

5 Transfer Implications from Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Literacy Studies

Although we have devoted a separate chapter for literacy studies scholarship, we understand work in literacy studies, with its focus on writing instruction, as part of the larger domain of fields dedicated to the study of writing. We believe that readers will benefit from this separation because it provides focus on three critical dimensions of transfer and writing: (a) explicit comparative focus on literacy practices across multiple contexts, especially in and out of school contexts; (b) emphasis on how culture, history, institutions, and personal factors shape literacy and thus heavily impact transfer; and (c) overt commitment to understanding and bettering the lives and literacies of students and communities who have been historically excluded from mainstream school settings.

Importantly, literacy studies emphasize school's role in mediating transfer, but without centering school as a writer's only or primary place of learning. Rather, school is always placed in relation to multiple other domains, all with complex sets of ideological, sociocultural, and historical factors that impact the transfer act, especially for learners whose home and community lives may conflict with the practices and values of mainstream schooling. In focusing on the movement of readers, writers, and literacies across school and non-school domains, we are guided by a question posed by Hull and Schultz (2001): "How can research on literacy and out-of-school learning help us think anew

about literacy teaching and learning across a range of contexts, including school?" (p. 575).

Studies of how literacies traverse in and out of school domains elevate the stakes of transfer, with special value for centering diverse and minoritized students in discussions of writing-related transfer. Such a sociocultural orientation challenges notions such as negative and failed transfer. We are invited to construct transfer in conjunction with literacy's varied and multivalent communities and practices to emphasize how transfer is also a generative and deeply cultural process that can build from community practices for school success. While writing studies has done excellent and extensive research on transfer in first-year writing, writing centers, writing across the curriculum, and workplace writing, the field has not pursued transfer as part of an explicit agenda for social and educational justice. Drawing from work in sociocultural literacy studies can change that trajectory and inform an orientation of anti-racist and anti-oppressive approaches to transfer in writing studies.

In what follows, we first synthesize research that illuminates how the cultural, historical, political, and ideological dimensions of literacy shape and motivate the transfer act. Next, we outline a series of methods for capturing literacy practices as they traverse (transfer) across multiple contexts. We then present readers with pedagogical and curricular options for teaching with culture, power, and transfer in mind.

THE IMPACTS OF CULTURE, POWER, IDEOLOGY, AND HISTORY IN LITERACY TRANSFER

Sociocultural literacies studies have provided groundbreaking examinations of the relationships between in- and out-of-school literacies (Au, 1980; Heath, 1982, 1983; Phillips, 1983; Street, 1993). From these studies, researchers concluded that mainstream schooling and students' home and community literacy practices were often at odds for historically marginalized students. Early studies shifted educational conversations away from assumptions of literacy deficiency in students. Rather, they established that in- and out-of-school literacies are based on differing sets of values, practices, materials, and engagements. This sociocultural viewpoint suggested that (a) when minoritized and working-class students experience disconnection with school, it can often be traced to the institution's lack of support and lack of value

for community languages and literacies, and (b) that students' out-of-school repertoires are, in fact, assets to be leveraged by teachers, not deficits to be removed or punished. We can draw two important implications for transfer from these broad findings. First, students are transferring writing-related knowledge across domains that have (at times) radically different practices, uses for, interactions with, attitudes towards, and values for writing and the multiple literacy practices that surround it. Second, literacies associated with mainstream schooling have been historically privileged over community literacies, which sets up a stark divide between students who appear to transfer and those who do not. Without recognizing the sociocultural dimensions of how literacy works in communities and how mainstream schools have promoted a predominantly white and middle-class literacy, transfer studies cannot ask effective questions nor develop useful pedagogical responses to benefit all students.

Cross-cultural studies have shown how literacy practices develop in relation to community needs and through cultural practices and values (Street, 1993). For instance, Heath's (1982) early study of bedtime stories from the communities of Trackton (working-class Black mill community), Roadville (working-class white mill community), and Maintown (middle-class, mainstream, and so-called school-oriented community) was one of the first comparative studies of home and school. Her bedtime story studies, which were also part of her longer, multi-year ethnography of these Carolina Piedmont communities (1983), demonstrated how "each community has rules for socially interacting and sharing knowledge in literacy events" (p. 50). In chronicling those family interactions across Trackton, Roadville, and Maintown, Heath compared children's experiences with school expectations around books, reading, and interpretation. She found that successful transfer of learning was directly linked to when and how children's prior experiences aligned with the school's definitions and practices of literacy; those that were matched (e.g., Maintown children) were welcomed and affirmed. Students whose prior experiences differed from formal environments (Trackton and Roadville, in their own distinct ways) struggled. Heath's work also emphasizes how literacy is part of life. Children do not pull practices on and off like clothing; they are deeply embedded in all ways of interacting and interpreting. In this way, because mainstream schooling in Heath's study developed from white middle-class values and traditions, it was

therefore those white, middle-class students who were afforded pathways for home-to-school transfer.

