A MATTER OF TIME AND MEMORY: A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF MEMORY FOR LIFESPAN WRITING RESEARCH

Joe Cirio
Stockton University

Jeff Naftzinger
Sacred Heart University

This chapter considers memory as a methodological concept, one that can clarify our relationship to the knowledge we seek to make about lifespan writing for interested researchers. If lifespan writing research is interested in "studying literacy development *over wider segments of time*" (Dippre and Phillips, 2020, p. 3, emphasis added), then *memory work*—the processes and products of remembrance—appears to be a necessary entry point to understand this expanse of (life)time. We specifically draw upon social theories of memory which approach the past as a shared text, one that is constantly being reshaped and revised given present needs. Given that lifespan writing research is interested in how writers negotiate their past and prior writing experiences, a focused consideration of memory as methodology provides perspective about the questions and epistemologies that go into such remembrance. However, although there have been efforts to rehabilitate the concept of memory in writing and rhetorical studies (e.g., Reynolds, 1993 and Horner, 2000), there has not yet been an articulation of how memory could operate as a methodological basis to guide writing and literacy research—both for lifespan writing research specifically and for composition theory more broadly.

In what follows, we first define the relationship that lifespan writing research has with inquiries of time. Establishing this relationship to time is important because it provides the justification to consider memory, which we define as the rhetorical process and product through which the past is constructed. We then propose five principles that forward our methodological framework. These principles are adapted from the assumptions for public

memory offered by Blair, Dickinson, and Ott (2010) in their introduction to *Places of Public Memory.* The principles that we articulate reimagine how Blair, Dickinson, and Ott's assumptions can serve to reframe the work in lifespan writing research and offer a basis for continued work in this area of research. The five principles are:

1. Memory is concerned with representations of the past for a present purpose.
2. Memory is a material, constructed, rhetorical process that is necessarily in flux, mutable, and porous.
3. Memory is cultural, collective, and inter-generational.
4. Memory is distributed cognition involving infrastructures and systems that support and impact memory processes.
5. Memory can address questions about "stickiness."

In each discussion, the principle is defined and situated within existing lifespan writing research. Particular attention is given to what a framework of memory can draw attention to: the processes and products of memory that researchers can seek from writers, the methods and techniques to gather information on the processes and products of memory, and the inquiries and knowledge that are possible from orienting towards memory.

WRITING THROUGH THE LIFESPANS: A MATTER OF TIME AND MEMORY

This inquiry into memory as methodology must begin with defining the relationship lifespan writing has with time. The focus on writing across the life*spans* directs inquiry towards people's literacy experiences through the expanse of life—or the literacy experiences "from cradle to grave" (Dippre & Phillips, 2020, p. 6). Lifespan writing research, then, is tethered to inquiries of time, particularly in the ways writers represent and imagine the moments and movements of literacy experience across a lifetime. The centrality of time is in part acknowledged in the first of eight principles offered by the Lifespan Writing Development Group (Bazerman et al., 2017). Namely, the authors emphasize that lifespan writing research attends to how writers across the lifespan draw upon, repurpose, and make use of their past and prior writing knowledge and experiences. The authors explain,

> As roles and responsibilities expand across the lifespan, people reconsolidate past learning while encountering new demands and challenges. How people are able (and invited) to bring

their writing pasts in new contexts provides a basis for further
writing development . . . . (Bazerman et al., 2017, p. 354)

Lifespan writing research poses compelling questions about how writers invoke and repurpose their *past* writing experiences; about what mechanism and materials activate and mobilize those *past* experiences; about how writers invoke the *past* to engage in a *present* writing task; about how we can prepare for *future* writing activities; and about how we preserve and make way for the recirculation of literacy objects for the *future*. The temporality of literacy experiences, in this sense, is the *object* of study in lifespan writing development: for writing-researcher and writing-subject alike, our gaze turns toward the movements and moments in time that collectively compose the writer and our writerly experiences. But if time is the object of study, then memory is the methodology.

