Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education Volume1, Issue 2
Revue canadienne des jeunes chercheures et chercheurs en éducation February 2009

The Everyday Literacy Practice of Avatar Creation: Creating a Bridge between Curriculum Intent and Practice

Connie Morrison

Memorial University
conniem@mun.ca

Abstract

This paper begins by exploring the chasm that exists between intent and practice within the common English Language Arts Curriculum in Atlantic Canada. As a means to close that gap, it considers how an everyday literacy practice might combine the academic rigor of creating an autobiography with multimodal forms of representation that the curriculum claims to embrace. More specifically, this paper examines how youth might read and represent themselves in the world by combining autobiography, new literacies and technology. Embracing such everyday literacy practices provides another opportunity for educators to fulfill the stated goals for the foundation for the Atlantic Provinces English Language Arts.

Introduction

Living near the Water, but Missing the Boat

In Atlantic Canada, the *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada English Language Arts Curriculum* (1996) guides provincial curricula in English. Designed to enable and encourage students "to become reflective, articulate, literate individuals who use language successfully for learning and communicating in public and private contexts" (p. v), the Foundation document is similar to other progressive curricula in Canada in its attempt to broaden the scope and understanding of literacy (Kelly, 1997). By including an expanded notion of text to move beyond a print-based definition to include "any language event: oral, written or visual" (p. 11), the Foundation document also outlines an understanding of reading that moves beyond decoding print on the page to a process that will encompass a multi-modal understanding of image and sound in a culture of instant global interactivity and wireless networks (Kress, 2003; Thoman & Jolls, 2004). Despite what appears to be a deliberate attempt to shift English as a discipline towards a cultural studies frame by developing the reader of culture and refuting what Morgan (2000) defines as the "entrenched elitism in dominant literacy practices" (p. 70), however, the methodology assumed within the pedagogy of the Foundation document still adheres to a structuralist, conceptual landscape to ground meaning making.

As a former teacher, an educational researcher, and one working with teacher candidates as they prepare to enter their own classrooms, this paper attempts to address the fundamental philosophical and practical challenges inherent in making the intent of the Foundation document come together with the pedagogical practices implied within this guide. The concerns raised in this paper have emerged from my experience as former teacher whose attempts to reconcile conflicting messages around curriculum delivery often left me feeling frustrated that it was impossible to attend to the stated graduation outcomes while also delivering curriculum in a way that was expected. Such concerns were responsible, in part, for providing the catalyst that inspired my doctoral work, and they continue to motivate my desire to help teacher candidates as they come to terms with similar challenges in their work. To that end, this paper begins by first exploring the chasm that exists between intent and practice within the curricular document in order to examine the potential causes of the apparent disconnect. Embracing what Lankshear and Knobel (2003, 2006) refer to as everyday literacy practices, educators might find opportunities to fulfill the stated goals in the

Foundation document in a manner that serves the intent of Atlantic Canada's common curriculum. For Lankshear and Knobel, the definition of literacy moves beyond a static decoding of print on a page to encompass multiple and evolving practices in reading, writing, composing, viewing, listening and communicating as legitimate forms of social knowledge. For them, everyday literacy practices are limited only by the new and evolving technologies that hold them. In 1999, Knobel's book *Everyday Literacies: Students. Discourses. And Social Practices* adopted the term "everyday" from Ludwig Wittgenstein's notion of "ordinary language, socially constituted meanings and forms of life" (p. 16). In this book, Knobel acknowledges that everyday literacy practices are those that are used to negotiate computer-mediated networks and other forms of technology and media that deliver information to those in postindustrial communities rapidly, easily and continuously. Then, as a means to attempt to bridge the gap between intent and practice, the introduction of an everyday literacy practice will be considered as part of the curriculum that combines an expanded notion of multimodal literacy with the desired curricular outcomes in personal and critical communication across a wide range of media texts. More specifically, this paper will examine how poststructuralist notions of autobiography and representation can become the metaphorical bricks to build that bridge as youth combine an everyday literacy practice with technology to represent themselves in the world.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical position of this paper assumes pedagogy from within a cultural studies framework. It also requires a positioning of knowledge within social, historical and economic contexts (Hall, 1999). As far back as the 1930s and 1940s in Britain, Leavis and the Cambridge school suggested that social harmony could be achieved through literature in English, and in particular, through the establishment of a literary canon with a moral vision that could help the working class determine good from bad in art, literature and cinema (Ball, Kenny & Gardner, 1990). As a practical and educational project, Leavisite English remained through the moral panics of both World Wars, and some argue that it continues to thrive in places yet today (Morgan, 1995; Pirie, 1998). By the 1960s, Leavisite English was being critiqued for its high moral purpose and its refusal to budge from the canon while the learner, first-hand meaning and the daily life of the authentic child was becoming important as an educational project. Within the shift toward English within a cultural studies frame, texts are chosen not for their cultural value or worth, but more importantly for how they contribute to individual and collective identity and meaning-making within the culture.