Purcell-Gates (2013) expands studies of in- and out-of-school literacies to include preschool children in migratory farmworker contexts in the US. This study of the literacy practices of children of migrant farmworker communities attending a Head Start Program explores the profound breakdown between community-based knowledge and school programs to expose how racialized and class-based assumptions on the part of school administrators and teachers create barriers to transfer. While camp life was rich with multiple languages and literacies, interviews with Head Start teachers revealed their profound ignorance about camp life and their inability to conceive of literacy development and practice beyond a narrow definition. For instance, the teachers and directors believed that the farm workers did not value reading or writing and that no one at the migrant camps could read or write. These Head Start workers drew from their positions as white, English speaking, and non-mobile (living in one location and in one household) when imagining the lives of these migrant families, who, in this study, spoke mainly Spanish, came mainly and recently from Mexico, and were always relocating from farm to farm and from camp to camp. As Purcell-Gates explains, her case study provides

a glimpse into how damaging it is to children's future success in mainstream schools if educators fail to understand the fund of knowledge that all children bring from their homes and communities and the ways that early literacy instruction can build on this knowledge to better prepare the children for success. (p. 94)

Migrant farmworkers are integral to the US economy, and yet this Head Start program, a federally based educational program that was designed to teach children of migrant workers, had no resources or culturally specific knowledge for working with these children. This study is a powerful reminder of the sociocultural binds of transfer and how, without careful and deliberate attention to students' funds of knowledge and sociohistorical circumstances, the benefits of transfer may be reserved for those students whose experiences align across contexts. Moreover, it helps emphasize the ways in which schools, as institutions, are ideologically attached to larger political and economic structures that can deny and erase children's and families' literacies.

As these sociocultural studies show, transfer cannot be separated from broader structures and ideologies that shape culture and society. Moreover, the potential to successfully transfer, as was the case in Brandt's (2001) *Literacy in American Lives*, is subject to the economic values attached to the literacies and languages that writers bring to new contexts. For instance, in her study of 80 literacy history interviews of Americans born between the 1890s and 1980s, Brandt shows how changing economic conditions impacted writing development, writings' uses, and the possibilities for transfer when personal knowledge of writing becomes incompatible with changing institutional needs. Transfer, then, should be understood within this process of intertwined trajectories of societies, institutions, and access to power.

Lorimer Leonard's (2018) work on the literacy repertoires of multilingual migrant writers extends our understanding of literacy, value, and transfer to include language more explicitly. She finds that study participants' literacies and languages are intertwined, and together impacted their movement across social domains to produce at different moments fluidity, fixity, and friction, explaining that "fluidity shows writers' values agreeing with others'; fixity shows how values can be mismatched; and friction shows how writers' values simultaneously do and don't correspond to those of others" (p. 124). For transfer studies, the construct of friction is especially helpful, as it adds analysis of "shifting social conditions" and "shifting value" (p. 93) to studies of writing-related transfer.

Of course, such challenges do not negate writers' agency and intention. For instance, Rounsaville (2017), in her lifespan case study of Clara, found that agency and structure interplay in transfer for migrant multilingual writers in complex ways, and that the interplay may shift depending on age, life circumstance, or the writer's development. As Rounsaville reports:

Findings emphasized the transnational character of how genres-in-use develop dialectically at the nexus of the individual and the social. For Clara, this nexus included legacies of writing from her grandfather and mother, the drive and urgency to make texts produce transnational attachments, as well as more conventionally sanctioned affordances and limitations. This configuration shifted across the lifespan and was influenced by where Clara was positioned on her family's migration trajectory, where she was positioned in life (as a child,

an adolescent, an adult), the contexts she wrote in, and where she was positioned in relation to the accumulating repertoire itself. (p. 334)