Social frameworks of memory, influenced by social theorists like Maurice Halbwachs (1980), will often define memory in its relationship to time. Namely, that memory is the rhetorical product that is constructed to make sense of one's past. In their introduction to *Places of Public Memory*, Blair, Dickinson, and Ott (2010) describe an analogy posited by Halbwachs to understand memory in relationship to time, drawing a connection to the relationship between place and space:

Place : space :: memory : time

In other words, place is to space what memory is to time.[1] The authors explain,

If places are differentiated, named 'locales,' deployed in and deploying space, we might suggest that memories are differentiated, named 'events' marked for recognition from amid an undifferentiated temporal succession of occurrence. Both place and memory, from this point of view, are always rhetorical. They assume an identity precisely in being recognizable—as named, bordered, and invented in particular ways. They are rendered recognizable by symbolic, and often material, intervention. (Blair, Dickinson, & Ott, 2010, p. 24)

Time and the sequences of time are the resources for rhetorical knowledge—memory is the meaning-making process to make sense of time. Writing

---

1   This analogy likewise poses the possibility of *place* as a methodological concept for life-*wide* writing research. In other words, if lifewide refers to an interest in the "many social spheres that writers participate in" (Dippre & Phillips, 2020, p. 5-6), then place-based inquiries and metaphors of "wayfinding" (Alexander, Lunsford, & Whithaus, 2019) can describe how writers make sense of the expanse of "lifespaces."

knowledge might be understood as a stable-for-now or just-in-time assemblage of undifferentiated temporal resources: prior writing experiences, writing processes, writing beliefs, dispositions, knowledge, points of departure, and so on (Yancey, 2017). Writers activate, mobilize, and assemble these priors to engage in an immediate writing task. This is a process of memory, and memory assemblages are rhetorical actions.

Framing memory as a rhetorical process would also allow us to break away from understanding memory and the past as located within various cognitive functions; rather, the value of a public, collective approach to memory is its attention to representation which moves memory beyond simply a storage system within an individual's brain. Memory work, then, involves the construction of discursive, rhetorical products that reveal and facilitate shared ideology and shared social practices. Framing memory in this way, an attention to memory prompts methodological questions about what factors influence the *articulation* and the *becoming* of memory—or maybe more broadly, the articulation and becoming of the past.

Taken together, framing memory as both a rhetorical process and product of time provides an avenue to consider memory as a methodological framework, especially in the study of lifespan writing development where there is a particular interest in reflecting upon the convergences of past, present, and future. If this emergent area of research on lifespan writing has an interest in how writers—from cradle to grave—invoke and re-invoke their writing pasts to navigate writing presents and futures, then the processes and products of memory work become our entry point to begin that methodological inquiry.

FIVE PRINCIPLES OF METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF MEMORY

Our goal in proposing memory as a methodological framework is not to dramatically alter the way research into lifespan writing is conducted; rather, our interest is to flesh out a methodological orientation that appears already threaded in the work being produced in this area. The five principles we offer below function more as observations from research interested in writers' priors, including prior "processes, dispositions, beliefs, knowledge, and points of departure" (Yancey, 2017, p. 314). With them, we hope to articulate what a memory methodology can offer lifespan writing and composition studies given our particular interest and goals. Though the distinction between methodology and method has been notoriously slippery in writing research (Nickoson & Sheridan, 2012), we approach our methodological framework as a "theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed" (Harding, 1987, p. 2 qtd. in Schell, 2010,

p. 2). Our reference to this memory methodology as a "framework" has been deliberate since a frame functions to shape and unify an understanding of our circumstances. As Adler-Kassner and O'Neill (2010) describe, "the ideas of frames and framing can be applied to the constructions of what individuals and groups perceive to be realistic and feasible, or unrealistic and out of the realm of possibility" (p. 16). In articulating our methodological framework, we have sought to define what is possible and feasible in three areas of conducting research: *ontologically*, i.e., what is considered meaningful data?; *procedurally*, i.e., what methods or techniques can gather such meaningful data?; and *analytically*, i.e., what questions can such data answer for us? For each principle, we seek to address some of these three questions by pointing to extant research already circulating in lifespan writing scholarship as well as speculate at the kinds of data, methods, and questions that are possible if we frame our research under the banner of memory.

1. MEMORY IS CONCERNED WITH REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PAST FOR A PRESENT PURPOSE.

Though memory is focused on the past, it is a rhetorical process that we engage at a present moment in order to solve immediate problems. Blair, Dickinson, and Ott (2010) begin their assumptions on public memory with this very idea: memory work is rhetorical work, meaning that selecting and re-constructing aspects of the past can communicate for ourselves or others who we are at the current moment—the conditions, beliefs, ideologies, and goals. In lifespan writing scholarship, researchers will often rely on writers to reflect on their past and prior writing experiences to help us understand their development over time as a way to understand what has shaped their current literacy actions. In oral historical research, oral historians recognize that a narrator's testimony reveals something about their *relationship to the past* rather than a whole and accurate conduit to the past. In his foundational theoretical work on oral history, Alessandro Portelli (1981) notes that narrators of the past "tell us not just what people did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, and what they now think they did" (p. 99-100). In doing so, narrators are communicating something about what is presently valuable about the past and their relationship to it. For writing and literacy researchers, such thinking appears to be aligned with our particular interests: what are the literacy experiences and actions in a writer's development that have shaped who the writer is now and what they will do?