By contrast, traditionally, texts from popular culture have been ignored, marginalized or even shunned from the classroom for their association with a low culture (Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear, & Leu, 2008). But as traditional pedagogy around literacy practices in the classroom often ignores everyday literacy practices and popular texts, it also attempts to view the terms "text" and "reading" through a progressive lens as is demonstrated in the expansive definition of text within the Foundation document**.** Here text is defined in the *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada English language Arts Curriculum*. (1996) as:

> any language event, whether written, oral, or visual. In this sense, a conversation, a poem, a novel, a poster, a music video, a television program, and a multimedia production, for example, are all texts. The term is an economical way of suggesting the similarity among many of the skills involved in 'reading' a film, interpreting a speech, or responding to an advertisement or a piece of journalism. The expanded concept of text takes into account the diverse range of texts with which we interact and from which we construct meaning. (p. 11)

Kelly (1997) demonstrates how this definition "simultaneously fails to understand fully, the complex political relationship of culture and identity" (p. 67). Within the discourses around media studies, for example, a focus on technology, combined with an inoculatory pedagogy serves to protect students from the harmful messages they passively receive (Pungente, 2002). What has traditionally been ignored in this approach is the attention given to the effect media has on readers. Rather than evoking a protective or an inoculatory approach to texts from popular culture, for example, a cultural studies pedagogy may offer hope by focusing attention on the effect media has on its readers. By critically attending to the "point of engagement" between media and the reader, texts are examined for their constitutive effects at the intersection between culture and power (Kelly, 1997).

It is also important to situate critical constructivism (Kincheloe, 2005) as a framework that also allows for such everyday literacies to be examined against larger cultural ideologies like racism, patriarchy and the division of social class. From this location, the world is a social construct, and subjects are informed by their historical location within this world. Using poststructuralism as a companion framework includes notions of the non-unified, de-centered, often conflicted subject, a subject as an historical construction, shaped by and through language and discursive practice (Peters & Burbules, 2004). If language and discourse are not neutral modes of communication, rather are entangled within power relations, social and historical phenomena, then the way we speak, they way we represent ourselves and the way we act are also tainted by discursive practice, not to mention by social and power relationships (Dolby, 2003; Foucault, 1972; Thomas, 2004, 2007). As such, this paper will consider how traditional print forms of literacy continue to be privileged by educators and policy makers and how in the apparent quest to embrace a more complex, nuanced understanding of literacy, the point is missed.

Discussion

Exploring the Chasm

> "Failing to engage the popular presents an educational loss to everyone involved, for it bypasses an opportunity to examine how culture, power, desire, and identity intersect in all of our lives" (Kelly, 1997, p. 79).

Within the Foundation document, there appears to be a lack of consensus between students, educators and policy makers on what it means to be literate, and more specifically how such definitions are fluid in a world where constantly reinvented forms of visual and electronic media have become dominant tools for forms of expression and communication (Buckingham, 2003; Coiro et al., 2008). This lack of consensus has created a chasm between intent and practice. Lankshear and Knobel (2006, 2003) remind us that with new ways of reading, writing and representing the world come new ways of understanding the world. With ever-evolving methods of digital communication available to students, conventional forms of meaning making are being abandoned by youth in favor of new socially recognized forms as in the "new paralinguistic symbols such as emoticons" (Knobel & Lankshear, 2006).