Thus, while Clara, a migrant, multilingual writer whose family moved between Argentina, Brazil, and the US, made decisions about when and how to use her genre knowledge, the availability of that knowledge for use was both ideologically and developmentally constrained while at the same time forming through her innovations and life circumstances. Moreover, this study attests to how genre transfer can be formed and circulated in transnational movement, and confirms “that the residue of transnational life persists in, inheres in, and motivates local literacies, even after physical movement across borders has occurred” (p. 337). We might consider transfer as both an active act (i.e., Clara carried and transformed her grandfather’s and mother’s values about writing into her own writing at school) and as an unpredictably accumulative act (i.e., the more Clara moved her family’s relationship with writing into new situations, the more that process became integrated into her everyday).

The story of transfer presented thus far is one of successes, barriers, or mixtures. Literacy practices themselves and the values attributed to them help shape whether transfer will be welcomed or blocked. In other words, the theory of transfer being forwarded implies that if the “sociocultural logic of [literacy] patterns, and the complex relations among them” (Courage, 1993, p. 490), find connection, then out-of-school practices have the chance of finding salience within school activities. It also implies that “how literacy was valued and re-valued” (Brandt, 2001, p. 76) will impact whether and how transfer takes place. Of course, if patterns do not relate, if values are hierarchized, then learners are left to manage complex and often contradictory transfer pathways on their own. In writing studies, more work must be done to understand and counter the ways that the transfer act is embedded within and realized through oppressive systems that deny transfer potential for many historically excluded students.

Gonzalez et al. (2006) and Moll and Gonzalez’s (2001) valuable work on funds of knowledge—defined as “those historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll & Gonzalez, 2001, p. 160)—bridges the knowledge of language minoritized and working-class students with mainstream, school-based cur-

ricula, and literacy tasks. Actively developing relevant curricula based on these rich types of knowing—ranging from knowledge of plant cultivation to masonry to midwifery to biology and chemistry—offers transfer routes not accessible through standardized curricula. Working from funds of knowledge elevates households and the complex networks between households and communities as core sites of culture where literacies are part of the broader sets of experiences that encompass and inform these children's home worlds. Based in a “dynamic, [and] ‘processual’” (Moll & Gonzalez, 2001, p. 162) view of culture, funds of knowledge focuses on how young people can be empowered with cultural pathways to bring their practices to school-based tasks. Transfer is bolstered by working with households' knowledge and wisdom.

Multiple studies of the teaching practices stemming from a funds of knowledge paradigm (McCarty et al., 1991; Warren et al., 1994) all attest to positive outcomes. For instance, in their study of a Navajo bilingual program in Rough Rock, Arizona, McCarty et al. (1991) observed how a curricular change that invited Navajo students' language and community-based experiences radically improved student engagement. Counter to long-standing stereotypes about the passive and quiet indigenous student, McCarty and colleagues came to understand how

Rough Rock's inquiry curriculum taps directly into the socialization experiences and learning predilections Rough Rock children bring to school. This use of children's learning resources, as well as the clear social-cultural relevance of curriculum content, account for the positive responses of Navajo children and their teachers to questioning, inductive/analytical reasoning, and to speaking up in class. (p. 52)

Collaboration, negotiated learning, elevating funds of knowledge, and providing reason and opportunity to use cultural and linguistic resources were all central to students' transfer of out-of-school learning into school contexts. When biliteracy is included in the curriculum, such transfer of funds of knowledge extends further (McCarty et al., 1991, p. 45). McCarty & Watahomigie (2001) suggest strategies for funds of knowledge as a bridge to the classroom, which start with the assumption that bilingualism and multiculturalism are assets (p. 500). For instance, they suggested leveraging the literacy continuum,

where native language is valued and activated and “orality and literacy, indigenous and Western narrative forms, are united in ways that allow students to use what they know to develop new language skills and to inquire about the world” (p. 503). Transfer is supported when students’ multiple literacies are valued as are the communities, households, and histories they came from (p. 505).