Procedurally, in writing research, researchers will invite writers to access their prior knowledge and experiences by engaging in some form of reflection, conceived by Yancey (1998) as a dialectical process that entails "casting backward to

see where we have been" and based on "what we know, what we have learned, and what we might understand" (p. 6). Yancey's conceptualization of reflection focuses on how the invocation of the past is goal-oriented and geared toward understanding something about who the writer is and where they are going—it bridges temporal concepts of past, present, and future. Roozen (2016) applies this concept through a method of reflective interviewing, through which a researcher uses a writer's own writing artifacts to stimulate the writer's recall and trace their literacy histories and motivations. Roozen makes clear how the past bridges into the present and future. Certainly, such reflective practices can offer researchers a "means of understanding a person's experiences with texts and textual practices from other times and places;" yet, he also notes how such invocations of the past also reveal what literacy practices are shaping the writer "in the immediate here and now of the ethnographic present" (p. 255). Inviting writers to reflect upon their past—whether with reflective interviewing, literacy narratives, textual personal narratives, or life-stories (Knappick, 2020) necessarily involves writers making sense of their literate lives. As Knappick notes, by "creating a coherent story, segmenting and ordering *their past*, research subjects are making sense of *their present*" (p. 68; emphasis added).

These techniques of collecting data on writers' development through reflection recognize the contingent and selective nature of this memory work. The methodological framework of memory values ambiguity as a necessary component to its work because such ambiguity invites analysis and interpretation about one's *link* to the past—and the material, social, and ideological contingencies that make that link possible. In engaging writers in these reconstructions of the past, we are not accessing a singular and "accurate" moment from a writer's life as we discuss their development. Instead, we're encountering a *reconstruction* of that memory that can reveal something about their relationship to that moment in the past and the current conditions that make that reconstruction possible.

2. MEMORY IS A MATERIAL, CONSTRUCTED, RHETORICAL PROCESS THAT IS NECESSARILY IN FLUX, MUTABLE, AND POROUS.

Memory is also an externalized, material practice that is supported by various memory objects, systems, and technologies. Memory theorist Jan Assmann (2008) explains that cultural memory operates as a kind of institution that is built and sustained through objects and materials that are "exteriorized, objectified, and stored away in symbolic forms" (p. 110). As he explains, "Things do not 'have' a memory of their own, but they may remind us, may trigger our memory, because they carry memories which we have invested into them, things such as dishes, feasts, rites, images, stories and other texts . . . ." (Assmann, p.

111). Assmann provides a way for us to explore the kinds of literacy artifacts, materials, and objects that are necessarily wrapped up in a writer's lifespan. If we want to have a full discussion about a writer's past and how they conjure and invoke that past, then we necessarily need to inquire into the kinds of literacy objects and materials that circulate in their literate practices.

Yet, objects are not always stable conduits of memory. Objects, like the memory work they can facilitate, are in flux, mutable, and porous. How we use certain objects, what meanings we attach to them, and how we relate to them might change depending on when and how we interact with them. For example, among the scenes of everyday writing discussed in Yancey et al. (2020) is a notebook from Bessie Dominick Suber, "poorly preserved with dates ranging from December 19, 1964 to November 4, 1979" (p. 17). The authors describe how the notebook is a dynamic intertext "which changed over the years as Bessie's life did" (p. 18). For Bessie, the notebook is a space of becoming where she can engage in reconstructing her identity and her relationship to her communities by returning to and revising this material document. Such a complex object does not represent a single moment or a clear set of sequences of development but, instead, represents layers of literacy experiences that the authors call an "a-chronological" "intertextual palimpsest" (p. 20). Though this notebook appears to be of particular complexity, it invites researchers to view any literacy object as intertextual palimpsests. In other words, literacy objects like these will change as they move through time and space. As they are witness to these passages of time, they change as they are written in, revised, grafted, or stored with other objects, yellowed and damaged with age, or become lost completely. And likewise, the memories associated with these objects are capable of manipulation, of getting lost, of degrading, of being repaired, of being hidden or displayed, and of being shaped by the situations in which they are recalled.

