1

Introduction

Tara Lockhart, Brenda Glascott, Chris Warnick, and Juli Parrish

The certainty that Americans occupy a shared reality has been deeply shaken since the 2016 presidential election revealed the vulnerability of readers and viewers to mis- and dis-information sponsored by an adversarial power. The weaponization of the epitaph "fake news" by President Trump to further confuse Americans about what, if any, authorities might be trusted and which facts and narratives are reliable, exploits the splintered "imaginary communit[ies]" that constitute a seemingly ever dividing United States (Anderson). Considering the witches' brew of malignant actors, deterministic algorithms, and a hermetically sealed mediascape that is designed to impede readers' critical understanding, it is tempting to describe the state of information literacy as in crisis. A frequently cited 2016 study by the Stanford History Education Group reports that a majority of students struggled to evaluate online content ranging from sponsored posts on news sites to tweets recirculating polling data gathered by advocacy groups. Contributing to this sense of an information literacy crisis, the study's authors write, "Overall, young people's ability to reason about the information on the Internet can be summed up in one word: bleak" (4). *Misinformation* was Dictionary.com's word of the year in 2018 (Strauss), and a 2019 Pew Research Center survey finds that "more Americans view made-up news as a very big problem for the country than identify terrorism, illegal immigration, racism, and sexism that way" (Mitchell et al 3). Deepfakes, altered videos that wrongfully depict public figures saying words or doing actions that did not happen, are a threat during the 2020 election cycle and beyond. The slow and haphazard response to the COVID-19 global pandemic within the US and the anxiety surrounding state reopenings have been fueled by mis- and disinformation about the causes of the pandemic (e.g., the Wuhan lab and 5G conspiracy theories), potential treatments (e.g., President Trump's touting of hydroxychloroquine as a preventative drug despite a lack of clinical evidence), and possible vaccines (e.g., the Bill Gates microchip conspiracy theory).

Researchers in writing studies have offered varying pedagogical solutions to this perceived crisis in information literacy. John Duffy suggests literacy educators recommit to teaching rhetorical ethics, creating "scenarios, real or fictional, in which individuals or groups are confronted with injustices, and to which students would respond in discussion and in writing. Together, students and teacher would consider all the available means of a virtuous response" (124). Expanding on her earlier research on reading, Ellen Carillo argues for improving reading instruction by teaching stu-

dents metacognitive reading practices, such as keeping a reading journal and annotating texts in a manner similar to journalists (45-46). "Current teachers," she writes, "might use students' personal experiences and backgrounds—as they have been doing for years—as a means to get them thinking in more critical ways about the texts they encounter" (17). Bruce McComiskey contends that statements such as the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing and the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition point a way forward. The Framework outlines eight habits of mind that are, in the words of the statement, "critical for college success": curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence, responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition (Framework). "Simply teaching writing as an exercise in developing the habits of mind described in the Framework," McComiskey argues, "will help to check and counter some of the effects of post-truth rhetoric on future audiences" (38-39).

Each of these proposals shares an assumption that the solutions are already in front of us and that teachers need to recommit to, or teach in a more explicit manner, values and practices already well established within literacy education. As McComiskey puts it, "The fact is, rhetoric and composition have had the tools to combat post-truth rhetoric for years, and we, as a community of scholars and teachers, need to double-down on those tools" (38). This argument that teachers do more of what we do already is appealing, in part, because it suggests we can teach students to resist misinformation without significantly altering our pedagogies; it furthermore positions literacy educators as uniquely qualified to prepare students for 21st-century citizenship.

However, a central argument made in this collection is that recommitting to traditional information literacy and rhetorical pedagogies is by itself an inadequate response to the problems posed by "post-truth rhetoric" because such an approach fails to account for the structures that sustain the creation, distribution, and reception of mis- and disinformation. Some of these structures were explored by contributors to a 2017 special issue of *Literacy in Composition Studies* we edited on Literacy, Democracy, and Fake News: for example, the digital tools that enabled Macedonian teenagers to monetize fake news stories (Craig); algorithms, bots, and other automated writing systems that increase the circulation of disinformation (Laquintano and Vee); the political and media networks that sponsor hard-right discourse against global higher education (Minnix); and, the affective dimensions of trolling rhetoric (Riche). What emerged from these contributions was an emphasis on "network literacy"—whether technological, social, or personal—and the need to understand the infrastructure, platforms, ecologies, and relationships that determine how information and knowledge is made and experienced. *Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age of Misinformation and Disinformation* expands on the work begun in the *LiCS* special issue by presenting a range of perspectives—from literacy professionals in higher education, K-12, journalism, information technology, and other fields—for addressing mis- and disinformation in and beyond the classroom in ways that also interrogate their underlying networks and structures.