It would appear that the commitment of the Foundation document to "essential graduation learnings" in the areas of aesthetic expression, citizenship, communication, personal development, problem solving and technological competence embrace new ways of understanding through the implied postmodern philosophies. Yet, despite a curricular document that encourages teachers to embrace such forms of communication, our actions as educators suggest that traditional forms of writing and reading continue to be privileged and valued as the only forms that warrant our class time attention, not to mention assessment. This author's anecdotal experience supports the literature, which demonstrates that the critical attention given to the influence of electronically mediated texts within a sanctioned curriculum, remains lacking (Alvermann, Moon & Hagood, 1999; Coiro et al., 2008; Dolby, 2003; Kelly, 1997; Morgan, 1998, 2000; Torres & Mercado, 2007). Today's classrooms are filled with technically capable students yet continue to be lead by "liner-thinking technologically stymied instructors" (Jones-Kavallier & Flannigan, 2006, p. 10).

For Kelly, and others (Giroux, Shumway, Smith & Sosnoski, 2000) literacy practices often remain steeped in the notion that the canon represents the golden standard against which all works are considered. Within an ethos of academic accountability, numeric grades imply not only a measure of a student's competence, but also assign a value for certain forms of work. One only needs to look to standardized examinations in the discipline of English to see that new and everyday literacy practices receive little value in favor of traditional literacy practices (Coiro et al., 2008). Over a decade and a half ago, Peim (1993) found operational models of literacy to be "punitive and exclusive" (p. 174). So, while claiming to embrace multiple forms of text in a world where images and sounds carry profound pedagogical influence (Giroux et al., 2000; Buckingham, 2003; Gee, 2003), English examinations in Newfoundland and Labrador remain based rigorously on a print version of literacy, and students are restricted to making meaning through their competence with written words as apposed to their engagement with technology, images or even sounds.

If this were the extent of the chasm that divides intent and practice, the challenge to create a bridge would still be significant. However, the lack of consensus over what it means to be literate is only the beginning. Kelly (1997) demonstrated a decade ago that the framework of the Foundation document actually contradicts, ignores and denies its own intention through a refusal to acknowledge images and sounds as important contributions to meaning making. More specifically, the Foundation document claims to embrace yet fails to acknowledge the pedagogical influence of popular culture, as is often the case when popular culture falls into the "zone of literacy" (p. 74). According to the document, the only mention of culture is placed within the domain of tradition and a thing to be possessed, rather than as something that needs to be negotiated. While claiming to embrace an expanded understanding of text and reading, the Foundation document fails to acknowledge a more subtle, but critical factor in the conception of knowledge production. That is, that the subject is "constituted in and of literacy practices" (p. 75). Morgan (2000) draws on Raymond Williams to elucidate this same point. He demonstrates that culture is constitutive in subject/identity and he also suggests that the way we see the world is how we live, and the way we communicate is related to how we are in our community.

To support this view, increasingly educational and public discourse reveals a belief that popular culture has a "more significant, penetrating pedagogical force in young peoples' lives than schooling" since youth are more inclined to listen to their peers than to their teachers or even to their parents (Dolby, 2003, p. 264). Popular culture informs what we know about the world, and it speaks to issues of citizenship and democracy while it, at once, serves as our social glue and as our social divider. Understanding media as a ubiquitous commercial entity with near constant exposure (Dolby, 2003) brings more to bear on the psyche of young people than print texts and versions of literacy. If this is the case, then the often-ignored forms of electronic media in the classroom are central to negotiating notions of power, identity, knowledge and our sense of otherness. And despite first appearances within in the Foundation document that gestures toward the importance of meaning making through popular cultural sites, the marginal mention of media in the document as a site to appropriate meaning highlights a missed opportunity to focus on "the meaning-maker (or the meaning made of the maker). [Instead] the reader has been disembodied and vacated; identity, as an effect of the negotiation of meaning, appears to be conceptually beside the point" (Kelly, 1997, p. 76).