In research on writers' lifespan development, several methods and techniques of gathering data have engaged writers in discussing and reflecting upon materials and objects to help in their recall. In Bowen's (2020) literacy tours, for example, participants lead Bowen through the spaces where they engage in literate activity and highlight objects that point towards the "role of materiality in literacy development" (p. 116). These literacy tours involve a wide variety of literacy objects and materials: "predictably literacy-related objects, such as books, computers, writing instruments, and notebooks, as well as less obviously literacy-related artifacts: photographs, chairs, maps, model vehicles, clocks, and other objects" (Bowen, 2020, p. 117). As they point out the materials that play a role in their literate activity, they are necessarily invoking and constructing their past and prior experiences and negotiating the public memories surrounding those objects.

Writers' literate lives are inextricably entwined with resources, materials, objects, and technologies that anchor and give shape to our literacy development. Researchers' engagement with these objects—these companions to literate lives—is rhetorical memory work. Such objects can operate as prisms that can shape how a writer articulates and reflects upon their past literacy experiences.

3. MEMORY IS CULTURAL, COLLECTIVE, AND INTERGENERATIONAL.

In framing memory as "exteriorized, objectified, and stored away" (Assmann, 2008, p. 111), we can begin to consider memory as collective—as something that groups can share and, both figuratively and literally, pass on to others. Objects, as Assmann claims, have a certain degree of stability and "may be transferred from one situation to another and transmitted from one generation to another" (p. 111). Objects carry with them common ritual that groups can share in re-enacting or common practices that are re-produced across different individuals and people. These objects thus become a point of convergence to orient groups together and form a common, collective sensibility.

This orientation is illustrated by White-Farnham's (2014) concept of *rhetorical heirlooms* where writing practices and genres are passed down, inherited, and repeated from generation to generation. White-Farnham offers the "household literacy practices" of Edna who mediates her life through "writing recipes, planning meals, writing grocery lists, and maintaining a budget;" yet these writing practices also "reflect and perpetuate values central to Edna's family life, such as their Italian heritage and eating meals together" (p. 210). The re-use and re-creation of these household literacy practices operate as ritual, repeated practices that can link the present to the past and link the individual with the collective. Ritual practices like these rhetorical heirlooms are memory work; these textual objects and rituals serve to define our relationship to our shared past and navigate our shared present.

Ritual can also serve as a particular technique of research—as a mode of knowledge-making through re-inhabiting or re-playing the movements and behaviors of another as a way to gain a view from their particular perspective. Shipka (2021), for example, uses repeated practice to form a bridge between herself and a couple named Dorothy and Fred, ordinary people whose boxes of memoria were bought by Shipka at a yard sale. Shipka describes being moved to "try to understand something of these strangers' lives, relationship, and experience while adding to and reflecting on my own" (p. 114). Her method of seeking this connection was through re-staging and re-tracing a trip, documented

in Dorothy's travel diaries, that Dorothy and Fred made from Baltimore to St. Louis in the summer of 1963. As Shipka (2021) explains:

> While my partner and I based our movements on those of strangers, we inevitably transformed that trip, making it our own—populating it with our own rhythms, histories, and intentions. In this way, their experiences, practices, and memories became folded into, and thus transformed, our own. (p. 114)

Like memory work more broadly, ritual is not a perfect gateway to the past—it is not that Shipka retraces the trip to form a whole and accurate account of this experience from 1963; rather, Shipka sought to form a relationship to the past and, in particular, these people she never met. Retracing this trip allowed Shipka a new perspective on who this couple was—not necessarily as a project for preservation, but to collaborate with the dead "to learn how the past might 'break through into the present in surprising ways'" (Cresswell 2010, p. 19, qtd. in Shipka, 2021, p. 115).

Shipka demonstrates a compelling method of collaborating across generations of dead and not-yet-born—working across documents and memoria to recreate and retrace a past experience which could, in turn, be recreated in the future. The implication of such a process is that some sensibility, affect, and/or knowledge is being handed off, generation after generation.

Shipka does not speak directly to what exactly such re-staging and re-tracing *does*, yet there are certainly deeper implications to these ritual practices in terms of circulating particular ideologies. Consider, for instance, an historical inquiry from Fullmer (2012) into typewriter technologies in the early 20th century. As he observes, the typewriter was used in the classroom to reinforce and recreate a formalist writing pedagogy and the typewriter itself "provides a means of 'standardized' and 'form-alized' writing" (p. 60). As a technology, the typewriter is imbued with a particular ideology through the rituals and practices that we attach to them *in the classroom*. But Fullmer observes how these same ideologies moved into the *household* as typewriters became a common household appliance and these efforts "seemed suppressed by the mechanical constraints of the typewriter and the form-alist pedagogy" that framed its use (p. 69). Fullmer's example demonstrates the deeper implications of a ritual literacy practice centered around a literacy object: they circulate particular ideologies, even harmful ones, as these objects move through various spaces in life. And while the typewriter is distributed across individual homes, the ritual practices are nonetheless shared and collected which influence the way writers act and frame writing as a collective.