The essays and interviews collected here further show how this networked understanding of mis- and disinformation calls for both a renewed commitment to and expanded definitions of critical reading. One of the surprises in this collection is the urgency with which the authors here insist that any classroom response to the era of fake news and disinformation center on the almost clichéd

learning objective undergirding the humanities: critical thinking/analysis/literacy. While *critical thinking* is one of those terms, like *excellence* or *innovation*, that often functions as an empty signifier of virtue in academic discourse, the authors in this collection make a compelling case for reinvigorating the concept by rooting their explorations of critical ways of knowing in robust descriptions of pedagogical approaches to the problems of truth and credibility. The critical ways of knowing described in this collection prompt students to imagine a writer/creator behind the text they encounter. This becomes particularly crucial in digital textual environments in which the journey between the composition of a text and the encounter of it by a reader is obscured by algorithms. As Drew Virtue reminds us in his contribution to this volume, "[t]he way the internet works can make it difficult to discern who is communicating what messages, as well as the motivations behind those messages"; this was less the case when television was a primary tool in the dissemination of discourse about McCarthyism, an analogy that Virtue establishes in this chapter ("Historical Literacies: McCarthyism, Edward R. Murrow, and the Television"). In many ways, the pedagogies here push students to re-animate the hidden author and to describe the intention of that entity as evidenced through the text.

The versions of critical reading we see in the chapters of this collection go further than other models of rhetorical reading by forefronting the need for students to approach texts warily, aware that the writers they are encountering can be motivated to confuse, obscure, and trick, and that elements of a digital ecology—including algorithms, bots, trolls, and applications—might direct or boost information based on economic or political motivations. Of course, anxiety about manipulation is as old as rhetorical studies, but contemporary pedagogical approaches to teaching reading and writing frequently presume good faith on behalf of the reader and writer. As the authors in this collection make clear, teachers must help students recognize that a critical reader does not take for granted that the writers they encounter are seeking a fair exchange of ideas, that an idealized version of a public sphere built on earnest communication for greater understanding and knowledge does not—and indeed has not ever—existed. As Genevieve García de Müeller and Randall W. Monty warn in this collection, "Fake news can be understood as bullshit because the speaker (or other source with an assumed voice) is interested in influencing the reader but not interested in providing any actual new or accurate information. In other words, the deception is both the means and the ends" ("'Don't Give Me Bullshit': Constructing a Framework of Response to Fake News").

Contributors demonstrate that in addition to asking who the writer is and what their motives are, we must ask: Is the writer intentionally trying to manipulate me? Melissa R. Sande and Christine M. Battista's chapter suggests that all too often, responses to digitally circulated texts are passive and that students must learn to take a heightened skeptical approach," building on Freierean critical consciousness, in which one must "carefully evaluate and thoughtfully interrogate truth-based claims" ("Developing Critical Consciousness: Literary Theory, Process Pedagogy, and Information Literacy"). And Angela Laflen offers a pedagogy that prompts students to recognize that quantitative visuals "are the result of careful crafting" by people who "have chosen to use data in ethical or unethical ways in the interest of persuading an audience." Laflen argues that teaching students to question quantitative information is a key element in information literacy ("Quantitative Literacy in the Composition Classroom: Using Infographics Assignments to Teach Ethical and Effective Data Use").

The skepticism of these approaches is rooted in a process dependent on sustained information literacy praxis, a foundation shared by many of our contributors. Practicing journalists and community literacy workers interviewed for the collection highlight the affective trade-offs in occupying solely a position of suspicion, while simultaneously prompting us to attend more carefully to our own emotional and affective responses to information as critical, generative tools (see, for examples, the interviews with Joanna Geary and Jennifer Hofmann).

A central contention of the collection is that our literacy practices must adapt to take into account the material realities, challenges, and affordances of the technologies shaping information production, distribution, and reception, what John Trimbur calls "the total system of production" (213). To equip readers to identify and respond to this kind of intentional deception, Eric Leake's version of civic literacy produces "critical citizens" trained to ask about and identify the human-created systems of production and circulation that land certain kinds of texts in their social media feeds. Like the other authors here, Leake wants readers to turn their attention to the intentionality that led to the creation of the text they are encountering, focusing "not on what the story is but how it is and why and for whom it is; focusing not on what the story is about but how it is about" ("The Multiple Live of News Stories: Civic Literacies and Rhetorical Transformations").

Without critically investigating the mechanisms by which information is shaped, manipulated, and selectively shared or amplified, any critical reading and understanding will be inevitably decontextualized and thus potentially inaccurate. As Nicole Allensworth frames the issue in one of two short praxis essays, "we have left a print-based culture and its editorial assurances far behind, for a publishing model that employs algorithms, not editors. In this model, content is driven by clicks and data-mining opportunities, not journalistic / humanist values like truth, independence, fairness, and accountability" ("Keeping Truth Alive: Literacy, Libraries, and Strategies in an Age of Misinformation"). Since information bombards us through a range of devices, modalities, and settings, we can no longer trust that others have done the hard work of verifying what we are seeing, just as we can no longer trust that the words we see are shared with an intent to inform. We must look deeper.

