of teaching audience to students who turn to faith-based reasoning and religious rhetoric and how such a turn may disrupt notions of academic audiences. Those who teach in communities where expressions of faith are not so overt may find this article unexpectedly engaging. Freeman argues for the need to move beyond merely suggesting to students that faith-based arguments are ineffective in the academic discourse community and rather to reconsider the often provincial view of academic audience. Freeman offers an example of how she uses stasis and a personal essay assignment to allow students of faith to interrogate the commonplace notion that faith-based arguments are not welcome by academic audiences. In “Theorizing Audience in Web-Based Self-Presentation” Erin Karper calls on Kenneth Burke’s theory of identification as a means of understanding the interactive nature of audience in digital environments, and in “Reading Audiences” Dan Keller turns to reading pedagogies to examine how students’ understanding of audiences are shaped by their reading practices. Finally, in “Writing Assessment as New Literacy,” Lee Nickoson-Massey considers how classroom writing assessment practices and peer-response activities are rich areas of inquiry into the concept of audience.

This timely collection clearly demonstrates that the concept of audience and the struggles on how to help students understand this important rhetorical concept is alive and well in our field. This collection also serves to remind us that the theories and concepts that define our field of study are shifting, evolving, and often lead us in exciting new directions.

Providence, RI


Reviewed by Rebecca Richards, University of Arizona

Trying to translate the principles of critical pedagogy into the U.S. composition classroom has not been without challenges. U.S. composition instructors drawn to Freire’s work, in particular, have had to attend to the differences and privileges of their specific geopolitical location from that in which Freire wrote and worked. In addition, U.S. composition instructors must also confront the tension presented in the U.S. media, which quickly and superficially proclaims that U.S citizens live in an already-free and egalitarian society, all while lived experiences and observations tell us
otherwise. In *Democracies to Come: Rhetorical Action, Neoliberalism, and Communities of Resistance*, Riedner and Mahoney situate critical pedagogy in conversation with elements of participatory democratic action, which is no easy task in today’s globalized society. Instead of narrowly defining pedagogy as a theory that informs classroom praxis, the writers define pedagogy as the theory that underlines “lived political work” (11). After introducing the major themes of the book in the first chapter, each subsequent chapter looks at highly divergent rhetorical situations to demonstrate the ways in which instructors can use critical pedagogy to interrupt hegemonic practices. Chapters 2 through 6 employ Riedner and Mahoney’s broader definition of pedagogy to help composition instructors think about how our actions and commitments—both inside and outside the classroom—enact methods of critical pedagogy, and the selected case studies provide interesting portraits of what critical pedagogy can look like for composition instructors.

To open and frame the analyses in the rest of the chapters, Riedner and Mahoney’s first chapter addresses the tension of the self-proclaimed freedom of the U.S. democracy and the reality of lived experience by asking readers to remember Derrida’s proclamation that “democracy remains to come.” For Riedner and Mahoney, this phrase explains the contradiction in celebratory nationalistic messages and hegemonic practices. *Democracies to Come*, as a book, reminds its readers that democracy is an ideal that a society must continually struggle to enact, and that pedagogy is the vehicle for moving toward that ideal. The first chapter pays particular attention to the notion of *kairos*, looking at how individuals must attend to the urgency and shifting nature of agency in each rhetorical exigency. In doing so, Riedner and Mahoney encourage composition instructors to consider how their own local situation gives them unique access to intervene in neoliberal logic with progressive rhetorical actions, which then frames the subsequent chapters where they investigate locations of interruption.

In chapter 2, the writers trace the emergence and circulation of the logic of neoliberalism, which they define as more than just an economic concept of the upward distribution of wealth. The writers argue that it is also a rhetoric and a pedagogy that forestalls action and limits possibilities because neoliberalism configures the “relationship of power and between labor and capital, consolidates identities, interpells bodies into systems of identity, and creates relationships across public and private spheres, it creates deep and even violent economic, political, and cultural ruptures” (21). Riedner and Mahoney maintain that neoliberalism is the broad and abstract logic that critical pedagogy seeks to interrupt. However, even though Composition Studies continually takes up critical pedagogy as the means for liberatory action, such work often times creates unintended byproducts—ones that reproduce neoliberal logic. Students and instructors
alike can experience despair, passivity, and apathy as they uncover some of the invisible mechanisms and flows of power—especially those found in the processes of globalization, such as inhumane labor practices and gendered inequity. The writers are keenly aware of the difficulties of enacting critical pedagogy in neoliberal spaces, which is an asset of the book—they understand the limitations of educational practices and spaces. Particularly, they are attentive to the identity crisis of higher education, which has become more and more of a corporatized space where students receive commodities, e.g., diplomas, and where academic labor is quantified through publications. While the book thoroughly critiques the marketplace logic of the university, the writers remain hopeful that academic spaces exist that allow for new literacies that can intervene in these dominant discourses.

Following the critique of neoliberalism and the university in chapter 2, Riedner and Mahoney look to specific spaces that can provide interruptions to neoliberal rhetorical habits. In chapter 3, for example, the writers claim that the university campus can be a space to interrupt neoliberalism. In this chapter, the rhetorical action they analyze is a sit-in at the George Washington University student center—a demonstration to support adjunct faculty and support service workers, for which students were arrested and yet the student leading the protest was awarded during the graduation ceremony. In the discussions (or lack thereof) that followed the student-organized sit-in, Riedner and Mahoney demonstrate how coercion functions at the university community, where interruption is rewarded symbolically but it is also met with police discipline and not engaged rhetorically.

