

Recalibrating Confusion: Reflections on My Hybrid ALP's Deictic Center

John Paul Tassoni

ABSTRACT: This narrative essay describes a basic writing instructor's engagement with student confusion in a hybrid Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) course. The story examines the ways confusion can mark sites of engagement for students and teachers and how ALP courses, in particular, might mediate effective (and ineffective) forms of confusion.

KEYWORDS: Accelerated Learning Program (ALP), Confusion, Pandemic, basic writing, Sites of Engagement

Introduction

Along with other instructors in this time of COVID-19 (see Malesic; see also McMurtrie), I recently experienced maybe my worst semester ever. I'm talking about the 2021-2022 school year, the term in which I taught the second iteration of what had been (I thought) a carefully configured Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) offering. In respect to social distancing, I set up this hybrid, mainstreamed basic writing (BW) class so that students could complete the asynchronous version of our open-access division's first-year composition (FYC) course, engage with portions of our online Studio offering, and meet with me (masks required!) once per week in hour-long, small-group sessions. Conceptually, then, students would experience the FYC curriculum, asynchronously share their reflections on this curriculum via the Studio component, and then gather with several other class members and their instructor to talk over anything that anyone felt needed talking over.

John Paul Tassoni is Professor of English/Languages, Literatures, and Writing at Miami University. He has just completed a 15-year term as editor-in-chief for *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning* and previously served as the founding co-editor of *Open Words: Access and English Studies*. Along with *Journal of Basic Writing*, his work appears in journals such as *Assessing Writing*, *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, *Writing on the Edge*, *Journal of Teaching Writing*, and *College Composition and Communication*.

© Journal of Basic Writing, Vol. 43, No. 1 2024

As viable as I believe this ALP model to be (the first iteration's students, in fall 2020, performed quite well), I regret to report that many class members in this second cohort frequently missed the small-group sessions, and whenever anyone did attend, we often ended up staring at one another as if we were all somehow in Zoom boxes, cameras off and muted (see Malesic). Far more than the usual number of students habitually left assignments uncompleted, submitted them weeks after their due dates, and approached them in ways I had not heretofore imagined. Never before in my 35-year career had I found myself turning from submission to submission with such a sense of dumbfoundedness. "No!," I would cry aloud, and then "Nooo!," and then "Oh, Nooooo!!!"

As Mina Shaughnessy would advise all BW instructors, I used these moments to sound the depths (236), to figure out why my students might be doing what they were doing and what I might do differently. As I would with any course, I used my soundings to revise this hybrid class in the midst of the semester—defined terms more thoroughly on the Canvas site, provided more rationale, made changes in the wake of whatever had just occurred and in anticipation of whatever missteps I sensed lay ahead. In regard to this particular ALP class, though, it occurred to me that I could try all I want to create a coherent curricular narrative, hyperlink to my soul's content, but nothing was going to prevent a good number of students from perceiving a gap in that narrative, imposing a meaning of their own, or neglecting to click a link altogether. Because of consistent questioning from one student, however, a student I'll call Di, I came to realize that what I instead should favor is not curricular clarity (much as I still try) but rather expressions of confusion: those times/places in which my students find conflict with course guidelines and expectations, email me or say to me, "I'm confused." I've come to see how this one student's regular and frequent expressions of confusion across our ALP course's many instructional modalities provided for us a site of engagement with course matters; at the same time, Di's questioning threw into relief for me ways that ALPs (online and hybrid versions in particular) might themselves mediate confusion.

Reflecting on my response to Di's questions in this hybrid ALP course, I am reminded of how much teachers, BW teachers especially, need to appreciate expressions of confusion for what they often are: signs of students' engagement, where aspects of writing instruction and students' experiences with that instruction come into conflict in real time. I recall, among others, Min-Zhan Lu's arguments as to how conflict and struggle do not represent enemies to BW but rather constructive forces (888). Rather than instantly

work to eradicate expressions of confusion, to swiftly take students to another round of written guidelines, mini-lectures, unanticipated interpretations, and hyperlinks, I've come to see expressions of confusion as a deictic center (not as disarray), and I think this view of confusion speaks to ALP's future in virtual and hybrid spaces as well as to ways an ALP itself might productively mediate confusion.