A corollary question must thus be posed that focuses beyond author motives to technology itself: How does the technology that mediates my encounter with this text obscure or reveal the intentions behind the text? Sande and Battista suggest more generally that "Teaching students to become aware of these unseen and often 'unrecognized' discursive power relations . . . is the key to developing a sense of critical consciousness in young minds." Joshua Daniel-Wariya, Tyler S. Branson, and James Chase Sanchez specifically address the role software plays in disseminating fake news, arguing that "fake news is generated, manipulated, distributed, accessed, and analyzed using particular software applications with materials histoires that are significant to when, where, and how stores are received" ("Making Software Visible in Rhetorical Approaches to Fake News"). Attending to these applications, as well as to the way that software participates in creating illusions of credibility, demands a critical software literacy, which the authors define as "a skeptical and reflective questioning of how software filters the information users consume." With perspectives from fields adjacent to composition, both Michael Calore (*Wired)* and Joanna Geary (Twitter) echo the need to understand and use machine intelligence within journalistic settings and social media environments, particularly since software

makes most of our feeds "work." However, both ultimately argue that while software is necessary in sharing information in our networked, up-to-the-minute environments and useful in helping humans make a first pass at screening information for accuracy, humans have a crucial role to play in verifying information and creating meaningful narratives out of infobytes. Insight into journalistic literacy practices based in newsgathering in online environments, information verification, and digital forensics can inform literacy workers into the critical mindsets needed to understand and productively interact with digital information ecosystems. Librarians can be further allies in this work; Allensworth shares a bevy of resources useful for problematizing search engine biases, the logical fallacies inherent in confirmation bias and selective attention behaviors so often fueled by technological overwhelm. And our colleagues designing or delivering curricula in K-12 settings, represented here by a praxis essay by Shannon M. Pella and interviews with Martee Schmitt-Lopez and Leyla Akincilar, can help us better understand and build on the literacy practices happening in K-12 classrooms.

Specifically, combining critical ways of investigating the intentionality behind a text with attention to the software literices that shape information sharing helps students, teachers, and society members nurture the deliberative, reflective practices and pedagogies needed in our current moment. To this end, Thomas Girshin and Tyrell Stewart-Harris offer a pedagogy that contextualizes Trump's racist discourse in the ever-prevalent and frequently hidden racist and racialized discourse of truth that pre-dates the founding of the republic ("Trump's University: Argument and Pedagogy in the 'Post-Fact' Era"). Shereen Inayatulla and Michael T. MacDonald unpack the colonizing logics invoked in citizenship discourses—and in the related "ways in which the documents we require, demand, circulate, and value in composition may be subject to colonizer logics of time and 'order.'" Like the other authors in this collection, Inayatulla and MacDonald point to critical literacy as a way of responding to hidden ideologies "when we talk with students about the texts circulating in their lives" ("Sans Papiers: Humanizing Documentation"). Like Drew Virtue, both Daniel-Wariya, Branson, and Sanchez's chapter and Inayatulla and MacDonald's chapter remind us that the mis- and disinformation that documents and authors perpetuate are current but not new; in Virtue's words, "the use of fake news, misinformation, or political propaganda is not new in itself but only in how people distribute it using new technologies."

The turn to a contemporary critical literacy evident in this collection is necessarily accompanied by a renewed focus on student writing and student experiences. Laflen shares significant student work as she walks us through how her students work to understand quantitative visuals ranging from erroneous to misleading to unethical. By analyzing her students' revisions of misleading infographics as well as students' own infographics, Laflen provides a model for how students and instructor can partner in taking up the challenges inherent in understanding and presenting data and evidence ethically. García de Müeller and Monty also focus on their students' work, discussing the ways that students in a lower-division composition course developed frameworks for evaluating credibility as a product not just of a writer but of a text's embeddedness in networks; and the ways that students in an upper-division discourse analysis course created working definitions of newsworthiness that they used to identify and assess fake news.

Students' efforts to develop critical literacy are always mediated by the power relations and em-

bodied practices of the classroom. Lava Asaad's contribution to this collection considers the teacher's positionality, exploring what it means to be an Othered instructor in a resisting, "predominately white" class where "[a] teacher's racial identity collides with every socio-political aspect that they encounter before entering the classroom." Assad draws a parallel between these (in)visible socio-political aspects and the invisible decisions and intentions that underwrite texts circulated in digital networks ("'I Am a Refugee and I Am Okay': Instructor Identity in Resisting Classrooms"). John Sellers, in his interview, discusses resistance on a larger cultural and political scale, focusing in depth on activist strategies for winning the story through techniques like meme warfare. Ultimately, the attention contributors pay not only to hallmark concepts such as critical thinking, but to the larger structures, relationships, and technologies that aid in the creation and circulation of mis- and disinformation, constitutes the primary argument of this collection.