SOCIOCULTURAL STUDIES OF LITERACY AND NEW CONSTRUCTS FOR TRANSFER

In this section, we present sociocultural literacy research that considers transfer as always activated in literacy practice, even when unobserved by a teacher or researcher. Drawing from sociocultural views of teaching and learning (Rogoff, 1990; Wertsch, 1985), Dyson defines transfer from a sociocultural perspective, where “skills and understandings . . . are organized by, and occur in the service of, goal-oriented, socially situated activities” (1999, p. 145). From this base, transfer is an act “interwoven into the background of shared activities within which language itself emerges. . . . If and how learners transfer particular means across activities cannot be separated from the activities themselves and how they are socially framed and arranged” (1999, p. 145-146). Moreover, within this theoretical orientation, literacy events are active events; “they are on-going accomplishments negotiated by children and other participants as they respond to each other” (p. 146). Such redefining provides alternative frameworks for transfer. In this section, we review two constructs with great potential for writing studies: recontextualization (Dyson, 1999) and repurposing (Roozen, 2010).

Dyson (1999) rethinks and redefines transfer: “transfer involves the negotiation between and among teachers and learners, as frames of reference for judging ‘relevant’ material are themselves differentiated and expanded” (p.142), and challenges the long-held application model of transfer (often linked back to Thorndike). Dyson suggests that educators must radically reimagine the frames of reference that they use to interpret children’s actions and to interact with children’s intentions and imaginations, with a deliberate turn toward pedagogical “relevance” over “normalcy” (p. 142). In this way, successful transfer is facilitated by an open orientation towards children’s diverse worlds. Such a perspective encourages educators to take on the role of negotiator, not arbiter, of meaning-making via children’s relevant frames.

This collaborative dimension of literacy learning extends to literacy transfer. Children don't merely bring materials to school settings and place them onto inert activities; rather, they build social worlds (Dyson, 1993, 1997, 2003; Genishi & Dyson, 2009) using materials from across their cultural landscape (Dyson, 2003, p. 25). Dyson's extensive ethnographic work, often with children from poorer African American communities, demonstrates this point through students' creative building from and transformation of popular literacies, characters, and media in ways that deny strict boundaries between home and school. Dyson's research illustrates the fundamentally dialogic and intertextual nature of literacy, which serves as the basis for reimagining transfer as a dynamic act of recontextualization within "collaboratively constructed events" (1999, p. 159) for "a negotiated transformation of *both* school and child worlds" (1999, p. 166). Drawing on such media sources as sports figures and pop culture superheroes, children transformed their out-of-school frames within official school literacy events. What children bring to the classroom, and thus transform through acts of recontextualization, are as diverse as the children themselves. When children's sociocultural worlds are honored ahead of standardized pedagogies, assessments, and assumptions (Genishi & Dyson, 2009), educators ignite transfer potential.

Roozen traces the relationships, patterns, and intertwined trajectories of in- and out-of-school literacy, with particular attention to discipline-specific, university-level writing (Roozen, 2008, 2009, 2010; Roozen & Erickson, 2017). In these fine-grained explorations of how in- and out-of-school practices interact, Roozen prefers the term literate activities, which he defines, drawing from Prior's (1998/2013) work, as activities "not located *in* acts of reading and writing, but *as* cultural forms of life saturated with textuality, that is strongly motivated and mediated by texts" (Prior, 1998/2013, p. 138). When looking across realms of literate activity, Roozen finds that students actively repurpose and interweave activities across personal and academic writing (Roozen, 2009) and public and academic writing (Roozen, 2008, 2010). For transfer studies, this research foregrounds interconnections across private, public, and academic writing. Specifically, Roozen presents the construct of repurposing to emphasize how spheres of writing are not separate; rather, drawing from theories of intertextuality and "nexus of practice," literacy is configured within a "network or matrix of intersecting practices which, although they are never perfectly or

inevitably linked into any finalized or finalizable latticework of regular practice, nevertheless form a network or nexus” (Scollon as cited in Roozen, 2009, p. 546). Such a perspective has profound implications for transfer because it assumes that transfer is always happening; transfer is intrinsic to writing and not a separate act. Pedagogically then, the role of the educator is to facilitate students’ recognition of the complex and individual ways they pull, reuse, and reshape writing practices from one domain (e.g., diary writing) into another (e.g., school-based essay assignments).

This perspective, also indebted to the earlier work of Prior (1998/2013) and Prior and Shipka (2003), demands that we re-see transfer and repurposing as common. Prior and Shipka’s work on chronotopic lamination provides both a theoretical and methodological framework for this vision.