A deictic center is the linguistic point of reference upon which a spatial relationship is established (see Holmes). My student's expressions of confusion, I believe, became just such a center for us in relation to all the *up ahead's*, *back there's*, *back then's*, and *over there's* that our ALP comprised. Confusion signaled for me a (dis)orientation in regard to curricula arranged along multiple time/space stations (see de Saint Georges 156-157), and Di's articulation of confusion seemed to provide us both with a sense of *here and now* in relation to them all, a *here and now* that helped us consider where we had come from and where we might go. In the reflective essay below, I channel the confusion that my student's expressions of confusion spurred in me in regard to our ALP course. I highlight the sorts of complexities that confusion represents and, in my concluding section, use them to speak to aspects of ALP that might facilitate and other aspects of ALP that might curtail students' productive engagement with writing instruction.

Di Raises Her Hand

Due to various, ongoing issues, Di often cannot join her in-person, small-group sessions. Almost weekly, she asks to compensate for her absences through one-on-one Zoom sessions, and given the pandemic conditions, I make every effort to oblige. Over the course of this semester, she will attend only two in-class meetings, but she and I will hold 11 virtual sessions. It is during maybe our fifth or sixth Zoom meeting when I point out to Di that I have started smiling whenever she says "I'm confused." I share with her ways I've been playing with "confusion"'s etymology, especially as it relates to actions like "bringing to ruin" or "mixing or mingling together" ("Confuse"). I let her know that my take on these meanings (one where confusion is shared, mutual) helps me wonder where her prior knowledge/expectations might mix with and/or bring to ruin assumptions (hers/mine) shaping the curricula in our hybrid course. I suggest to Di that she is not confused because she doesn't know things; she is confused because she does know things, things that don't always sync with our course's guidelines. Di agrees, and her articulations of confusion become the point at which I try to

orient us in regard to the (dis)array of assignments, expectations, deadlines, webpages, goals, and assumptions that constitute our ALP class.

As my Zoom calls with Di accumulate and new questions come up, new inquiries beginning with “I’m confused,” the more I notice we both now are smiling. I’m focused on my conversations with Di here, frankly, because unlike most others in her cohort, she often volunteers questions (in Zoom sessions, over email, in her Studio and FYC posts) about the nature of assignments—she is very much engaged in very discernible ways. Not only will we meet for these 11 Zoom sessions, we will also exchange over 170 emails during this school term (scheduling or rescheduling meeting times, affirming due dates, clarifying expectations, reporting on progress, offering directions as to where submissions and resources might be found, conjecturing as to when drafts might be graded and returned, expressing confusion, etc.). Our course is basically online, so she doesn’t always get to raise her hand in class, but for the sake of my discussion here, I’d like you to imagine always this one student raising her hand.

Thinking of Di and the frequency and nature of her questions, I focus (momentarily) not on what I’d consider the kind of confusion you see over a threshold concept, where students are abandoning old ways of thinking for something new and vital (Meyer and Land 1). I first see Di’s expressions of confusion, rather, as moments where guidelines are not interpreted in expected ways, where a curriculum for a moment derails. When Di asks me questions, she does not seem to be, at least not on the surface, grappling with a concept known to be complex but rather one that I (and colleagues who helped design our asynchronous FYC and Studio offerings) assumed to be a given. However, after thinking more about this, I can’t for sure say this distinction holds true. In other words, I’m not sure where my guidelines necessarily end and the concepts of college writing begin, especially for the students referred to our BW offerings, students whose ACT scores in reading and writing, writing samples, and/or previous GPAs project a bumpy transition to college work.