The Collection's Organization as Network

This collection brings together voices from diverse locations within—and outside of—the academy. By inviting literacy colleagues from sites including K-12 education, social media, activist organizations, and journalism to participate in this collection through interviews and short praxis essays, we hope to create the kind of recursive, textured conversation needed for contemporary critical literacy. The mix of genres, professions, and contexts represented in this collection creates a polyphonous interrogation of mis- and dis-information and creates opportunities for different kinds of literacy workers to hear and learn from each other—a networked approach that echoes the patterns of information ecologies themselves. Through discussing how literacy professionals in other spheres understand the affordances and challenges of networked literacy, software algorithms, and the technological advances and practices that shape our world and sense of truth, we enhance our understanding of the information literacies required in today's world and classrooms.

For example, in their interviews, Michael Calore (Senior Editor at *Wired*) and Joanna Geary (Director of Curation at Twitter) discuss credibility, authority, circulation, and bias in terms of larger media ecosystems, where misinformation can inform everything from individual tweets and product reviews to larger systems involving deep fakes and meme warfare. Interviews with public activists, such as John Sellers, President of the Ruckus Society and Director and co-founder of the Other98%—an online activist, anti-corporate, justice-oriented collective—and Jennifer Hofmann, professional writer and creator of the *Americans of Conscience Checklist*—a researched list of actions supporting democracy and social justice that reaches more than 75,000 people every week—reveal how these activists think about literacy and rhetorical strategies that confront mis- and disinformation in our culture. Martee Lopez-Schmitt and Leyla Akincilar each speak to education's confrontation of misinformation in K-12 contexts, including both specialized curricula (IB and ERWC programs) and EdTech, widening our understanding of how, when, and where our students are taught to engage and counter mis- and disinformation. In praxis essays, Shannon M. Pella shares curricular design expertise as she explores a specific curriculum she built for 12th graders on fake news, while Nicole Allensworth considers pedagogies that address misinformation from an adjunct librarian's

standpoint, pointing readers to an arsenal of resources and highlighting the crucial instruction and partnerships that can happen beyond the walls of composition classrooms.

As readers explore the various perspectives and strategies offered to understand and combat disinformation, we hope they will notice the convergences and divergences that the collection's network of ideas afford. For example, many of the essays and interviews point explicitly to how "software invisibly structure[s]" our lives and work (Daniel-Wariya, Branson, and Sanchez) and to the accelerated speed of information circulation that demands different literacy tactics (Sellers). Such realities demand more generally that we actively integrate information and critical literacies and more specifically that we more closely inspect our relationships with software and "fake news." As Sande and Battista write, "One could make the claim that our current media literacy crisis stems from a passified relationship to information in general." Similarly, Daniel-Wariya, Branson, and Sanchez claim that user interfaces are designed with the goal of obscuring how software works; for Laflen, part of why infographics are effective at disseminating fake news is because users don't fully understand how they work. How we theorize today's information ecosystem as either continuous or discontinuous with the past (or perhaps a mixture of both), will in turn necessarily shape our response. García de Müeller and Monty, along with Daniel-Wariya, Branson, and Sanchez, argue that there is something unique about fake news in our moment, based especially on circulation factors. On the other hand, Virtue argues that the role that broadcast news played in spreading the specter of McCarthyism in the 1950s provides "historical context that helps articulate why the issue and consequences of fake news are so very important," and Girshin and Stewart-Harris posit that today's dissemination of information is better understood as an acceleration, not a break, with the past; and that students need to understand that a version of mis- and disinformation—"systemic post-factualization"—has "existed since the birth of the nation."

Many of the essays propose that in response to the accelerated circulation and increased polarization of our current moment, educators must find ways to reanimate the connections between— and students' investment in—information literacy, critical literacy, process pedagogies, and literary study. As Sande and Battista argue, "Cultivating an intersectional relationship between student and text is . . . the first step in teaching students to care deeply about their own literacy." Students must be taught to slow down (Girshin and Stewart-Harris; Laflen), to practice rhetorical listening (Asaad; Virtue), to reconsider relationships between claims and authority (García de Müeller and Monty; Leake). One thing these approaches have in common is that they ask students to consider their own literacy practices as part of larger networks of meaning. Inayatulla and MacDonald "advocate for an affirming student-centered pedagogy that works to place texts within their larger contexts of production and circulation." Girshin and Stewart-Harris suggest that students should develop "the framework to productively engage in ongoing political discourse by formulating their own theories of why the current political moment exists as it does." Asaad argues that we must "strategically awaken our students' habit of mind, to critically examine the validity and the credibility of information they are bombarded with, and to carefully situate and maintain their own unique perspectives against the engulfing circulation of misinformation." Paying attention to that circulation, Leake says, "can help students recognize systems of production and circulation, especially when their discoveries about

the stories are shared with classmates for the potential of discovering larger patterns."