Research and anecdotal experience shows that educators continue to privilege a print version of the literary canon, and standard productions of written text while they fail to account for the multimodal literacy skills required to communicate in the world today (Coiro et al., 2008; Morgan, 2000; Tyner, 1998). Looking more closely at the hierarchal structures behind literacy practices, Kelly (1997) points to the nearly two decades of calls for cultural literacy which include rituals, traditions and objects within Western democracies to frame the impetus behind a cultural studies movement. She explains:

> Culture here is not only selective, but elitist, not only closed but often openly hostile to unassimilable Others for, ultimately, culture here is a history of a particular notion of civilization spawned in the Enlightenment, fueled in schooling through Arnoldian and Leavisite English, the legacies of which much of the curriculum subject of English still enshrines, and reclaims in this usage. (p. 16)

Rather, Kelly explains that a more accurate definition of culture includes a collection of processes and practices through which social relations and group positions can be defined.

Closing the Gap by Building a Bridge

Returning for a moment to the primary vision of the common Atlantic English curriculum, that is to enable and encourage students to become "reflective articulate, literate individuals who use language successfully for learning and communicating in personal and public contexts" (p. v), we might expect curriculum to invite students to bring their everyday literacy practices into the culturally relevant conversation. Giroux (1994) explains that with the contested field of literary theory, a poststructuralist perspective provides a space for texts from "everyday life" (p. 112) to enter into the classroom in order to legitimately be positioned as forms of social knowledge. From this perspective, it can be argued that the various forms of

electronic media from everyday life are central to negotiating notions of power, identity, knowledge and our sense of otherness. If aesthetic expression, citizenship, communication, personal development, problem solving and technological competence are indeed essential graduation learnings as stated in the Foundation document, then engagement with youth culture and the youth cultural acts as manifested in everyday literacy practices should be embraced for their inherently pedagogical nature. Everyday literacies not only embrace the conversational features of youth culture, they represent aesthetic expression, technological competence and communication. As such, these practices are constitutive in subject/identity as well as in the creation of knowledge production (Buckingham, 2003; Dolby, 2003; Giroux, 1998; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006), which could be argued provides insight into the graduation objectives of personal development and citizenship as well.

These popular texts, and the aesthetic expression inherent in their everyday literacy practices, particularly in their collectiveness, might often be dismissed as trivial, low cultured and unimportant (Dolby, 2003; Giroux, 1999; Luke, 2002; Pirie, 1993). However, upon closer examination, they may provide a site for personal development where youth are able to define membership and group identity. Claiming tastes and preferences for modes of cultural production like make up, clothes, gestures and hairstyles are entrenched and imbedded into institutional and discursive practices. By staking one's preferences, youth attempt to become located within the larger social order (Pomerantz, 2006). From this perspective, popular culture's constitutive effects can be profound for those who are struggling to create agency and establish a coherent self-identity (Currie & Kelly, 2006; Dolby, 2003).

As suggested, acknowledging and integrating the constitutive role that popular culture plays in the creation of identity, an everyday literacy practice is recognized as a valid form of meaning making and knowledge formation. By placing visual representation into the realm traditionally reserved for written expression, an everyday literacy practice might also be regarded as a form of autobiographical writing. As such, a bridge between intent and practice within the Foundation document might be created in an effort to satisfy the curriculum mandate to embrace new and socially relevant forms of communication.