In this model [of chronotopic lamination] then, a literate act, say reading a newspaper, is both localized in the concrete acts, thoughts, and feelings of the reader(s) and sociohistorically dispersed across a far-flung chronotopic network—including the embodied acts of writing the story, almost certainly spread across multiple chronotopic episodes of individual and collaborative composing; the histories of journalism and the genre of the news story; the actual embodied worlds being represented and their textualized representations; the reader’s histories of reading papers and of earlier events relevant to those represented in the story; and so on. (pp. 186–187)

Methodologically, such tracing reveals multi-scalar and multi-temporal interconnections. Moreover, such an account radically widens the realm of prior knowledge and adds layers and networks beyond what is typically considered relevant as sources of transferred knowledge. Recognition of the expanded possibilities for bridging home and school supports a multidimensional, dynamic, and transformative view of transfer.

METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM LITERACY STUDIES

Literacy studies provides several shared and new methods for studies of writing-related transfer. These methods include ethnographies and

multisite ethnographies; meaning-making trajectories and trajectories of practice; and lifespan studies.

Ethnographies of communication and writing and multi-site ethnographies provide an emic view of sociocultural literacy practices from within the logic, historicity, and ideologies of communities and individuals. Methods include interviews, observations, and multiple forms of document collection. Multi-site and comparative studies are especially promising for understanding writing transfer. For instance, in her study on students' in- and out-of-school literacy practices, Schultz (2002) explicitly advocates for the multi-site ethnography to "examine and document the circulation of cultural meanings, objects, and identities across time and space" (p. 363). More recently, transcontextual studies (Kell, 2009) have replaced or supplemented comparative studies. This transition focuses less on the site per se and more on how literacy and writers move among and across contexts. Kell suggested transcontextual analysis could illuminate the ongoing recontextualization of text, practice, and process across contexts. Specifically, Kell (2006) proposed "meaning-making trajectories"—based on earlier discussions of "text trajectories" (Blommaert, 2001; Silverstein & Urban, 1996)—as units of analysis for studying recontextualization. Nordquist (2017) proposed a "multi-sited, mobile ethnography" (p. 47) to not only capture practices that circulate among sites, but also to attune researchers to new developments in in-transit practices (p. 50).

While there are no singular methods attached to studying literacy and transfer across a lifespan (ethnography, interviews, discourse analysis, etc. are all viable), we include this approach to emphasize a benefit from viewing literacy throughout life stages. Bazerman et al. (2018) suggest several research orientations: "look to embodied acts of writing" (p. 8), "look to the medium of written languages" (p. 8), "look to contexts of participation" (p. 9), and "look to the historical and cultural catalysts of writing development" (p. 10). Brandt (2018) more specifically draws from literacy history interviews in combination with the work of Bronfenbrenner (1979, 2005) and others to show what life-course research might reveal about literacy development and transfer. Brandt opts for the construct and theoretical lineage of life-course over lifespan research because "life-course development research focuses on change and aging as continual, multidimensional and mutually influencing processes that are in analyzable relationships to processes and changes in wider environments" (p. 245). Bronfen-

brenner's work facilitates this approach and with an added dimension of what Brandt translates as "dispositions for writing development," which "often gather continuity and stability over time; yet they are ever-renewing coproductions of persons and their lifeworlds—constituted out of inner and outer resources, permeable, dynamic, and performative" (p. 262). Brandt references Gonzalez et al.'s (2006) work on funds of knowledge as an example of where researchers might notice developing and changing dispositions. As discussed earlier in this chapter, funds of knowledge treats family as a source of conscious and intuitive knowledge that is shared across and developed through interaction with immediate and extended members. Brandt suggests that we ask how this base grows over time, from what new encounters, and through what age and contextual changes. In fact, she suggests that

their [Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti] accounts force an expansion of what is considered transfer in writing, as not merely the ability to carry over writing experiences from one context to another or to translate background knowledge from one task to another but rather a more abstract ability to turn raw experience into 'structuring proclivities' for literacy learning and, indeed, textuality itself. (p. 265)

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM LITERACY STUDIES

From research presented in this chapter and beyond, literacy studies scholars have developed promising pedagogical approaches for bridging literacy between home or community and school, thus creating expanded opportunities for transfer. While specific pedagogical recommendations differ, all foreground writer agency and emphasize treating students' out-of-school worlds and repertoires as assets with bridging potential. The goal with each approach is to bring equity to the classroom: equity of opportunity to leverage out-of-school knowledge for in-school learning and equity for transfer potential.