White-Farnham, Shipka, and Fullmer exemplify the ways that ritual, repeated practice can have the dual function of tethering past to present (and future) and individual to collective. Thus, memory work operates not simply at the

nexus of temporal questions of representing past, present, and future—it also simultaneously operates to conjure and build a *shared* past, present, and future. This principle of memory, then, can help us extend our research beyond thinking about writing development as involving a single lifespan and can instead help us think about development across *lifespans* and the ways in which these shared processes or collective connections can shape that development.

4. MEMORY IS DISTRIBUTED COGNITION INVOLVING INFRASTRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS THAT SUPPORT AND IMPACT MEMORY PROCESSES.

As we work with social and material approaches to memory, our attention must necessarily include the relationship between the process of remembrance and the systems of objects, materials, and environments that are necessarily part of that process. Scholars researching memory, like Derek Van Ittersum (2009), have offered distributed cognition as a model to understand memory and the ways that externalized systems of materials augment the capacity of an individual's memory. Framing lifespan writing research in the context of memory frameworks can help us develop inquiries into the ways writers exist and construct environments, systems, or infrastructures that invoke particular kinds of prior writing knowledge and thus affect literacy. When we understand memory as distributed cognition, then we might frame memory not simply as something we invoke, but rather something we can *inhabit.* Memory may operate similarly to what Johnson-Eilola (2004) refers to as the datacloud, the environments or spaces that information workers inhabit in order to "work with information, rearranging, filtering, breaking down, and combining" (p. 4). These spaces go beyond simply information stored on a computer (read: computer memory); they also extend to environments that include a variety of technologies and tools to mediate the composing process. The datacloud offers a compelling parallel to memory work where writers construct environments that render certain kinds of remembrance—and likewise certain kinds of literacy—possible.

Some of the possibilities in observing the relationship between memory, environment, and literacy—and the benefits of these observations for lifespan writing research—can be seen in Jacob Craig's (2019) research into the "writing sanctuaries" that writers construct to support their writing processes. One participant of Craig's study, Maggie, sought to recreate a workflow environment that echoed that of her childhood despite being in a new location and faced with new, college-level writing tasks. Craig writes that Maggie

> [n]ot only found focus as she had in childhood and mitigat-
> ed the stress of the writing task as she had on the couch in

> her first apartment, she 'felt creative,' realizing the affective
> potential of her mobile sanctuary to help her invent dis-
> course. (n.p.)

Maggie's experiences demonstrate a compelling link between a writer's prior writing knowledge and the writing environments that they construct. Maggie's re-creation of a childhood writing sanctuary allowed her an avenue to a writing past in order to accomplish an immediate goal. Such writing sanctuaries offer a material space for research inquiry in lifespan development: not simply what objects and materials exist in that space, but how it's arranged and facilitates a writer's work flow.

Craig's work aligns well with inquiries posed by social memory theorists like Olick (2007) who, likewise, understands memory as distributed across a collection of representations and symbols; yet he notes that memory researchers attend particularly to publicly available resources of remembrance. Specifically, memory inquiries must necessarily involve attention to "what symbols and words were available to [people] in which times and places and hence with how those cultural frameworks are prior to, and thus shape, their intentions" (Olick, 2007, p. 7). Olick pushes us to consider questions of accessibility and availability of materials and technologies of remembrance—as well as the barriers and gateways that make certain resources accessible. In other words, we should consider how the objects and technologies that augment and enhance human memory can also define the bandwidth of what's possible by defining how that memory is accessed: what can be remembered and what is supposed to be forgotten? These regimes of remembering and forgetting are what Nathan Johnson (2020) has referred to as memory infrastructures. These memory infrastructures are not simply environments that individuals can construct; rather, it refers to the institutional forces involved in designing what is remembered for a public. Johnson offers examples of libraries and archives that use systems of selection and documentation, labor forces, and often institutional and hegemonic imperatives that, according to Johnson, "do not merely document pieces of the past; they anchor, shape, and compose remembering and forgetting" (p. 15).