Writing, One Click at a Time

Before exploring the proposed literacy practice, which may create the metaphorical bridge between intent and practice, it is important to step back and theoretically situate the practice of avatar creation being suggested here. Traditionally an avatar is understood to be a three dimensional representation of an individual for use in a virtual online space. However, the form of avatar creation discussed here is set apart from previous contexts in gaming applications (Cooper, 2007; Turkle, 2005, 1995), and uses in second life (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006, 2003; Thomas, 2007, 2004). Instead, it is situated as a new literacy practice. These avatars are intended to be purposeful visual representations of self, which could be used in computer-mediated communication, social networking and online communication practices. In simple terms, if autobiography can be understood as a constructed representation of self, and if multimodal literacy practices include multiple forms of representation, then the practice of creating virtual identity with the representative image of an avatar can be understood as a form of autobiography, a poststructuralist visual writing of the self (Kelly, 1997; Graham, 1991).

As youths create social relationships in and through popular cultural texts, they lay claim to individual agency constituting what Dolby (2003) calls a "vital political space" (p. 273). As an act of claiming this political space, creating an autobiographical avatar unearths the non-transparent constructedness of this particular form of everyday literacy. By examining an element of popular cultural practice, educators might view these avatars as culturally situated discursive practices that allow students and educators to pose a number of salient questions: Who do youth think they are? Who they would like others to think they are? How and why do youth write and represent themselves the way they do within their turbulent and unpredictable culture? Who do they believe counts as socially and politically relevant? How and why do youth create virtual identities in the way they do? What is missing in these representations, or more plainly, what can be read into the silences of what they leave out (Kumashiro, 2001; Tierney & Dilley, 1992)? Other questions may be, what might be possible if students were encouraged to engage in an exercise of autobiographical writing/representing in an attempt to trouble the social construction of self within a quest

for different perspectives? Could autobiography, especially in its visual manifestation, provide a means to understand the constructed nature of the sources, structures, and frames of reference that shape our students' understanding of them and others? Does creating an autobiographical avatar become an act of political resistance (Fiske, 2002, 1989; McRobbie; 2005), or social conformity (Livingstone, 2002; Walkerdine, 1997)?

In turn, the everyday literacy of avatar construction may contribute to a body of knowledge that informs the process of technological competences, communication, personal development, and aesthetic expression, as mandated in the Foundation document, through autobiographical avatar design. More directly, allowing a visual, self-reflexive production of an autobiographical avatar into the English language arts classroom might contribute to questions surrounding the construction, or representation of self as "language connects bodies to selves, even in cyberspace" (Kolko, 1999, p. 178). Following Kress (2003), such a pedagogical practice might also ask what can the image do that writing cannot? And conversely, "what is it that writing can do that the image cannot?" (p. 12). Of concern to educators is how established pedagogical and discursive practices underwrite writing or constructing an autobiographical avatar. It might also open consideration of how individuals learn to "objectify and reinvent themselves in products and the lifestyles they promise" (Luke, 1997, p. 42). And, in what way is agency enacted or shut down by the limitless or limiting possibilities available in avatar design of the self (Currie & Kelly, 2006; Kolko, 1999)?

Rather than being interested in merely what the avatars look like, educators might focus their attention on the poststructural willingness to "interrogate the will to truth" (Kelly, 1997, p. 53) that undercuts these representations. In the discussion that follows, select autobiographical lenses provide a view of the practice of constructing avatars to allow for an appropriation of meaning. The negotiation of power and privilege intersect with individual and group identity in a manner that is conceptually the intended point, rather than a missed opportunity, of the Foundation document.

Making Avatars in English Class

When combining literacy practices with the social construction of identity, Martusewicz's (1997) theory of "curriculum as translation" is helpful to provide a frame for autobiographical writing as a pedagogical practice. By evoking Derrida's (1985) notion of performativity to facilitate an understanding of autobiography as a tool, Martusewicz considers the partial representation of one's life as a movement through language. What Martusewicz's theory offers yields from the poststructuralist assumption that texts in translation are inevitably incomplete. The translation between lived experience and representation will always involve differences, perhaps in the form of omissions or embellishments. In this regard, autobiography serves as the vehicle that allows movement over the border of one language to another. By considering ways in which the virtual identities of youth might correspond to or contradict with the established discourses within social science fields, the chasm between the intent and purpose of the foundation might be lessened. By asking the following questions: Within a culture of ever changing representation and identity renegotiation, how does subjectivity get negotiated? What are the pedagogical implications when youth are asked to slow down and visually represent who they think they are? Or what do students think their visual representations will mean to others? What happens when youth identity is constituted within the limits and possibilities of their everyday literacy practices?