“I’m confused by what this assignment means by ‘revise.’ Where is that supposed to go?”; “I’m confused by what these directions mean by ‘proposal.’ This is a revision, right?”; “I’m confused—I thought that what I wrote was the ‘outline’”; “I’m confused why there’s a summary in that bibliography but that you didn’t want summaries in this bibliography”: “I talked about ethos, pathos, logos; I’m confused why you say not to”; “I’m confused why I have to keep writing about the same topic. Can’t I research something else?”: with questions like these, Di very much seems to be grappling with

the gate itself, with the course guidelines, but at the same time, I'm thinking she also may be paused at some key concept—a concept involving process, research, terminology, or genre. I've come to see ways concepts in college writing likely mix in moments such as this with students' prior educational experience: revision might be integral to the writing process, but a revised draft is something that needs to be posted somewhere; annotations serve a purpose in the writing process, but they don't always manifest as something graded; key vocabularies provide for a conscious orchestration of rhetorical moves, but not all assignments ask that that consciousness be articulated; extended research assignments help familiarize students with more nuanced approaches to content and scholarly sources, but this extension doesn't necessarily align with the autonomy student writers might desire in their college careers. Concepts in college writing do not exist here independent of the course in which a student is enrolled; a student's development as a writer mingles with their efforts to stay on board the train that is a curricular narrative. Luckily for us, Di does not hesitate to pull the request cord, to let us know when it's time to step off for a bit, share our understandings and intentions, recalibrate our destination(s). Confusion might very well be an emotion that an individual feels, but its expression is also a social act signaling a mix of forces: Di, the curricula, and I are all in this together, this confusion.

Di and her cohort often interpret the guidelines to exercises in ways our design team did not anticipate. I read her classmates' online submissions and in-class silence and believe very much these students are confused, but I don't know if they know they are confused. I wish they did feel confusion, wish they were more like Di. I've got Di's "I'm confused" in my head and project that onto others in the class. I claim they are confused, but they rarely express to me a sense of confusion. Rather, I am making a value judgment—"You are confused. You are mixing something here, although I'm not sure what. You are bringing to ruin my carefully laid plans for this exercise. Will you please tell me that you're confused? Can you please feel confused?" In multiple ways, I say this much in class (and in multiple emails to individual students), beg for confusion, but on some symbolic plain, I've left myself muted, camera off. I've got to wonder—are students really confused in these moments that I declare them confused? Are they rather acting with confidence, perhaps ballasted by prior experiences that they've imported to our course sites and that override our curricula? Have they just confused us, their teachers, brought to ruin our belief in coherent lesson plans and our unexamined assumptions about students as some "mythical average norm" (Ostroff 1.9)? When I think in terms of demographics, of the underserved

student populations so often overrepresented in our BW offerings, our course design team's assumptions here, our failures to anticipate or invite mingling/mixing, our resistance to ruin, all signal exclusionary practices. What was it we hoped would remain pure and stable, unconfused?

The online curriculum has already been mapped out, even to some extent the Studio component as well, and these students who remain on board appear content to stumble somnambulistically or, perhaps, as Cheryl Hogue Smith might say, anesthetically ("Interrogating" 64) down what looks to be a "sequentially graded curricular path" (Prior), one online assignment at a time: complete an exercise, respond to others' posts, post a comment to Studio, respond to others' Studio posts, submit a draft, provide feedback to others' submissions, write a reflection, write another reflection, visit the writing center, write a summary of that visit, move to the next module. Examining their work, I often feel as though the majority of the class is content to click through the course pages and intermittently submit material with little understanding (or with too much unhelpful understanding based on prior experiences) of where they had just been and/or with little anticipation of where they could be headed. Feedback I post along the way seems rarely heeded, if heeded at all. If this course were indeed a train, students would be randomly unboarding and boarding again at stations along this curricular track (destinations unknown), complying (or not) to some approximate degree with whatever directions that one cart's conductor might convey.