5. Memory Can Address Questions About "Stickiness."

A methodology of memory also allows attention to questions about what sticks, which is particularly salient for writing researchers because it addresses what kinds of writing knowledge, experiences, and practices find resonance with our students: what is going to be remembered? What is kept, what is recirculated, and what is transferred from one context to the next? What's going to be invoked

by students in the future and why? Invoking "student" is deliberate since the teaching of writing often forms the center of our disciplinary work. For many of us, educational institutions are our dominion: it's where we work, it's where we regularly share and circulate our knowledge, and is often the site of our research and where we *make* our knowledge about writing. But in terms of a lifespan, K-12 and college education are only a relatively brief and transitional moment in the life of a writer; however, school literacies remain deeply embedded in writers' approaches to writing in the lifespan. Barton and Hamilton (2012) remark that they had assumed that their study of the literacy activities of everyday people in Lancaster, UK would uncover a "distinct home literacy which could be contrasted with work literacy or school literacy," but instead, they discovered how work, school, and home literacies "mingle together" in the home (p. 188). Since school can so often be a sticking point for writers, the question of *what sticks* occupies a great deal of attention for researcher-educators: if we only have a handful of brief moments to engage students in writing knowledge, then we really need to think about what sticks and what is going to be remembered. Stickiness, in this sense, frames memory as both a question directed to the present (What prior experiences or knowledge will a writer uptake in a given moment?) and future (What will resonate?).

Researchers in the transfer of writing knowledge have sought to address this question of stickiness. The teaching for transfer curriculum, for instance, from Yancey, Taczak, and Robertson (2014), seeks to address how we, as teachers, "can help students develop writing knowledge and practices that they can draw upon, use, and repurpose, for new writing tasks in new settings" (p. 2). But even before we point to the future, we already know the major writing knowledge that sticks with our students. Wardle (2012) has noted the ways students' learning dispositions are a reflection of the institution of which they are a product. And specifically, the over-reliance of standardized testing and the corresponding culture of such testing creates an environment that socializes students in a way that limits "the kinds of thinking that students and citizens have the tools to do" (Wardle, 2012, n.p.). In demonstration of the impact of such socialization of writing knowledge, research from Cirio (2019) underscores Wardle's conclusions: students in Cirio's study on classroom rubric negotiation had drawn upon their previous experiences with rubrics that they were already familiar with and would offer rubric criteria that teachers had hoped to disrupt in negotiating the rubric. Put simply, certain writing knowledge is, indeed, sticking with students as they move through the education system and move beyond it—yet it appears that not all that writing knowledge is particularly useful for students and may misinform them about how writing works as they move in new, unfamiliar writing situations.

These are concerns of memory. Rounsaville (2012), in fact, argues that the focus on "uptake" in research on writing transfer is dealing with the complexities of memory work. Uptake, for Rounsaville, provides a language and frame to describe how knowledge transfer is a process of *selection* and *translation* of "heterogeneous and even contradictory memories" (n.p.). Rounsaville recognizes that prior writing knowledge and experiences are invoked to solve new, unfamiliar writing problems; namely, "past experiences serve as platforms and interpretive frames for solving problems of new and unfamiliar genres and are recalled precisely because of the task at hand" (n.p.). An attention to uptake would invite researchers to "trace and track those memories within textual and generic systems that are grounded in the student's own writing logic" (n.p). In this sense, uptake draws attention to the interfaces that make certain connections to the past possible—or not. Rounsaville discusses John, a first-year student who had trouble linking his past writing experiences in a college preparatory school with an assignment in his first-year writing course. Although John was able to point to a variety of past writing experiences and complex writing practices (e.g., the role of scholarly texts in academic writing), he was unable to bridge those experiences in a meaningful way to a particular writing task in first-year writing. As an issue of stickiness, John demonstrates how even complex and useful prior writing experiences may not always stick or be taken up to solve a particular problem.

Educational institutions and specifically our classrooms, then, operate in much the way that Johnson (2020) describes memory infrastructures. In that sense, certain writing experiences appear particularly salient for students and, by design, define the scope of what's possible in the future. Yet, students also have rich, literate lives both in and out of a writing classroom, so a memory methodology can address the kinds of writing that are most useful for our students and how educators design regimes of remembering and forgetting that can prescribe certain kinds of knowledge. Put another way, memory methodology poses inquiries into how we create stickiness, how we invoke particular kinds of uptake, and how we can trace futurity, but not simply as educators, as researchers. Memory methodology invites researchers to consider the writing knowledge and prior experiences that writers carried with them and why.