Returning briefly to this paper's vision of autobiography, the seminal of work Graham's (1991) is used in that the exploration of identity is also tied to notions of self-consciousness and its social construction, and with Kelly (1997) who demonstrates that the poststructural can examine the constructed relationship between the social and the self. Graham explains that within education and curriculum theory, autobiography is linked with neo-pragmatist or constructivist epistemologies, as well as neo-Romantic projects. This allows youth to reclaim their own voice in a form of story telling which they are already fluent. If the Foundation document is to stay true to its claim to strive for goals of communication, personal development and citizenship, then reclaiming voice should be an obvious pursuit. Within models of progressive literacy and personal growth, the self-revealing stories of autobiography permit authors a privileged authority over their texts. However Kelly (1997) argues that notions of an authentic self, which have informed scholarship in autobiography as a pedagogical method, offer a mere transparent window to

the authentic self. From a poststructuralist perspective, she reminds us that along with the emerging prevalence of autobiography in education, there has been a "more radical practice, which questions the discursive production of memory, history, representation, desire and knowledge" (p. 48). Autobiographical writing cannot ever be complete. Kelly reminds us of the poststructuralist caveat that by telling one story we silence others. When the understanding of the self as whole and true is disrupted (Lacan, 2000), and students are asked to confront the notion that the self is at least partially fictional and mythical, then understanding what we count as knowledge, even self-knowledge, helps students to gain critical perspective on themselves and on others within a broader notion of citizenship. Deciding what counts as experience can also be a challenge, as Scott (1991) reminds us that experience is not the origin of our explanations, nor it is authoritative evidence for what is known; rather it is what we seek to explain. As a form of cultural production, autobiography is necessarily selective in its inclusions and its omissions. What remains salient, from a poststructural perspective, is "to interrogate the will to truth that informs these stories" (Kelly, 1997, p. 53) and to acknowledge that they are not only true but that they are created and shaped as truths. To that end, as important as it is to re-present and re-write our stories in order to understand how they might inform a greater community, it is equally important to understand how we go about this re-writing and how we come to invent ourselves the way we do. It is here that a bridge might be built between the intent and practice of the Foundation document. If experience can be equated with constructed subjectivity, then educators must not be afraid to ask how some experiences are more salient than others. Students must be allowed to question how their modes of seeing have been shaped by the dominant culture (Kincheloe, 2005). Scott (1991) tells us "experience is at once always already an interpretation and something that needs to be interpreted. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, and always therefore political" (p. 797).

Also premised on the understanding that the manner in which we represent ourselves (through words, dress, gesture, or speech) is constructed in relation to influences from, but not limited to, family, peers, institutional practices, or media; the inclusion of avatar design in English class proposes to venture into an exploration of an everyday literacy that requires a critical examination of writing not unlike the clarity sought when students engage in "mystory" writing (Sabik, Davin & While, 2007). Mystory writing draws from Ulmer (1994) and is designed to explore not that which is already known, entrenched and colonized by modernist literacy practices, even though this seems to be the prevailing type of writing in schools today. Rather mystory writing plunges students into the realm of theoretical curiosity. Ulmer states, it "alters the means of textual production (what it means to write), the means of consumption (what it means to read), and the means of inquiry (what it means to know)" (p. 568). By resting comfortably in the folds of postmodern theory, mystory writing includes fragments of personal experience and engagement with popular culture and scholarly discourse. It is through this combination that the writer may participate and explore more fully in the process of meaning making and knowledge formation. It also requires that the writer stay "present in body, mind and spirit" (p. 568). What mystory writing offers to this inquiry is a genre of writing (and reading) that "cuts across forms of media, that sharpens our critical eye, that provides a way for us to simultaneously enact, critique and reflect" (p. 574).