Maybe others in Di's cohort are not mixing, but are reluctant to mix, hesitant to transfer/transform—hesitant to consider the fact that our formal papers invite a different kind of attention (from them, from me) than does the informal writing exercises that precede them, that the annotations they completed in the prior module are not duplicated in their actual research paper, that the remix of that paper they are working on now does not need them to make statements about the rhetorical moves they are attempting. That was the rhetorical analysis paper; for their own research-based arguments and remix of those arguments, they need to do rhetorical analysis behind the scenes (before, of course, we ask them again to articulate their rhetorical intentions in subsequent reflections). "Largely," Cheryl Hogue Smith writes, "basic writers write ineffectively because when they read and try to interpret academic texts, they are missing much of the cultural knowledge and academic information possessed by better prepared students" ("Diving" 670): Smith is talking here about literary and scholarly texts, but BW students must also bring a certain understanding to syllabi and assignment guidelines as well. This understanding is prerequisite to the curricular

cohesion that the course designers—all experienced writers and college teachers—intended and assumed. Their/our intentions did not invite conflict and struggle, confusion, the raised hand as central to BW: we thought it our goal to avoid these things. Throughout these online components of my hybrid ALP course, I see now there are multiple aspects that can and probably should lead students to mix, to mingle expectations, to be confused, to raise a hand: right now, only Di does.

Di raises her hand. When I call on her, she says, “I’m confused.” At this point in our mutual confusions, there’s no way I can possibly read this moment as an exhibition of deficit. Something is mixing, confounding, coming to ruin. My “tale of learning” (see Prior), never as seamless as I might think, most probably mixes with a story my student unravels and writes inside her head. Maybe she picks up on something I said earlier in our Zoom meeting, or something we exchanged in an online thread, or something I said in an email the week before, maybe even something another teacher or parent or friend or book said at some other point in her life. Maybe Di is now way up ahead of where I imagined us to be, configuring some application for something I might not even be saying.¹ Whatever, this confusion is our site of engagement at which these multiple semiotic resources now come together in real time (see Scollon, *Mediated* 28). Di says she’s confused, we both smile, and we dwell here, stop to see what this might mean and what we might do next.

What This Might Mean and What We Might Do Next

This pandemic experience reminds me that my BW curriculum could, and perhaps should, promote confusion as an advanced state of knowing—of knowing something is mixing, that something needs to be laid to waste. That something laid to waste could be the “sequentially graded curricular path” that is our online FYC course (Prior), a path prefigured before any of these ALP students even clicked on its first module. What often comes to ruin in these moments is the “tale of learning,” as Paul Prior would call it, founded on the idea that learning, that becoming, happens along a narrow track inside a single domain (Prior)—a graduate program, a probationary period, any writing program geared to move students along as efficiently as possible, with little regard to local circumstances (Inman 1), circumstances as local as a hand raised. There is not much, if anything, in praise of confusion in these tales: in them, confusion is something to overcome, not the likely outcome of a student’s attempts to board.

Educators describe confusion “as an important epistemic emotion” that “can help students focus their attention and effort when solving complex learning tasks” (Nawz et al. 118). Among the many emotions students might experience in regard to a BW curriculum, then, confusion can facilitate their engagement with that curriculum. I believe Di’s expressions of confusion helped us both to find a focus among my ALP’s multiple time/space stations and to locate trajectories vital to her becoming as writer (see de Saint-Georges 156-157). A productive confusion arouses curiosity and spurs focus; it brings us into contact with what is mixing, coming to ruin, and directs us to what we might build out of these ruins. A productive confusion can help students make connections, form trajectories out of an ALP’s various time/space stations. ALPs themselves represent sites conducive to productive confusion. Nonetheless, the fact that eight of the other 11 students in Di’s ALP section eventually received failing course grades indicates to me that aspects of ALPs can curtail rather than facilitate a useful confusion.

While Di’s expressions of confusion seemed to steer us both in productive directions, many things in my ALP course, obviously, went terribly wrong. What went wrong points to the complexity of BW students’ relationship to writing instruction and the ways that ALP is especially positioned to incite and address this complexity. By its very nature, ALP’s reliance on different time/space stations (see de Saint-Georges 156-157)—usually an FYC class and corequisite workshop—invites engagement with either site at different (time/place) points in the course. Teachers can use the workshop, for instance, to look back on past FYC lessons, or pre-teach concepts vital to future assignments, or dig down ever deeper into current projects. Likewise, feedback instructors provide on ALP students’ FYC papers might reference concepts discussed or even personal revelations shared in the workshop. Granted, stand-alone courses can provide opportunities for all of this to and fro and round and round as well, and an ALP offering might indeed provide a linear curricular calendar; ALP, however, more so than most mainstream curricula, embeds the to and fro and round and round by design, embeds the up ahead’s, over there’s, past struggles, current concerns in ways that students’ life circumstances and divergent skill levels represent stations in themselves. An ALP is specifically designed to capture and attend to student need at the multiple entry and exit points BW students often encounter: a missed assignment, extended absence, accommodation issues, a failed paper, confusion over guidelines, etc.

