

# Journal Prompt 1

---

1. Identify a “Big D” Discourse you are a part of, then identify what you use to pull off said identity.

I am part of the SuperUser Discourse. (SuperUser (normally shortened to su) is in reference to computers, their hardware and their software). As such, some of the tools and interactions I use have include:

- building my own computer
- frequenting tech YouTube channels, to keep myself up to date with knowledge on new hardware, software, etc.
- using Linux as a main operating system
- concerned with privacy
- monitoring my installed programs with reference to privacy
- communicating with others about computer parts, terminology, etc.
- just because its good, doesn't mean we can't play with it, but it doesn't mean we should play with the same exact one that works, in case it breaks
- improvement, but without sacrifice

---

# Journal Prompt 2

---

1. With an eye toward your upcoming Critical Synthesis essay, I thought it would be useful to provide a space for you to identify some connections (or points of contention) between Gee's ideas and the claims offered by Gloria Anzaldua or Vershawn Ashanti-Young. How do you See these texts as being connected? What similar issues are motivating these authors? How might you put them into dialogue with each other? How might your own experience allow you to amplify or complicate the main ideas explored by these writers?

There's a lot of conflict between the two ideas. Ashanti-Young has an excellent way of showing how important translating between Discourses and more importantly, communication between Discourses is. Meanwhile, Gee's entire stance stands on the fact that Discourses only interact within an individual, and any attempt to converse between the two leads to miscommunication, or individuals becoming jack-of-all-trade, master of none. They both do discuss the fact that differing groups exist, and that their languages, dialects, and discourses are fundamentally different, but their responses are ultimately drastically different.

My experience could weigh on either side. On the one hand, I've had horrid experiences of attempting to translate between Discourses, to the point of where I've left a Discourse over the extreme miscommunication. But I've also been a keystone and go-to translator between Discourses, and its gone extremely well.

---

# Journal Prompt 3

---

1. What is your past experience with the peer review process? When and where did you engage in this activity? For what purpose? Did you think it was a helpful and productive exercise? If so, how? If not, why? How do you think it could be improved? If you haven't

had the chance to participate in a peer review workshop, what do you think you would want to get out of the experience? What sort of feedback would you like to receive?

My past experiences with the peer review process have been formulaic, as with the rest of my English classes as a whole. It was in high school, with the attempt to better a paper after a first draft. It was “productive”, because it made the essay... better(?), but it wasn’t helpful from a form standpoint. To me personally, it was less a discussion on individual work, and appeared to be more of a chance to flaunt that “Yes, I am an educated individual, and you can’t provide any helpful feedback, because my writing is so glorious as it is”.

## Journal Prompt 4

---

1. We spend this week talking about and finding examples of two rhetorical strategies that Joseph Harris believes academic writers employ: forwarding and countering. For this entry, I'd like you to think about your Critical Synthesis essay through the lens of these particular writerly “moves”. That is, how might you forward or counter the ideas/claims/perspectives/positions of Gee, Anzaldua, or Ashanti-Young? Try to be specific.

I plan to explore how language works, and the discussion on universal languages. Gee has some rather conservative thoughts on the subject, while Anzaldua and Ashanti-Young have some more progressive thoughts. Gee seems to be saying that its necessary, to avoid conversing between Discourses. Meanwhile, Anzaldua and Ashanti-Young seem to hold the opinion that that inherently starts discrimination, and is dangerous at best.

## Journal Prompt 5

---

1. We’ve devoted the better part of two weeks to engaging with several sources. What are the fundamental concerns of writing studies scholars? What are some overarching themes you found across sources? How might we begin to characterize or categorize the articles? Has this experience led you to your own subject of inquiry and research? If so, how? If not, why not? What are you interested in researching for your inquiry-project? Remember that it needs to be connected to language, literacy, identity, culture, education, knowledge, power, etc.

Writing studies scholars seem to be discussing big picture problems that are easy to see, but hard to solve, and even harder to implement. All of the sources seem to see some major problem in society, with most of the ones we talked about in our group pointing out problems with the education system. We could categorize the articles by their subject matter; education, discrimination, race. This experience hasn’t really given me any subjects I’m interested in researching, as what I learned about from reading the document, while interesting, didn’t provide any further questions to ask. I’d be interested in doing something about transgender identity, and how it connects to one’s past life, or possibly future careers, although this may be difficult.