Although we invite readers to experience the collection in any way that is useful to their own pressing needs and contexts, we offer a few key pathways through the text for those readers who might like to explore specific themes or interests. As in a tapestry, the threads we detail below necessarily rely on one another to portray an overall representation of how mis- and disinformation function and the possibilities for literate response. Far from a silver bullet answer, the complexities of critical literacy in our current moment and information landscape demand multifaceted "answers" that shift depending on actors, contexts, purposes, and challenges. Spanning both macro global and political perspectives and the concrete terrain of the classroom, each thread considers a specific set of questions, arguments, and approaches helpful to instructors and literacy workers across disciplines and sites. Below, we name four essential threads that emerge most urgently from the collection's contributors and provide an overview of what readers may expect in exploring each particular pathway.

Thread: Understanding Mis- and Disinformation Through a Network of Keywords

Before we can identify critical literacy practices that expose and address the problems inherent in today's media landscape, it's necessary to first define what these problems are exactly and how they take shape. Thus, one thread through this collection are those longer chapters, interviews, and praxis essays that take up such definitional questions as: What constitutes misinformation and disinformation? How should we understand the relationship between these two seemingly related literacy practices? What other concepts beyond mis- and disinformation can we use to name disruptions—both intentional and unintentional, and sometimes baked in—to the information literacy ecosystem?

Readers of this collection will find a range of key terms for describing mis- and dis-information, including "fake news," "bullshit," "propaganda," "post-truth," and, of course, "misinformation," and "disinformation." In many ways, the key terms are like different facets of a prism, illuminating the state of communication in slightly different ways. Many authors explore the slipperiness of distinguishing between mis- and disinformation, including in student work. At the heart of the prism is the extent to which there is an intention to deceive. Misinformation is the outlier term here, with authors frequently using it to label authorial error or inaccuracies introduced for a range of nonmalicious reasons. For Joshua Daniel-Wariya, Tyler S. Branson, and James Chase Chavez in their essay, "Making Software Visible in Rhetorical Approaches to Fake News," fake news is "a story that, while fabricated, presents itself and is received as a credible news story." In her chapter, "I Am a Refugee and I Am Ok: Instructor Identity in the Resisting Classrooms," Lava Asaad reminds us that fake news is a new name for an old problem. Virtue further shows us that fake news isn't new; what is new, he writes, is how fake news is distributed. Leake agrees, emphasizing the necessity of awareness about the systems that produce and circulate fake news. The journalists and activists interviewed in the collection are particularly quick to highlight willful deception, including for profit or power, as a crucial difference between disinformation and misinformation (see Hofmann; Geary; Calore; Sellers). *Wired* editor Michael Calore, in his interview, "From Product Review to Lack of Common

Ground: How Mis and Disinformation Shape Our Wired World," provides a useful refraction of this attention to circulation, defining fake news as deliberately sensational stories engineered for page views and ads.

In her interview, "Civic Literacies, Despair, and Hope: Our Current Information Moment Unfolding," professional writer and *Americans of Conscience* creator Jennifer Hofmann links misinformation to sales, in similar fashion to Calore's definition of fake news. Hofmann writes, "In my own experience, misinformation is unintentional and disinformation is intentional. Misinformation sells newspapers, sells subscriptions, sells ads. Or it's shared through the grapevine. It's worded in a way that's evocative so that people will read it or have an emotional response and at the same time see the ads on the sidebar. But disinformation is more strategic; it's more deliberate." In the essay "Sans Papiers: Humanizing Documentation," Shereen Inayatulla and Michael T. MacDonald explore how colonizing/er logics forward disinformation, dispossessing individuals to the right of self-determination. They write, "Knowledge, information and disinformation about [US borders] can shape our understandings of citizenship as a concept, right, and lived experience. This knowledge works to define and confine the 'citizen' as both a unit of measurement and a term defined often by negation."

Thomas Girshin and Tyrell Stewart-Harris's attention to "fact" and "post-fact" in their chapter, "Trump's University: Argument and Pedagogy in the 'Post-Fact Era,'" resonates with Inayatulla and MacDonald's description of disinformation when they write that

> the rhetorical standpoint that values are always constructed by and through communities of speech suggests that we have never not been post-fact. With few exceptions, the history of rhetoric is a couple-millennia-long discourse on the slipperiness and opacity of 'facts.' So as writing professors we can ask students to complicate our current 'post-fact' moment, by viewing it through the lens of rhetorical history to reveal the ways the discourse of truth has been racialized since the colonial era.

Truth, ideology, and context also appear in "International Baccalaureate, Theories of Knowledge, and Misinformation Spotting in the High School Classroom," an interview with Martee Lopez-Schmidt, Director of IB Programs at Capuchino High School in San Mateo, California: "And so when we talk about a worldview, when we talk about how we build it, the idea of truth comes into play with belief and with knowledge. Because if, again, if we're saying that to know something means that you have proof of it happening, what is the tension between knowing and believing?" Moreover, different kinds of information require specific knowledge to understand their truth; Angela Laflen, in her chapter, "Quantitative Literacy in the Composition Classroom: Using Infographics Assignments to Teach Ethical and Effective Data Use," explores the particular literacies needed to understand and represent quantitative information ethically.