CONCLUSION

Our intention with offering a methodological framework of memory was to identify and describe a thread that we believe was already embedded in lifespan writing research. As we have forwarded, memory can describe (a) a process of invoking, reconstructing, and remembering the past; and (b) the material, rhetorical products that construct the past. Memory's relationship to the past

appears well suited to provide a unifying methodological framework to lifespan development research since this emergent field of study seeks to understand how the prior experiences of a writer's life(time) is constitutive of their current writing practices. The lifespan perspective is unique in its consideration of a writer's movement through time and how they make sense of such development over time. In that sense, memory is something that's always being engaged in the research process. And framing the research process under the banner of memory can offer a scope of (a) the kinds of data to collect that can speak to writers' priors, (b) what methods to use in order to collect that data, and (c) what questions such past-oriented data can address for us.

Drawing upon rhetorical and social approaches to memory offered an understanding of the materiality of memory: that memory is mediated by *things* that have a relationship with or have some tether to a shared past. For lifespan writing research, exteriorizing memory as material *things* is necessary for the research process since representations of the past are the basis of our data. And like any *thing* of memory, what we encounter as researchers can be collected, selected, constructed, arranged, shared, circulated, destroyed. But most importantly, these things move through time and shift as they encounter the social and material world. These things of memory are companions to one's life, witnesses to one's past, and an insight into one's development. Likewise, these things can be touchstones to writers' pasts as well as touchstones to their collective communities. With a rhetorical-material approach to memory, lifespan development research's interest in wider segments of time can go beyond simply the individual writer and extend outwards to the multi-generational collective.

We've also observed how existing research in lifespan writing already engages techniques of data collection that align with a memory framework. Methods like document-based, reflective interviews (Roozen, 2016) and literacy tours (Bowen, 2020) use objects, tied to one's prior writing experiences, to, in part, stimulate a writer's recall. But even those methods go beyond simply recalling one's past and instead, work towards bridging how the writer's prior writing development informs their current literacy knowledge and practices. And methods like Knappick's (2020) literacy narratives explicitly understand such narratives as revealing more about one's present and immediate circumstances, even if it's pointed to the writer's past. We've also noted the possibilities of less conventional techniques such as ritual as a method of knowledge-making: Shipka (2021) reimagines a researcher's relationship to the memory objects they may encounter, even from everyday or personal archives like estate sales or your attic. A researcher can gain insight into a collective literacy experience by recreating and re-inhabiting the movements of complete strangers, accessed through the literacy materials they've left behind. Our principles also open questions about

the site of our research, whether the ways writers construct and inhabit writerly pasts (see Craig, 2019) or different kinds of archives of literacy objects. Johnson (2020), in particular, invites conversations about how regimes of remembrance, like archives, can reveal *what* a community remembers about their past and *how* that community should remember that past.

Turning toward the future of lifespan writing research, we believe a memory framework can reorient the kinds of questions that we can seek to answer through the collection of data oriented towards one's past. Just as a theorist of public memory will seek to understand the social function of monuments in public space, lifespan writing researchers might turn our attention to what we believe our "monuments to literacy" may be and what that may mean. And here we mean "monuments" literally: what are those material things that unify communities of writers? How are those things tied to a shared past? How do these things bring a writer's past to bear on their literacy practices and writing knowledge? How are those things constructed and responsive to various social, cultural, and collective entanglements? The frame of memory that we've proposed prioritizes questions that recognize literacy development as constelled in communities, as grounded in materiality, and as rhetorically constitutive.

Like any methodological approach, our framework provides only a beginning, a prospectus about what is possible in our understandings of lifespan writing. We have offered a point of departure from which we believe all lifespan writing research can branch: an orientation towards wider segments of time and the multiple ways writers conjure and make sense of those literacy moments and movements through a constellation of lifetimes.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, L., & O'Neill, P. (2010). *Reframing writing assessment to improve teaching and learning*. Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgrtq

Alexander, J., Lunsford K., & Whithaus, C. (2019). Toward wayfinding: A metaphor for understanding writing experiences. *Written Communication, 37(1),* 104-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319882325

Assmann, J. (2008). Communicative and cultural memory. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook* (pp. 109-118). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207262.2.109

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M., (2012). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203125106

Bazerman, C., Applebee, A. N., Berninger, V. W., Brandt, D., Graham, S., Matsuda, P. K., Murphy, S., Rowe, D. W., & Schleppegrell, M. (2017). Taking the long view on writing development. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*, 351-360. https://doi.org/10.58680/rte201728980

Bowen, L. M. (2020). Literacy tours and material matters: Principles for studying the literate lives of older adults. In R. J. Dippre & T. Phillips (Eds.), *Approaches to lifespan writing research: Generating an actionable coherence* (pp. 111-125). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.1053.2.07

Blair, C., Dickinson, G., & Ott. B. L. (2010). Introduction. In G. Dickinson, C. Blair, & B. L. Ott (Eds.), *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials* (pp. 1-55). University of Alabama Press.