Conclusion

As known from discourses in cultural studies (Hall, 1999) power and privilege play an important role in the construction of knowledge. Ignoring the kind of critical reflection made possible in autobiographical writing (in many of its constructed manifestations) represents a missed opportunity for those involved. Failing to specifically address the significant commercial and political influence that popular culture has on the social construction of identity and belonging represents a missed social, cultural and pedagogical opportunity for students and educators. The regulating of meanings and values have become so normalized that if we do not make a conscious effort to critically examine what gets taken for granted as truth and knowledge, then we miss their influence entirely. Questions regarding the purpose of school and how curricula is conceptualized and organized, what counts as literacy, and how educators approach the pedagogical act of knowledge production lead to more specific questions regarding the legitimacy of everyday literacy practices.

Reading, sharing and creating texts from everyday literacy practices, especially in their popular and alternative forms must be recognized for having the ability to provide a vehicle for knowledge formation and meaning making. This kind of exploration of the intersection between youth and popular culture in a deeply personal way asks youth to represent their personal autobiographical stories in a manner that makes sense in their visually dominated world. Kelly (1997) has shown that working with students and autobiography has revealed their deep personal connections with texts from popular culture as it bears on their individual and collective identity. When students are not treated as active agents in their own cultural production then educators have missed the intent behind developing reflective, articulate and literate individuals. If we fail to attend to the complex conceptual landscape of what literacy is, then we also miss the opportunity to attend to notions of aesthetic expression, citizenship, communication, and personal development within our mandated curriculum. However, drawing on a cultural studies framework, avatar creation is positioned as a legitimate form of social knowledge that combines the academic rigor of autobiography with a venue for youth to read and represent themselves. Embracing this everyday literacy practice might provide an opportunity for educators, at least in part, to fulfill the stated goals of their curriculum.

References

Alvermann, D. E., Moon, J. S., & Hagood, M. C. (1999). *Popular culture in the classroom*. Chicago: International Reading Association.

Ball, S., Kenny, A., & Gardiner, D. (1990). Literacy, politics and the teaching of English. In I. Goodson & P. Medway, (Eds.). *Bringing English to order* (pp. 47-86). London: Falmer Press.

Bloustien, G. (2003). *Girl making: A cross-cultural ethnography on the process of growing up female*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media education, literacy, learning and contemporary culture.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (2008). Central issues in new literacies. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear & D. J. Leu, (Eds.). *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 1-21). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cooper, R. (2007). *Alter ego: Avatars and their creators*. London: Chris Boot Publishing.

Currie, D. H., & Kelly, D. M. (2006). "I'm going to crush you like a bug." Understanding girls' agency and empowerment. In Y. Jiwani, C. Steenbergen & C. Mitchell, (Eds.). *Girlhood, redefining the limits* (pp. 155-172). Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Derrida, J. (1985). *The ear of the other: Otobiography, transference, translation: Texts and discussions with Jacques Derrida* (P. Kamuf, Trans., C. V. McDonald, English Ed.). New York: Schocken Books.

Dolby, N. (2003). Popular culture and democratic practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(3), 258-284.

Fiske, J. (1992). Cultural studies and the culture of everyday life. In L.Grossberg, , C. Nelson, & P. Treichler, (Eds.). *Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1989). *Understanding popular culture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Foucault, M. (1972). Discursive formations in, *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved, Dec. 14, 2005 from http://foucault.info/documents/archaeologyOfKnowledge/foucault.archaeologyOfKnowledge.ch-o2.html

Foundation for the Atlantic Canada English language Arts Curriculum. (1996). Halifax: Department of Education and Culture, Government of Nova Scotia.

