and from them, from and to places elsewhere" (Ingold, 2000, p. 229). Practically speaking, this "unsettled" networked view of reading, as a cosmopolitan practice and image, calls out literacy educators and researchers for bounding online spaces too tightly and too quickly. Students cannot understand networks, their positions in them, and the ways that these networks connect them to others, by becoming skilled at the work of individual page-reading and writing.

As the individual page needs to be unsettled and networked, so must the individual actor. The shift we are proposing to the assemblage, at the nexus of digital literacy research and cosmopolitanism, involves assuming that the social "group," digitally connected at various scales, should be a principal "unit of analysis" for research and pedagogy. Due to the structuring of school around individual work and assessment, and for other reasons, the notion of inherently collective digital activity, or the learning digital assemblage, is a poor fit in the traditional school context. Still, moves in this direction are not impossible nor merely theoretical. As we write, digital tools are being developed that can be used to conceive of how individuals and groups come together in large, discursive Conversations (Gee, 2014). One example is a new add-on to widely-shared news articles published online by BuzzFeed, a news and entertainment company. BuzzFeed developed this add-on feature, called Outside Your Bubble (www.buzzfeed.com/outsideyourbubble), in February 2017, in response to trends of civic and political polarization. The tool appears as a module at the bottom of select news articles, where it collects and categorizes the multiple ways people are responding to the article across social media sites. For instance, a story recent to the writing of this chapter ("Trump Says Transgender People Cannot 'Serve In Any Capacity' In The Military," July 26, 2017) is followed by links to eight divergent responses. The first four of these are captioned as follows:

1. Many people disagree with Trump's decision and feel it poorly represents American values.
2. Several have pointed out that there are already transgender people in the military and say they feel Trump is disrespecting their service.
3. Many feel Trump is affronting the entire LGBT community, and one person pointed to an example of the community's impact in the military.
4. One person says he is in the Army and that he feels it's not a "good environment" for trans people.

As we consider cosmopolitan digital literacies, what is most interesting about this and similar tools is that a multiplicity of perspectives is curated and offered, avoiding rants or binary arguments. Moreover, these perspectives are not artificially shaped argument types for learning, but are connected to real people and lived experiences—they serve to exemplify how people, texts, and material practices are organized and assembled. Other media network analysis tools could also be used pedagogically, to make evident the routine structures or "conversational archetypes" of social media topic networks (e.g., "polarized crowd," "tight crowd," "community cluster,"

and "broadcast network," Smith et al., 2014). While there are problems with these early tools, they also offer digital literacy educators a developing means through which to show their students that conversations and positions online are worked out in complex, rhizomatic movements with others, rather than clear argumentative outlines contained on the page.

Finally, the critical reading of social-digital networks themselves is one way in which typified encounters, sedimented online or offline, can be unsettled and re-interpreted for who they include and exclude, and what their social and cultural practices are. In one project, Leander, together with colleagues, engaged migrant and non-migrant youth in analyzing their social networks, online and offline (de Haan, Leander, & Ünlüsoy, 2014). Such work made evident many of the differences in social networks between youth with different cultural practices and backgrounds. For instance, Turkish-Dutch youth were more inclined to practice family-oriented networks than were either Dutch or Moroccan-Dutch youth, and both groups of migrant youth had fewer networked connections nationally than did the non-migrant youth. Such differences, of course, are not static, and they are also not wholly invisible to youth. Yet, there are surprises that come to light when we make social-digital networks explicit, and thereby make them available to unsettling. Every day, most literacy students are not merely reading and writing "within" networks—they are in fact reading and writing the networks themselves. These are critically significant movements of their lives that can be marshaled as readable/writable networks in cosmopolitan digital literacies.