Perhaps the most charged key term for deceptive communication in the collection is *propaganda*, since it connotes a state-sponsored effort to deceive not only outsiders, but frequently also its own citizens. Certainly, propaganda is a proper term for the misinformation campaign run by Russia to confuse American voters leading up to the 2016 election. Perhaps because of lingering hopes that "it can't happen here," American scholars, including many in this collection, have been reluctant to label Trump and his administration's efforts to confuse, deceive, and activate as propaganda, sticking

to terms like mis- and dis-information and Trump's own hobbyhorse, "fake news." Perhaps not surprisingly, considering his attention to Joe McCarthy, Virtue equates fake news, misformation, and "political propaganda." Nicole Allensworth, in her essay, "Keeping Truth Alive: Literacy, Libraries, and Strategies in an Age of Misinformation," is one of the few other writers to invoke propaganda, writing that "Every student now needs to understand the history, uses, and dangers of propaganda as a kind of inoculation against the misinformation they encounter daily on the web."

Teaching students to understand, analyze, and respond to individual acts of mis-information or instances of fake news, then, is part of a solution, but two essays argue for a broader view that sees misinformation in our current moment as symptomatic and generic. Genevieve García de Müeller and Randall W. Monty, in "'Don't Give Me Bullshit': Constructing a Framework of Response to Fake News," call for both an acknowledgment of the networks in which acts of mis- and dis-information circulate and for a view of fake news more broadly as a genre, with conventions and logics that students can be taught to name and assess. In particular, García de Müeller and Monty call attention to the "complexity of credibility in a contemporary era of instantaneous dissemination of information and rapid-fire response" and ask students to understand that credibility is an effect of networks, not only positionality. Thomas Girshin and Tyrell Stewart-Harris, in "Trump's University: Argument and Pedagogy in the 'Post-Fact Era,'" argue that both our "post-fact" era and Donald Trump's place within it are best understood as historical "signs"—not "causes"—of larger, racialized tensions and discursive networks. Girshin and Stewart-Harris ask instructors to situate discussions of "post-fact" discourse within a framework of racialized discourse that positions Europeans and their descendants as truthful *a priori*, while simultaneously constructing marginalized and colonized citizens in a more precarious relationship to truth that warrants an audience's skepticism. Students must be taught, they suggest, not only to respond to and intervene in acts of mis- and dis-information but to theorize about those acts and to understand them in historical context.

Attending to the definitional nuances writers employ in the collection, particularly as connected to their locations, positionality, and expertise, provides rich ground for both students and scholars of our information landscape and its challenges and offers a central thread for readers to follow through the collection.

Thread: Location and Perspective

A central emphasis of the collection considers our localized response to the mis- and disinformation swirling around us at rapid speeds. As teachers and literacy workers, with different bodies in different kinds of institutions with different and diverse student populations or participants, how do we act to acknowledge and confront fake news and its impact? How does our institutional positioning make some kinds of work more possible—or more crucial—than others? Spanning a range of institutions from community colleges to small private colleges to large, urban universities; writing from the middle of the US, the coasts, and our north and south borders; occupying tenured, adjunct, and graduate student positionalities, the longer essays in this volume explore the impact of mis- and disinformation on the literacy environments and practices of their given locations and their range

of students.

Alongside scholarly research and pedagogical interventions, readers will find interviews with a range of nonacademics encountering—and countering—mis- and disinformation in the spheres of public and professional life. From efforts to change K-12 education to aid students in epistemology and rhetorical awareness to identify misinformation, to insights from technology-based journalists and a curator of circulation on Twitter, to workers directly facing disinformation challenges in educational technology, libraries, or through battles of "meme warfare," the interviews that punctuate this book diversify our understanding of the changes possible both within and outside of the classroom. In each case, the interviewee's or author's particular context, location, and professional landscape is highlighted to illustrate what "working against" mis/disinformation might look like across a range of sectors. For example, interviewees Lopez-Schmitt and Akincilar identify their own positionalities that guide their work with or on behalf of students, whether that means Akincilar advocating for more POC on her team and using her own background as the daughter of a Turkish immigrant to initiate greater diversity in teaching materials, or Lopez-Schmitt encouraging her Latinx students to "disrupt the status quo" in all white spaces. Geary and Hofmann discuss the centrality of attending to our personal values and affective reactions as we encounter mis- or disinformation; for Geary this means using our emotional response "as a basis for questioning" reporting or information, while Hofmann details using the values that connect to her lived experience as a lesbian, like equality, to forge productive discourse with those who are swayed by disinformation. Understanding such literacy landscapes and interventions beyond academia is, we argue, crucial to our work in classrooms aimed at investigating and acting upon our worlds through words.