"Cultural modeling" (Lee, 2001; Martínez et al., 2008; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008) encourages deep fidelity between students' cultural funds of knowledge and school-based assignments to activate prior knowledge for tasks such as reading and interpreting literature. For instance, Lee's (2001) work specifically serves African American students by connecting cultural knowledge, such as signify'n and playing

the dozens, to African American authors such as Zora Neale Hurston and Toni Morrison who use similar strategies in their writing. As she states, “the idea behind the Cultural Modeling Project is that African American English Vernacular offers a fertile bridge for scaffolding literary response, rather than a deficit to be overcome” (p. 101). The framework “matches” cultural knowledge—rhetorical and linguistic—to school-based readings and assignments to “make public and explicit knowledge of strategies that they routinely use that have been intuitive and implicit” (p. 101). Her work draws from rich scholarship in African American rhetorical and linguistic traditions (Smitherman, 1977) to create what she calls a “mental model” (drawn from Perkins, 1992) link between home and school literacies.

Lee’s model has been taken up by other educators in ways that model different cultural and ethnic groups’ linguistic and literate funds of knowledge. For instance, Orellana and Reynolds (2008) develop a framework for Latinx immigrants living in the Chicago area to account for the their bilingual immigrant experiences. Thus, in their case, they “focus on the skills that are required as children of Mexican immigrants negotiate across languages and cultures” (p. 50). As Orellana and Reynolds note, while they refer to this as the leveraging of funds of knowledge, other sociocultural literacy research would refer to this as practice for transfer (p. 50). But the goal of such transfer (or leveraging) is neither mere celebration nor direct application of skills. Rather, it’s to provide an environment for students to bring their comfort with translation to school contexts. Through cultural modeling, students learn to deliberately engage in the transformation of home and community knowledge when in new contexts; cultural modeling may even “cultivate hybrid abilities that merge different elements from students’ repertoires of practice as these elements are displayed across contexts, tasks, and relationships” (p. 50). For such an approach to succeed, there must be empirical work into how students experience their out-of-school communities; these are not instances of guessing at students’ prior knowledge.

“Third space” theories of teaching (Gutiérrez, 2008; Gutiérrez et al., 1995) develop pedagogies for an “increasingly complex, transnational, and hybrid world” (Gutiérrez, 2008, p. 148). Within this approach, all social interactions (all classroom dynamics) have the potential to transform from individualistic, sociocultural scripts into distinct ways of knowing that combine multiple dimensions and ex-

periences in third spaces. The formulation is no longer home versus school, but home *and* school as they interact (with an openness from both teacher and student) to generate new linguistic and literacy practices and identities. Third space theory—as with Dyson’s notion of transfer as a dynamic act of recontextualization within “collaboratively constructed events” (1999, p. 159) for “a negotiated transformation of *both* school and child worlds” (p. 166)—understands all discursive interaction as fundamentally social, heteroglossic, and intertextual. Likewise, these transformed social spaces—as third spaces—support “expansive learning” (Engeström, 1987), in which the students, teachers, and classroom systems are transformed. Thus, third space approaches (Gutiérrez et al., 1995) foster parity between in- and out-of-school practices and promote new sets of practices and values that benefit all learners. Transfer then, in this method, is the on-going recontextualization of prior knowledge through classroom interaction for the purposes of using out-of-school resources to create a “new sociocultural terrain” that shifts “what counts as knowledge and knowledge representation” (Gutiérrez et al., 1995, p. 445).

In addition to these more comprehensive “named” approaches, many scholars promote a more general approach to bridging that includes honoring and activating students’ histories, facilitating metacognitive understandings, and finding transfer routes through low- and high-stakes assignments where students are guided to use and transform their knowledge. Whether a teacher chooses a comprehensively developed pedagogy (e.g., cultural modeling or third space), or whether they work with more general practices for leveraging out-of-school experiences for transfer, they respect the multivariate socio-cultural influences that enrich writing.