Critical Reflections: From Multiple Resources to Multi-Agency

As mentioned previously, authors drawing on cosmopolitanism often pair this theory with more explicitly Critical theories. Along with these Critical perspectives, other C/critical reflections in the field have made more explicit and developed pedagogies around the diverse multiple resources through which language and literacy are produced. In the literature cited above, authors contribute to these reflections, emphasizing different kinds of productive multiplicity (e.g., multimodality, multivocality, multilingualism) in cosmopolitan interactions. These forms of multiplicity afford what Hull et al. (2013) call "generative polysemy and indeterminacy" (p. 1234). Texts with these kinds of multiplicity are "generative" because they allow various points of entry, possible interpretations, and potential responses, and therefore are conducive to hospitable dialogues, C/critical reflections, and unsettling encounters.

In order to deeply engage with C/critical reflection in digital literacies, in addition to these more familiar types of productive multiplicity, presently there is a pressing need for more direct C/critical engagement with computer-based agents that act along with humans and guide much of human action. Such a shift requires attending not simply to the individual *qua* producer/consumer of texts, but to assemblages that bring together humans and non-humans alike (See Knox, 2016; Spector, 2015). A significant non-human participant in digital interactions, worthy of critical and ethical consideration, is the algorithm. Algorithms are ubiquitous in digital interactions, although they are often overlooked. To return to "Outside Your Bubble," for instance, the divergent comments on a given BuzzFeed article are gathered through the working of algorithms on BuzzFeed's official accounts on platforms such as Reddit, Twitter, and Facebook, and later summarized at the bottom of the original, selected article. Once clicked on, these topical links show the text of the actual comment and links to it. Considering "Outside Your Bubble" in this way highlights how different media platforms are involved in "reading" this kind of news, all of which are powered by algorithms that assesses popularity (likes, up votes, etc.) and determine visibility.

When discussing their work behind the scenes, early research suggests that students often have problematic understandings of algorithims (Jones, 2019). More explicitly, Jones catalogues how undergraduates in the UK and Hong Kong attribute different roles to algorithms: as agent,

authority, adversary, audience, and even as oracle (2019, p. 11). Our own work on social media, and especially Facebook (e.g., Burriss & Leander, 2017), suggests youth with several years of practice on Facebook have a variety of divergent understandings of how, when, and why its algorithms function.

Researchers in education and media studies have taken different approaches to the study of algorithms and the questions they pose for learning and interaction, including Critical approaches to their presence and functioning (Finn, 2017; Noble, 2018), affect theoretical approaches (Bucher, 2017), and pragmatic approaches concerning how algorithms are used and engaged by humans (Jones, 2019). Across these approaches, however, is general agreement on the massive expansion of algorithms and other types of computational agents within everyday interaction. The anthropocentric history of digital literacy studies allows too little consideration of non-human actants. Outside of education, post-human theorist and artist Trevor Paglen (2018) calls to our attention that "the overwhelming majority of images are now made by machines for other machines, with humans rarely in the loop" (p. 89). How such computer interpretation is unlike human seeing, and how human/nonhuman interpretation function in relation to one another, is of significant importance to the practice of literacy education, as well as to the ongoing evolution of literacies. In Paglen's terms, "If we want to understand the invisible world of machine-machine visual culture, we need to unlearn how to see like humans" (Paglen, 2018, p. 17).

One of many possible practical arenas for a C/critical cosmopolitan practice in digital literacy education is the area of advertising. In addition to moving from a text-to-network perspective, argued above, and also from a linguistic to a multimodal perspective, which has become commonplace in advertising and propaganda analysis, a C/critical analysis of practice and ethics involved in everyday advertising and marketing might take up the following topics:

- How is offline data on users collected (e.g., through credit card purchases)?
- What kinds of online data are collected through cookies when using websites?
- How has timing, perhaps more than content, become important in online advertising, so as to reach users when they are further down what marketers call the "purchasing funnel"?
- What kind of identity "bucket" is being made about a user through targeted ads and an ongoing online marketing profile developed through cookies?

Studying new forms of digital marketing is an important form of digital literacy pedagogy not merely because such marketing is ubiquitous, but because these new practices unsettle our presumptions of either the mass consumer or individual reading the ad. Instead, in current practices there are massively individualized consumers, for whom data is being mined, analyzed, and put to use in real time, in ongoing cycles involving humans, non-humans, digital action, literacy, material action, and ethical consequences.