In each of the longer essays, authors contextualize their pedagogical interventions with institutional context, teacher identity, and/or examples of student work in order to grapple with what it is like to teach at this specific political and cultural moment at specific colleges/universities/locations. Joshua Daniel-Wariya, Tyler S. Branson, and James Chase Sanchez, for example, consider their experiences "from a land-grant university to a public research university to a private liberal arts college . . . extending already-existing relationships and/or reorienting the service components of our work toward information literacy," making evident that engaging with misinformation "will indeed require creativity and hard work on our parts." Eric Leake presents his pedagogical initiative of tracking permutations of news stories within the context of a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) that brings together politically and economically diverse students within a "blue-leaning area within a red state." Drawing on his background as a former journalist, Leake highlights circulation through pedagogies that promote civic literacies within an expansive framework for what citizenship can mean. Angela Laflen, who has long taught professional and technical writing, uses her expertise to implement a rhetorical and visual quantitative-reasoning based curriculum in her FYC class, finding that a deeper engagement with how data is collected, processed, visualized, and presented prompted changes in both of her teaching specialities. Melissa R. Sande, a community college instructor, and Christine M. Battista, an assistant professor at a career-oriented, private university, draw on the similarities their diverse student bodies share in order to critique the ways that information literacy has been conceptualized as a skill and relegated to "one-shot" library sessions and FYC. Arguing instead

that information literacy is most productively considered and taught as a process intent on promoting a Freirean critical consciousness, the authors use their experiences and initial assessments from teaching feminist and ecocriticism literature classes to argue for extending information literacies across the curriculum.

The contributions in this thread prompt readers to reflect critically on their different institutional contexts, as well as on their location within these contexts, so that they can successfully adapt to their own situations the pedagogical responses to mis- and disinformation presented by the collection's contributors.

Thread: The Rhetoric of Mis/Disinformation

The field of rhetoric, as both a scholarly enterprise and pedagogical praxis, has throughout its long history offered frameworks for developing critical reading practices, understanding the situated nature of literacy, interrogating the dynamics between citizenship and literacy, and approaching other concerns that animate the essays and interviews collected in this volume. The authors gathered in this thread thus draw from rhetorical theory, both explicitly and implicitly, to examine questions about the nature of and responses to mis- and disinformation. What rhetorical functions does fake news perform and how? How does mis- and disinformation complicate our understanding of the rhetorical situation and the methods we teach students for reading texts and addressing audiences, especially now that audiences are mediated by algorithms and software? What rhetorical tools can be used to contest mis- and disinformation?

Authors insist that rhetorical awareness today demands understanding not only the text but also the methods of information circulation and distribution that allow readers to differentiate between data streams and news. Rhetorical literacy in our current information ecology necessitates that we work to become more literate in social media: its mechanics, how it is combating misinformation, and who owns the news outlets we're reading. From the perspective of technology journalism, Calore reminds us of the engineered aspect of stories to generate sensationalism and clicks. Both Calore and García de Müeller and Monty emphasize the bullshit motives of some information distributors/composers, as well as the ancillary skill of developing strategies for identifying bullshit and fact-checking. García de Müeller and Monty explore the dimension of arhetorical practice that disinformation occupies, showing how they and their students theorized fake news as nonrational argumentation that is uninterested in yet best contested through rhetoric.

Within classrooms, Sande and Battista explore how information literacy pedagogy, drawing on both the process movement in writing studies and Paolo Freire's concept of critical consciousness, can be centralized in literature courses, while Pella excavates how to plan and scaffold rigorous and relevant rhetorical analysis of sources and their evidence. However, looking closely at texts is not enough, as Daniel-Wariya, Branson, and Chavez argue. A focus on software literacies must accompany our analysis of information and texts; these author write that "Software literacy is a pathway toward learning *how writing works* to circulate discourse, and how software *as writing* impacts the ways audiences view, understand, and respond to information." In another extension, Hofmann and

Geary expand our understanding of how the affective must also be understood as part of the rhetorical situation, since mis/disinformation work largely by stirring emotion and prompting reaction. Recognizing and negotiating our own emotional reactions can be helpful not only in alerting us to mis/disinformation, but also in helping us connect with others through shared values in ways that can counter the effects of mis/disinformation. Finally, with an insider's analysis of creating rhetorically striking content to "win the battle of the story," Sellers details strategies in the playbook of a primary currency of the day: memes.