While chapter 3 looks at university spaces beyond the classroom, chapters 4 and 5 engage the classroom as a site of production of neoliberal despair and benevolence. Both Riedner and Mahoney share with readers their experience of teaching students about transnational power relations in their classrooms at George Washington and Kutztown University, respectively. Riedner's experience of teaching “Women in the Global Economy” led students to replicating a rhetoric of benevolence—a key component of neoliberal logic as “benevolence gives neoliberal authority as a feeling and self-identification” (55). But that feeling is a kairotic site for intervention where we can ask students to develop an understanding of social relationships that do not rely on subordination. Likewise, Mahoney’s teaching experience demonstrates how the authentic moral outrage of coming into a new understanding of how the world works can often and invisibly turn into despair through personal “rational deliberation” that disassociates emotion from knowledge. What is productive about both of these examples is that the authors are attentive to the importance of emotion in rhetorical action as well as the urgency in placing these discourses of despair and benevolence into larger communicative networks.
What this means for composition instructors is speaking to these emotions aloud (either in class discussion or writing) is important work since, most often, these emotions are processed individually and internally. Both benevolence and despair are collective neoliberal experiences, which means that there is the potential for organizing rhetorical action around them. Riedner and Mahoney point out that walking away from these moments in exasperation, as we all have, would miss out on the deeply kairotic moments for critical pedagogy.

Finally, the last chapter addresses specific writing practices that hold the potential to produce alternative social realities. Zapatista writing voices opposition to the Mexican government through the rhetorical strategies of irrationality, silliness, and laughter. The authors show how these strategies transgress the authoritative rhetoric of the government while acting upon the shared emotions of the writer and audience. The authors are careful in situating Zapatista writing in conjunction with academic writing, noting that doing so can flatten the context of the political discourse. In no way do Riedner and Mahoney implicate academic writing as equal to the political struggle confronted in Zapatista writing. However some cultural studies scholarship shares with Zapatista writing the ability to thwart neoliberal hegemonic practices through writing strategies. Academics can be transgressive or resistant to dominant neoliberal logic by creating works that “produce. . . beyond the scope of capital's control” (103). This means that not all academic writing—not even in the field of Composition Studies—must be accountable to the corporate publications culture that demands that research do something other than critique. Neoliberalism critiques such academic writing as elitist and irrelevant since it does not contribute to the expansion of the market. But feminist cultural studies, e.g. the work of Judith Butler, deliberately resists such a narrow definition of “relevant.” Riedner and Mahoney argue that we need to continue this type of work to expose the “excess, gaps, differences, and openings” in neoliberal rhetoric (103).

Democracies to Come does an excellent job defining and explaining how rhetorical action intervenes into neoliberal politics both inside and outside of the classroom, making it a good read for composition teachers who engage in service learning, participatory action research, or critical pedagogy. It is an important addition to composition scholarship in critical pedagogy and social action in that it is concerned with how neoliberalism, when left unchecked, can forestall even the best intentions for social justice. Additionally, Riedner and Mahoney are attentive to the role that emotion plays in perpetuating hegemony as well as in creating potentials for action; they do not easily resolve the simultaneous function of emotion as emancipatory or unproductive. Instead, they provide the readers with concrete and tangible examples that are messy and contradictory, much like the daily experience
in the composition classroom. *Democracies to Come* kicks off a series from Lexington Press on Cultural Studies, Pedagogy, and Activism; therefore readers can anticipate an ongoing conversation of the topics addressed in this book.

*Tucson, AZ*


Reviewed by Janet S. Zepernick, Pittsburg State University

*Organic Writing Assessment: Dynamic Criteria Mapping in Action* continues the work begun by Bob Broad in an earlier volume, *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing*, where Broad introduces dynamic criteria mapping (DCM) as both a philosophy of and approach to writing assessment. The current volume opens with an introduction in which Broad summarizes the philosophy of DCM (but not the methodology; see *What We Really Value* for a procedural explanation). Each of the five subsequent chapters describes a large-scale assessment project undertaken using DCM: Linda Adler-Kassner and Heidi Estrem’s assessment of the first-year writing program at Eastern Michigan University; Barry Alford’s development of shared learning outcomes for all of Mid Michigan Community College’s course offerings; Jane Detweiler and Maureen McBride’s evaluation of writing and critical thinking in the core writing course at University of Nevada, Reno; Susanmarie Harrington and Scott Weeden’s work to develop new program goals in the required writing program at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis; and Eric Stalions’s validation test of the first-year writing placement process at Bowling Green State University.

Philosophically, DCM privileges local control in every aspect of the assessment process, celebrates the complexity and diversity of features that might represent “good writing” in any given context, and honors the rhetorical process of negotiating local writing values. DCM’s imperative that process should emerge from context requires that each institution develop a unique, local methodology, and the five projects represented in this collection do follow very different paths. Beneath the superficial differences, however, they share a recognizably similar approach: Readers