Hospitable Dialogues: Listening across Online and Offline Practices

As a third dimension for the ethical transformation of pedagogy at the nexus of cosmopolitan theory and digital literacies, we draw attention to the value of listening as an integral part of hospitable dialogue. Though attentive listening is mentioned repeatedly in the literature that draws on cosmopolitanism (e.g., Stornaiuolo, 2016; Vasudevan, 2014; Yaman Ntelioglou, 2017), the predominant focus thus far has been on the *productive side* of dialogue. This is reflective of the broader field, with its abundance of literacy research and practice in terms of text/utterance production and relatively little research or pedagogical work on listening. As we explore the nature of listening in cosmopolitan exchanges, we counter-pose the idea of close reading—and the closures of meaning that it may support—with the notion of "open listening." By this, we intend

listening that is ethically and dialogically committed to the possibility of being changed by an interaction. Open listening conceives of both self and Other as unfixed, and yet related in their becoming through interaction. Ethically speaking, open listening runs much deeper than listening comprehension, as it does not fix a particular notion of content in advance of a listening occasion. Rather, open listening is envisioned as emergent and relational. It is worth noting that structures of dialogue can get in the way of open listening, including those designed to break I-R-E patterns for teacher-student exchange. For instance, student-student-student exchanges, bypassing teacher participation, can easily become topical commentary given to a common theme—with students waiting their respective turn—rather than practices of open, dialogic listening.

What might the shape of (online) interactions be that support open listening, and how might such interactions be scaffolded? One route into this difficult problem is through studying social practices, on- or offline, that appear to be especially given to knowing through intentional, open listening. While we retain the value of argumentation, persuasion, and debate for academic and scientific purposes, shifting our genres of literacy practice to those more supportive of open listening may be generative. For example, Enciso (2017) examines how significant the imagination is, to "borrow from and invent linguistic, artistic, and narrative forms," in story-telling among immigrant and non-immigrant youth (p. 34). Enciso's use of co-narration (Ochs & Capps, 2001) among culturally marginalized youth disrupts the notion of a separate listening moment from that of speaking; rather, listening, problem-solving, questioning, evaluating, and enacting are intertwined in the ensemble of relating. Also deeply connected to the imagination, in recent research, we have begun to study improvisational theater as a site for ethical engagement (Tanner, Leander & Carter-Stone, in press). Skilled improvisational artists must listen intently to know what to do next—their next move must build on the last, given by another in their group. Thus, in the flow of real time, skilled improvisational artists must both form responses and continually be open to omitting their responses as the situation ceaselessly evolves. Other literacy research in drama has a more developed history for showing the ways in which pedagogical mimetic practices involve engagement with real and imagined others that can deepen ethical sensibilities, including open listening (e.g., Edmiston, 2013). A grounded ethics of (new) everyday relationality could be supported by further research in such contexts, as well as by school-situated experimentation with open forms of dialogue, located at the nexus of online and offline interaction.

We have deliberately begun the discussion of pedagogical possibilities in this section in offline practices, because while we wish to maintain a focus on digital literacies, we believe in the case of dialogue in particular that the "online" problem of polarization must be addressed pedagogically within both online and offline spaces. As an experiment in this direction (Sabey and Leander, in preparation), in a recent course for university freshmen, we actively recruited students from across the political spectrum and engaged them in discussions of polarized topics (e.g., gun control). In cycles of participation and analysis, students were given the task of analyzing pieces of their own political dialogues and online interactions, in light of a developing set of reflective conversations and readings concerning cosmopolitan ethics. One realization from this work was simply that open listening is a challenging practice in both online and offline contexts. As students, teachers, social-media users, etc., we are not accustomed to being present with others and responding to their dialogic contributions openly; we tend to be much more comfortable in more predictable and controlled interactions. If, as we believe, open listening is an important aspect of cosmopolitan literacy practices, there is much to learn about how it can be developed and supported, perhaps especially online.