Thread: Citizenship and Civic Literacy

As explored through the threads above, our theoretical understandings and definitions of misinformation and disinformation—as well as the literacy needs of those we collaborate with (be they students or colleagues, friends, neighbors, or fellow activists)—are shaped by our own positions and embodiments. Contributors to this collection call us to engage in a conversation about how citizenship, in particular, is invoked in calls to improved literacy education. Authors such as Inayatulla and MacDonald, as well as Asaad, encourage us to think with more nuance about the logics of citizenship, including how we rethink what we mean by it. In their chapter, Inayatulla and MacDonald combine personal narrative about migration and the documentation processes they have confronted to interrogate the relationship between state and individual maintained through documentation, extending this comparison to the college classroom and white-washed, empty calls for developing "global citizens" through education. Inayatulla bridges her own experiences with misnaming as she and her parents moved between countries, illustrating how the "time-travelling immigrant" and their "papers . . . remain or become the keepers and arbiters of untranslatable literacy practices—untransposable and unknowable within the colonizer discourses used to exclude, shame, infantilize, or police us." Inayatulla uses this all-too-common instance to understand the skepticism and scrutiny her black and brown students at York College in Queens, New York, face in terms of both their documentation and perceived literacy. MacDonald considers his work with refugees, first at a writing center where refugees from Sudan were considered "extraordinary," and later in his work at a large state university near Detroit where the majority of his students can trace the histories of migration, asylum, or immigration within their own family histories. Critiquing the ways that immigrant and refugee stories and published texts have often been used to celebrate literacy myths of success or returning, educated and with tools, to one's homeland, MacDonald highlights the potentially "insidious attempts to disinform at the global level." Ultimately, these authors argue that our practices around documentation—often our students cannot exit our classes without showing their "papers" as it were—should be examined for the ways they uphold colonizing "logics of time and order" so that they may be revised and broadened beyond their "border il/logics" and static notions of what it means to be a citizen.

Asaad explores similar questions in her chapter, which considers her positionality as a TA and a Syrian refugee teaching in a politically "red state" at Middle Tennessee University, what she describes as teaching "resisting students in a resisting culture." Reviewing the limited ways that composition

studies has theorized the embodied reality of an Othered teacher in a predominantly white class-room, Asaad explores the limits of objectivity, neutrality, and rhetorical listening given her particular context, instead considering how non-traditional instructors might "become transformative agents in laying bare how knowledge can be misused." Asaad goes on to share her attempts, and the mixed results with students, of attempting transnational investigation aimed at identifying how discourse shapes reality and may come to be perceived as "sacred and unquestionable truths."

Beyond the classroom, interviewees and praxis authors echo aspects of the relationships between citizens and institutions that need continual investment and scrutiny: trust and transparency (Calore), decontextualization (Akincilar), corporate bias and the undue influence of money on politics (Sellers), the "socially constructed notions of authority that reproduce the language of the dominant culture" (Allensworth), and the "value of evidence as not only an academic disposition but also a social responsibility" (Pella). Hofmann explores misinformation's current swing toward dehumanization and fear, which create a range of responses in citizens from vitriol to withdrawing from civic and political life. Ultimately, these contributors provide perspective and interventions aimed at helping us all "be better thinkers, make better choices, [and] be part of a political world" (Lopez-Schmitt).

Like the authors in this volume, the students considered in these pieces differ significantly in their locations and lived experiences. Students are pursuing their education in community college systems, R1 institutions, liberal arts institutions, 4-year state universities, across three HSIs and one professional-oriented university. A range of courses are considered, in both lower and upper division coursework, in composition, general education, and courses in the major. The conversations opened up in this thread about citizenship, identity, and literacy are crucial to have with students and colleagues, both in and beyond the academy, with significant implications for pedagogy and how we interact with and advocate for all of our students.

Conclusion

As a whole, this collection offers responses and solutions as direct responses to our current moment with an eye toward how our literacy practices must change as we move forward. Through providing examples of how we might take action within our specific classrooms and circles, along-side instances of documenting disciplinary and professional responses to our evolving information landscape, we hope that this manuscript's exploration of literacies (what do we need to know how to do, now?), contexts for literate action (how do we understand this moment, now?), and pedagogies/practices (how do we work with students, now? how do understand and perform citizenship, now?) provides some pathways forward.

Specifically, in that the collection ranges from larger political, cultural, and intercultural land-scapes to concrete assignments, resources, and lesson plans, we hope that readers experience the productive movement between theory and praxis. Indeed, understanding the literacies and pedagogies that can support us in countering mis/disinformation demands this kind of multi-level attention and movement. Further, such understandings and interventions always live outside of our classrooms;

the interviews and praxis pieces remind us of the crucial ways that networked information circulates not only through curricula and research sites, but also through journalism, social media, educational technology, systems, institutions. Our work within classrooms intersects with and can amplify efforts made in other quarters. Making meaning together constitutes the very real human project, the Freirean antidote perhaps, to disinformation's goal of atomization, distraction, and obfuscation aimed ultimately at division and dehumanization.

Thus, as we experience what one reader described as the kaleidoscopic effect of encountering the ideas that this collection brings together, we hope that the differences and divergences in perspective prompt individual reflection about how definitions, practices, and pedagogies might be taken up in specific locales. We have challenged our authors and interviewees to locate themselves within their specific contexts not only to highlight how context and purpose must intersect, but to suggest that readers take up similar definitional and pedagogical work with their own students and institutions. Recognizing and countering mis/disinformation necessarily extends across not only across disciplines and grades, across institutional types, and through professional settings and affiliations; it also demands ongoing efforts of attention so that we might shift and reactivate as informational landscapes change.