CONCLUSION AND AVENUES FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

There continues to be a need for radical shifts in schools’ ideologies, curricula, and valuations of students’ funds of knowledge and out-of-school repertoires. This means first viewing students as active, capable, and adept individuals who bring agency and intention to classrooms. Of course, agency is not without its counter—structure—which is a big part of why we need these pedagogies in the first place. As Lorimer Leonard (2018) suggests, “the agency of literate valuation—who is in charge of determining what literacy is worth—is located not in in-

dividual migrants or in hegemonic institutions but in the social and economic values held by both” (p. 129). Such a structure-agency relationship has important implications for approaches to the transfer of writing-related knowledge in the classroom. It means that writers can and should reflect on, draw from, and develop metalinguistic and rhetorical awareness. It also means that teachers and administrators have a responsibility to identify structural barriers that deny students their full resources. As writing educators, we can redesign schools, curricula, and classrooms to help students bridge and use rather than leave behind and neglect their vast out-of-school lives, languages, and literacies. Realistically, it also means that agency cannot always overcome structure. Rather, it’s a state of on-going negotiation. Transfer, as collectively theorized within literacy studies, can be viewed similarly. Given that, the following theoretical and empirical insights serve as guidelines for how we might research and teach for the transfer of writing-related knowledge between in- and out-of-school contexts. Researchers and educators should consider the following when designing classrooms and curricula for transfer:

- Literacies are dynamic and practice-based in ways that change with factors such as context, purpose, time and place, cultural and linguistic resources and repertoires, and individual and community needs.
- Literacies are socially and historically situated and are impacted by multiple contextual variables that originated from an immediate context to larger shaping forces (e.g., economy, globalization, racialization, language ideologies).
- Literacies index social power relations and those relations are played out (often for the success or detriment of students) in and across in- and out-of-school domains.
- Schools should teach and attend to the linguistic and literate funds of knowledge for all students through some incorporation (broad or narrow) of culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) or culturally sustaining pedagogies. (Paris & Alim, 2017)
- Whether it’s empirical research into students’ households (Gonzalez et al., 2006) or discourse analytic work into students’ and their families’ brokering practices (Martínez et al., 2008), transfer can be enhanced through a locally developed literacy curriculum.

These suggestions connect to the work we covered in this chapter, which explored how people, practices, and repertoires traverse and are taken up across domains. But it is important to recognize that while this chapter focused primarily on transfer between in- and out-of-school settings, studies have also explored transfer of literacies across generations (Brandt, 2001; Prendergast, 2013; Rounsaville, 2017; Rumsey, 2009; Simon 2017); across religious, bureaucratic, and other non-school institutions (Brandt, 2001; Cushman, 1998; Lorimer Leonard, 2015; Vieira, 2011); through historical and archival studies of transfer and the extracurriculum (Gere, 1994; Peary, 2014); and across genres (Blommaert, 2008; Moss, 1994). These studies, like the ones included in this chapter, provide additional perspectives on how literacy transfer is imbricated in all dimensions of social life. Analysis and inclusion of diverse and multiple social factors in studies of writing-related transfer benefits all students and provides a more realistic view of what helps or hinders transfer.

REFERENCES

- Au, K. H. P. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11(2), 91–115.
- Bazerman, C., Applebee, A. N., Berninger, V. W., Brandt, D., Graham, S., Jeffery, J. V., & Matsuda, P. K. (2018). *The lifespan development of writing*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Blommaert, J. M. E. (2001). Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. *Discourse and Society*, 12(4), 413–449.
- Blommaert, J. (2008). *Grassroots literacy: Writing, identity and voice in Central Africa*. Routledge.
- Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brandt, D. (2018). Writing development and life-course development: The case of working adults. In C. Bazerman, A.N. Applebee, V. W. Berninger, D. Brandt, S. Graham, J. V. Jeffery, & P.K. Matsuda. (Eds.), *The lifespan development of writing* (pp. 244–271). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Sage.
- Courage, R. (1993). The interaction of public and private literacies. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(4), 484–496.

- Cushman, E. (1998). *The struggle and the tools: Oral and literate strategies in an inner city community*. SUNY Press.
- Dyson, A. H. (1993). *Social worlds of children: Learning to write in an urban primary school*. Teachers College Press.
- Dyson, A. H. (1997). *Writing superheroes: Contemporary childhood, popular culture, and classroom literacy*. Teachers College Press.
- Dyson, A. H. (1999). Transforming transfer: Unruly children, contrary texts, and the persistence of the pedagogical order. *Review of Research in Education*, 24(1), 141–171.
- Dyson, A. H. (2003). *The brothers and sisters learn to write: Popular literacies in childhood and school cultures*. Teachers College Press.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Genishi, C., & Dyson, A. H. (2009). *Children, language, and literacy: Diverse learners in diverse times*. Teachers College Press.
- Gere, A. R. (1994). Kitchen tables and rented rooms: The extracurriculum of composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(1), 75–92.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L.C. & Amanti, C. (Eds). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164.
- Gutiérrez, K., Rhymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445–471.
- Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 49–76.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4), 575–611.
- Kell, C. (2006). Crossing the margins: Literacy, semiotics, and the recontextualisation of meanings. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice* (pp. 147–172). Multilingual Matters.
- Kell, C. (2009). Literacy practices, text/s and meaning making across time and space. In M. Baynham & M. Prinsloo (Eds.), *The future of literacy studies* (pp. 75–99). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lee, C. D. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 97–141.