Yet another approach for the cultivation of hospitable dialogues online is to inquire about the development of new digital tools that might support open listening. The potential danger of filter-bubbles and echo-chambers in social media has received notable media and scholarly attention of late, with pundits and academics considering the role the Internet and social media may

play in socio-political polarization (e.g., Boxell, Gentzkow, & Shapiro, 2017; Lee, Choi, Kim, & Kim, 2014). In response to this concern, a number of app developers have begun to create tools that attempt to disrupt filter-bubbles and allow users to "hear" other conversations. For instance, FlipFeed, developed by researchers in the MIT Media Lab, is a Google Chrome Extension that allows users to replace their own Twitter feed with that of another actual Twitter user. Feeds are selected based on users' inferred political ideology so that "a right-leaning user … may load and navigate a left-leaning user's feed, observing the news stories, commentary, and other content they consume" (http://flipfeed.media.mit.edu). As a pedagogical opportunity, the idea of the feed seems both to shift attention from text to network—to provide a critical and ethical understanding of how individual texts participate in relations to myriad other texts (postings, advertisements, corporate media channels, etc.) in real time—and, perhaps, to encourage open listening. We are not, of course, suggesting that FlipFeed (or any other tool) stands on its own as a pedagogy. However, given an immersive pedagogy in forms of practice leading toward open listening and dialogue, tools like these may have untapped potential.

Concluding Thoughts

Digital literacy practices are profoundly implicated in the tense moment in which we find ourselves increasingly connected and divided. Recognizing this, we have explored how researchers and educators might contribute to the cultivation of more cosmopolitan ways of being with and relating to the Other. To this end, we reviewed the scholarly literature in literacy and language studies that draws on cosmopolitanism to outline a field-wide emergent theory regarding practices that cultivate and constitute these ways of being and relating. We have then employed this theory to frame our forward-looking commentary on the field of digital literacies, suggesting ways the research and education communities might refocus their attention to more fully understand the ever-evolving worlds of digital literacy and to contribute to the development of ethical relations within and across these worlds.

A number of pedagogical implications follow from this discussion: First, if we expect a given curriculum to cultivate cosmopolitan ways of being and relating, that curriculum will likely need to both typify and afford these cosmopolitanizing practices. While we find these practices compelling and believe they are full of pedagogical potential, we also recognize that they entail some risk. Some unsettling encounters may, for example, be traumatic for certain learners—an especially important consideration with regard to already vulnerable populations. With this in mind, we invite educators and researchers to explore and document forms of instructional scaffolding that appropriately support particular students' and teachers' participation in cosmopolitanizing practices.

As we have sought to apply this framework to ongoing and potential studies of digital literacy practices, we have had cause to re-examine the notion of dialogue which underlies much of the work on cosmopolitanism and on literacy more generally. The quintessential image of dialogue, as mentioned above, involves a verbal exchange between diametrically opposed individuals. In broad strokes, what we have suggested here offers a radical revision of this image, one that involves assemblages of human and non-human actors interacting in and across networks, modes and media. What it means to read, write, listen, dialogue, etc. in this context—let alone to do so ethically—are by no means settled. We hope that shifting our focus from the page to the network, from the (human) individual to the (human and non-human) assemblage, and from close(d) reading to open listening will prove not only to be useful redirections for further research, but will ultimately promote more cosmopolitan ways of being.

While we remain hopeful that such ethical relations are possible, and that ongoing teaching and research along the lines we have proposed may facilitate their realization, we are also deeply,

painfully aware of how far we have to go. Although we believe there are gaps in the field's theoretical and empirical understanding, and gaping holes in our collective public discourse and modes of relating across difference, this awareness most poignantly relates to our own personal failings to live the cosmopolitan ethic we have articulated here. And so we temper our hope with humility, acknowledging that we settle too often into unreflective and inhospitable patterns of thought and behavior, rather than truly engaging with the reality of others. But we must do better—to understand more fully, to listen more openly, and to respond more lovingly to fellow citizens of the world.