Cirio, J. (2019). Meeting the promise of negotiation: Situation negotiated rubrics with students' prior experiences. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 42*(2), 100-118.

Craig, J. (2019). Affective materialities: Places, technologies, and development of writing processes. *Composition Forum, 41.*

Dippre, R. J., & Phillips, T. (2020). Generating murmurations for an actionable coherence. In R. J. Dippre & T. Phillips (Eds.), *Approaches to lifespan writing research: Generating an actionable coherence* (pp. 3-11). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.1053.1.3

Fullmer, S. (2012). "The next takes the machine": Typewriter technology and the transformation of teaching. In S. Borrowman (Ed.), *On the blunt edge: Technology in composition's history and pedagogy* (pp. 52-71). Parlor Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row. (Original work published 1950)

Horner, W. B. (2000). Reinventing memory and delivery. In M. D. Goggin (Ed.), *Inventing a discipline: Rhetoric scholarship in honor of Richard E. Young* (pp. 173-184). National Council of Teachers of English.

Johnson-Eilola, J. (2004). *Datacloud: Toward a new theory of online work.* Hampton Press.

Johnson, N. (2020). *Architects of memory: Information and rhetoric in a networked archival age.* University of Alabama Press.

Knappick, M. (2020). Making sense of a person's literate life: Literacy narratives in a 100-year-study on literacy development. In R. J. Dippre & T. Phillips (Eds.), *Approaches to lifespan writing research: Generating an actionable coherence* (pp. 67-80). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.1053.2.04

Nickoson, L., & Sheridan, M.P. (2012). *Writing studies research in Practice*: *Methods and methodologies.* (1st ed.). Southern Illinois University Press.

Olick, J. K. (2007). *The politics of regret: On collective memory and historical responsibility.* Routledge.

Portelli, A. (1981). The peculiarities of oral history. *History Workshop Journal, 12*(1), 96-10. https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/12.1.96

Reynolds, J. F. (1993). Memory issues in composition studies. In J. F. Reynolds (Ed.), *Rhetorical memory and delivery: Classical concepts for contemporary composition and communication* (pp. 1-16). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roozen, K. (2016). Reflective interviewing: Methodological moves for tracing tacit knowledge and challenging chronotopic representations. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 250-268). Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.7330/9781607325161.c012

Rounsaville, A. (2012). Selecting genres for transfer: The role of uptake in students' antecedent genre knowledge. *Composition Forum, 26.*

Schell, E. E. (2010). Introduction: Researching feminist rhetorical methods and methodologies. In E. E. Schell & K. J. Rawson (Eds.), *Rhetorica in motion: Feminist rhetorical methods and methodologies.* (pp. 1-22). The University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vkff8.5

Shipka, J. (2021). Rethinking past, present, presence: On the process of mobilizing other people's lives. In B. Horner, M. F. Hartline, A. Kumari, & L. S. Matravers (Eds.), *Mobility work in composition* (pp. 112-126). Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646420209.c007

Van Ittersum, D. (2009). Distributing memory: Rhetorical work in digital environments. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 18*(3), 259-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250902942026

Wardle, E. (2012). Creative repurposing for expansive learning: Considering "problem-exploring" and "answer-getting" dispositions in individuals and fields. *Composition Forum, 26.*

White-Farnham, J. (2014). "Revising the menu to fit the budget": Grocery lists and other rhetorical heirlooms. *College English, 76*(3), 208-226. https://doi.org/10.58680/ce201424523

Yancey, K. B. (1998). *Reflection in the writing classroom.* Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt46nsh0.9

Yancey, K. B. (2017). Mapping the prior: A beginning typology and its impact on writing. In P. Portanova, J. M. Rifenburg, & D. Roen (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on cognition and writing* (pp. 313-330). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2017.0032.2.16

Yancey, K. B., Cirio, J., Naftzinger, J., & Workman, E. (2020). Notebooks, annotations, and tweets: Defining everyday writing through a common Lens. *South Atlantic Review, 85*(2), 7–34.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing.* Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wrr95