Gee, J. P. (2003). *What videogames have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Gee, J.P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies*. London: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H., Shumway, D., Smith, P., & Sosnoski, J. (2000). The need for cultural studies: Resisting intellectuals and oppositional public spheres. Retrieved Oct 1, 2005. http://theory.eserver.org/need.html

Giroux, H. (1999). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Giroux, H. A. (1998). *Channel surfing: Racism, the media, and the deconstruction of today's youth.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Giroux, H. (1994). Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture. New York: Routledge. Graham, R. J. (1991). *Reading and writing the self: Autobiography in education curriculum.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hall, S. (1999). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. (pp. 97-109). In S. During (Ed.). *The cultural studies reader* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Jones-Kavalier, B., & Flannigan, S. L. (2006). Connecting the digital dots: Literacy of the 21st century. *Educause Quarterly*, 29(2), 8-10.

Kelly, U. (1997). *Schooling desire: Literacy, cultural politics and pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). *Critical constructivism: A primer* New York: Peter Lang.

Kolko, B. E. (1999). Representing bodies in virtual space: The rhetoric of avatar design. *The Information Society, 15*, 177-186.

Knobel, M. (1999). *Everyday literacies: Students. Discourses. And social practices*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2001). 'Posts' perspectives on anti-oppressive education in social studies, English, mathematics and science classrooms. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3) 3-12.

Lacan, J. (2000). *The mirror stage*. In P. DuGay, J. Evans & P. Redman (Eds.). *Identity: A reader* (pp. 44-50). London: Sage Publications.
Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2006). *New Literacies, everyday practices & classroom learning, 2nd Edition.* New York: McGraw Hill.
Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies, changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
Livingstone, S. (2002). *Young people and new media.* London: Sage.
Luke, C. (2002). Re-crafting media and ICT literacies (pp. 132-146). In D. A. Alvermann (Ed.) *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world*. New York: Peter Lang.
Martusewicz, R. A. (1997, Fall). Leaving home: Curriculum as translation. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 13*(3) 13-17.
McRobbie, A. (2005). *The uses of cultural studies*. Sage: London.
Morgan, R. (2000). Uncertain relations: English and cultural studies, In B. R. C. Barrell & R. F. Hammett (Eds.), *Advocating change.* Toronto: Irwin Publishing.
Morgan, R. (1998). Provocations for a media education in small letters. In D. Buckingham (Ed.) *Teaching popular culture*. London: UCL Press.
Peim, N. (1993). *Critical theory and the English teacher*. London: Routledge.
Peters, M. A. & Burbules, N. C. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Lanham: Rownam & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
Pirie, B. (1993). *Reshaping high school English*. Urbana: NCTE.
Pomerantz, S. (2006). "Did you see what she was wearing?" The power and politics of schoolgirl style (pp. 173-190). In Y. Jiwani, C. Steenbergen & C. Mitchell, (Eds.). *Girlhood, redefining the limits*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
Pungente, J. (2004). The Canadian experience: Leading the way. *Jesuit Communication Project.*
Sabik, C. M., Davin, B. & White, C. J. (2007). "Diving into the wreck" Mystory writing to enact critical media literacy. In D. Macedo & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Media literacy: A reader* (pp. 567-575). New York: Peter Lang.
Scott, J. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry, 17*(4), 773–797.
Tierney, W. G. & Dilley, P. (1992). Constructing knowledge: Educational research and gay and lesbian studies. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.). *Queer theory in education*. Mahwah; NJ: Lawrence Erlbaun.
Thoman, E. & Jolls, T. (2004). Media literacy – A national priority for a changing world. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *48*(1), 18-29.
Thomas, A. (2007). *Youth online: Identity and literacy in the digital age*. New York: Peter Lang.
Thomas, A. (2004). Digital literacies and the cybergirl. *E-learning, 1*(3), 358-382. Torres, Turkle, S.
(2005). *The second self: Computers and the human spirit*. (20th anniversary edition). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
Torres, M. N., & Mercado, M. D. (2007). The need for critical media literacy in teacher education core curricula. In D. Macedo & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Media literacy: A reader* (pp. 537-558). New York: Peter Lang.
Tyner, K. (1998). *Literacy in a digital world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Ulmer, G. (1994). *Heuretics: The logic of invention*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
Walkerdine, V. (1997). *Daddy's girl: Young girls and popular culture*. London: Macmillan.
Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at Empire's End*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.