References

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers: An essay on the geography of anger*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Bartlett, L., & Holland, D. (2002). Theorizing the space of literacy practices. *Ways of Knowing*, *2*(1), 10–22.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanič (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7–15). London: Routledge.

Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. (2017). *Is the internet causing political polarization? Evidence from demographics* (Political Economy No. 23258). doi:10.3386/w23258

Brandt, D., & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *34*(3), 337–356.

Bucher, T. (2017). The algorithmic imaginary: Exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, *20*(1), 30–44.

Burriss, S. K., & Leander, K. M. (2017, March). "On This Day": Personal memory and social media. Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Assembly for Research (NCTEAR) Annual Conference, Towson, MD.

Campano, G., & Ghiso, M. P. (2011). Immigrant students as cosmopolitan intellectuals. In S. A. Wolf, K. Coats, P. Enciso, & C. A. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of research on children's and young adult literature* (pp. 164–176). New York: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.

Carrington, V. (2018). The changing landscape of literacies: Big data and algorithms. *Digital Culture and Education*, *10*(1), 67–76.

Cheah, P. (2008). What is a world? On world literature as world-making activity. *Daedalus*, *137*(3), 26–38.

Choo, S. S. (2014). Cultivating a hospitable imagination: Re-envisioning the world literature curriculum through a cosmopolitan lens. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 68–89. doi:10.1111/curi.12037

Choo, S. S. (2016). Fostering the hospitable imagination through cosmopolitan pedagogies: Reenvisioning literature education in Singapore. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *50*(4), 400–421.

Coiro, J., & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the Internet. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *42*(2), 214–257.

Collins, J., & Blot, R. (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity* (Vol. 22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crampton, A., Lewis, C., & Tierney, J. D. (2017). Proper distance and the hope of cosmopolitanism in a classroom discussion about race. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 175–190). New York: Routledge.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2017). Investing in new literacies for a cosmopolitan future. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 89–101). New York: Routledge.

De Costa, P. I. (2014). Reconceptualizing cosmopolitanism in language and literacy education: Insights from a Singapore school. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(1), 9–30.

de Haan, M., Leander, K., Ünlüsoy, A., & Prinsen, F. (2014). Challenging ideals of connected learning: The networked configurations for learning of migrant youth in the Netherlands. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *39*(4), 507–535.

Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. London: Routledge.