- Lorimer Leonard, R. (2015). Writing through bureaucracy: Migrant correspondence and managed mobility. *Written Communication*, 32(1), 87–113.
- Lorimer Leonard, R. (2018). *Writing on the move: Migrant women and the value of literacy*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Martínez R., Orellana, M.F., & Pacheco, M., & Carbone. (2008). Found in translation: Connecting translating experiences to academic writing. *Language Arts*, 85(6): 421–431.
- McCarty, T. L., Wallace, S., Lynch, R. H., & Benally, A. (1991). Classroom inquiry and Navajo learning styles: A call for reassessment. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 22(1), 42–59.
- McCarty, T. L., & Watahomigie, L. J. (2001). Language and literacy in American Indian and Alaskan Native communities. In E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 488–507). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin.
- Moll, L. C., & N. Gonzalez (2001). Lessons from research with language minority children. In E. Cushman, E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 156–171). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin.
- Moss, B. (1994). *Literacy across communities*. Hampton Press.
- Nordquist, B. (2017). *Literacy and mobility: Complexity, uncertainty, and agency at the nexus of high school and college*. Routledge.
- Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. F. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(1), 48–65.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Peary, A. (2014). Walls with a word count: The textrooms of the extracurriculum. *College Composition & Communication*, 66(1), 43–66.
- Perkins, D. N. (1992). *Smart schools: From training memories to educating minds*. The Free Press.
- Phillips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. Waveland Press.
- Prendergast, C. J. (2013). Or you don't: Talents, tendencies, and the pooka of literacy. *Enculturation*, 16. <http://enculturation.net/pooka-of-literacy>
- Prior, P. (1998/2013). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Prior, P. A., & Shipka, J. (2003). Chronotopic lamination: Tracing the contours of literate activity. In C. Bazerman, & D. Russell (Eds.), *Writing selves, writing societies: Research from activity perspectives* (pp. 180–238). (Perspectives on Writing). The WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity.
- Purcell-Gates, V. (2013). Literacy worlds of children of migrant farmworker communities participating in a migrant Head Start Program. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1): 68–97.

- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press.
- Roozen, K. (2008). Journalism, poetry, stand-up comedy, and academic literacy: Mapping the interplay of curricular and extracurricular literate activities. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 27(1), 5–34.
- Roozen, K. (2009). From journals to journalism: Tracing trajectories of literate development. *College Composition and Communication*, 60(3), 541–572.
- Roozen, K. (2010). Tracing trajectories of practice: Repurposing in one student's developing disciplinary writing processes. *Written Communication*, 27(3), 318–354.
- Roozen, K., & Erickson, J. (2017). *Expanding literate landscapes: Persons, practices, and sociohistoric perspectives of disciplinary development*. Computers and Composition Digital P/Utah State UP.
- Rounsaville, A. (2017). Genre repertoires from below: How one writer built and moved a writing life across generations, borders, and communities. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(3), 317–340.
- Rumsey, S. K. (2009). Heritage literacy: Adoption, adaptation, and alienation of multimodal literacy tools. *College Composition and Communication*, 60(3), 573–586.
- Schultz, K. (2002). Looking across space and time: Reconceptualizing literacy learning in and out of school. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36(3), 356–390.
- Simon, K. (2017). Daughters and learning from fathers: Migrant family literacies that mediate borders. *Literacy in Composition Studies*, 5(1), 1–20.
- Silverstein, M., & Urban, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. University of Chicago Press.
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Street, B. V. (Ed.). (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vieira, Kate. (2011). Undocumented in a documentary society: Textual borders and transnational religious literacies. *Writing in a Global Context. Spec. Issue of Written Communication*, (28)4, 436–461.
- Warren, B., Rosebery, A., & Conant, F. (1994). Discourse and social practice: Learning science in a language minority classroom. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 191–210). Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Harvard University Press.