Edmiston, B. (2013). *Transforming teaching and learning with active and dramatic approaches: Engaging students across the curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Enciso, P. E. (2017). Stories lost and found: Mobilizing imagination in literacy research and practice. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, *66*(1), 29–52.
Finn, E. (2018). *What algorithms want: Information in the age of computing*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Freire, P., & Macedo, D. P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
Gee, J. P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *Journal of Education*, *171*(1), 5–17.
Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies*. London: Falmer Press.
Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
Hansen, D. T. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and education : A view from the ground. *Teachers College Record*, *112* (1), 1–30.
Hansen, D. T. (2014). Cosmopolitanism as cultural creativity: New modes of educational practice in globalizing times. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 1–14. doi:10.1111/curi.12039
Hansen, D. T., Burdick-shepherd, S., Cammarano, C., & Obelleiro, G. A. (2009). Education, values, and valuing in cosmopolitan perspective. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *39*(5), 587–612. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00461.x
Hawkins, M. R. (2014). Ontologies of place, creative meaning making and critical cosmopolitan education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 90–112. doi:10.1111/curi.12036
Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Jr, Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2010). Literate arts in a global world: Reframing social networking as cosmopolitan practice. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *54*(2), 85–97. doi:10.1598/JAAL.54.2.1
Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2014). Cosmopolitan literacies, social networks, and "proper distance": Striving to understand in a global world. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 15–44. doi:10.1111/curi.12035
Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cultural citizenship and cosmopolitan practice: Global youth communicate online. *English Education*, *42*(4), 331–367. doi:10.2307/23018017
Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sterponi, L. (2013). Imagined readers and hospitable texts; Global youths connect online. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1208–1240). Newwark, DE: International Reading Association.
Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.
Jones, R. (2019). The text is reading you: Teaching language in the age of the algorithm. *Linguistics and Education*, (xxxx), 100750. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2019.100750
Juzwik, M. M., & McKenzie, C. (2015). Writing, religious faith, and rooted cosmopolitan dialogue: Portraitsof two American evangelical men in a public school english classroom. *Written Communication*, *32*(2), 121–149.
Kant, I. (1903). *Perpetual peace: A philosophical essay* (M. Cambell Smith Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.
Knox, J. (2016). *Posthumanism and the massive open online course: Contaminating the subject of global education*. New York: Routledge.
Larson, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Literacy as snake oil: Beyond the quick fix*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
Lee, J. K., Choi, J., Kim, C., & Kim, Y. (2014). Social media, network heterogeneity, and opinion polarization. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(4), 702–722. doi:10.1111/jcom.12077
Lemrow, E. M. (2016). *Créolization* and the new cosmopolitanism: Examining twenty-first-century student identities and literacy practices for transcultural understanding. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *4632*(June), 1–15. doi:10.1080/01434632.2016.1186680
Leu, D. J., Jr. Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J. L., & Cammack, D. W. (2004). Toward a theory of new literacies emerging from the internet and other information and communication technologies. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1570–1613). International Reading Association.
Lynch, T. L. (2015). *The hidden role of software in educational research: Policy to practice*. New York: Routledge.
Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Ong, J. C. (2009). The cosmopolitan continuum: Locating cosmopolitanism in media and cultural studies. *Media, Culture, & Society*, *31*(3), 449–466. doi:10.1177/0163443709102716
Paglen, T. (2018). *Machine visions*. Naucalpan, Mexico: Servicios Tepemex.
Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, *30*(3), 253–268. doi:10.1080/01596300903036863

Saito, H. (2010). Actor-network theory of cosmopolitan education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *42*(3), 333–351. doi:10.1080/00220270903494261

Smith, M. A., Rainie, L., Himelboim, I., & Shneiderman, B. (2014). Mapping Twitter topic networks: From polarized crowds to community clusters. In *PEW Internet Research Project*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/02/20/mapping-twitter-topic-networks-from-polarized-crowds-to-community-clusters

Spector, H. (2015). The who and the what of educational cosmopolitanism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* (September2014), 423–440.

Stornaiuolo, A. (2015). Literacy as worldmaking: Multimodality, creativity and cosmopolitanism. In K. Pahl & J. Roswell (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 561–571). New York: Routledge.

Stornaiuolo, A. (2016). Teaching in global collaborations: Navigating challenging conversations through cosmopolitan activity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *59*, 503–513. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.001

Stornaiuolo, A., Hull, G., & Hall, M. (2017). Cosmopolitan practices, networks, and flows of literacies. In K. Mills, A. Stornaiuolo, A. Smith, & J. Pandya-Zacher (Eds.), *Handbook of writing, literacies and education in digital culture* (pp. 1–16). New York: Routledge.

Stornaiuolo, A., & Nichols, T. P. (2018). Cosmopolitanism and education. In G. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education* (pp. 1–32). New York: Oxford University Press.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tanner, S., Leander, K. M., & Carter-Stone, L. (in press). Ways with worlds: Bringing improvisational theater into play with reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*.

Vasudevan, L. M. (2014). Multimodal cosmopolitanism: Cultivating belonging in everyday moments with youth. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 45–67. doi:10.1111/curi.12040

Whitty, P. (2017). Complicating literacies: Settler ways of being with story(ies) on Wabanaki lands. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 17–31). New York: Routledge.

Wohlwend, K. E., & Medina, C. L. (2017). Monster high: Converging imaginaries of girlhood in tweens' digital doll play. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 75–88). New York: Routledge.

Yaman Ntelioglou, B. (2017). Examining the relational space of the self and other in the language-drama classroom: Transcultural multiliteracies, situated practice and the cosmopolitan imagination. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 58–72). New York: Routledge.