An ALP’s curricular path is not narrow nor unidirectional but widened and transected, at times circular, vertical, even detoured by design. In light

of Paul Prior's work on ways people learn, ALP could very well represent a "trajectory of semiotic becoming," not a linear tale of learning. "Becoming happens not inside domains," he writes,

but across the many moments of a life. Becoming happens in spaces that are never pure or settled, where discourses and knowledge are necessarily heterogeneous, and where multiple semiotic resources are so deeply entangled that distinct modes simply don't make sense. (Prior)

At best, then, an ALP model like the one I describe here, one intentionally comprised of multiple time/space stations, can represent Prior's "trajectory of semiotic becoming." The representation manifests in relation to confusion, which marks a point of attention, a site of engagement where students and teachers can interrogate guidelines and expectations for FYC and establish trajectories of becoming. In this sense, a raised hand functions not as a disruption but as a continuity, a practice students exercise to thread their development as writers from nexus to nexus (see Roozen and Erickson 2.03.2): their raised hands open windows through which the students and their teacher can resemiotize the ALP's trajectories, draw attention to where teacher and students might transect these trajectories with students' own past, current, and future interests and knowledge. My dialogues with Di about confusion—her raised hand—marked our deictic center, our focus, our continuity among the many stations in time and space an ALP gathers.

Where this attention is absent, though, ALP's multiple stations (in the case here, not only an asynchronous FYC site, but also an asynchronous Studio site, face-to-face meetings on campus, all the assignments along the way, and wherever it was that students went whenever they unboarded our curriculum) disperse but do not engage. As Rodney H. Jones writes, "The same configurations of tools at the same moments in time and the same point in space may for some people function as sites of engagements for particular actions, whereas for others they may not" (41). For other class members, my ALP's configuration could very well have appeared as disconnected, atomistic, one countless text entry after another. The fact that many students were not submitting assignments or submitting them well after due dates meant that discontinuous points of need persisted at multiple points in time along the online curricula's linear framework: students were everywhere and nowhere all at the same time. Meanwhile, the online course just kept going, whether students were on board or not, due dates spilling

out ahead on our Canvas calendars. The multiple time/space stations, complicated by the random rates of submission and attendance, cast my own presence, as well, among various points in time and space. Despite my efforts to optimize what Prior might describe as the “embodied, dispersed, mediated, laminated, and deeply dialogic” aspects of an ALP design (Prior), my sequentially graded online curriculum (one Canvas page after another) seemed to tram most of the students farther and farther from the junctions at which we needed to meet. Had it not been for Di’s raised hand, my own sense of continuity among this hybrid ALP’s stations would be difficult even for me to ascertain. As Hope Parisi and Cheryl C. Smith might say, I would have had little chance of shifting “*there to right here* and the goal-oriented *sometime soon to right now*” (1, emphasis in the original).

In my ALP model, the weekly face-to-face sessions were meant to serve as *the place* that would orient us in relation to students’ work in the virtual spheres and to any other time/space that proved relevant. I can only guess as to why the on-campus meeting did not function in this way: in light of Cheryl Hogue Smith’s epigraph above, I am now the one, after all, doing the most abstracting. Perhaps I could have (and I really think I should have) devoted more time to community building; maybe our division’s newly designed on-line FYC course, which replaced the bare-bones shell the previous ALP cohort had completed, inserted too much curriculum between students and myself (More is less?); perhaps I should have recognized that the Studio, aligned as it was with our own FYC class, could not really function like a Studio—the thirdspace that Grego and Thompson imagine (205-206); and given other teachers’ accounts of student disconnection in this time of COVID-19 (see McMurtrie), not to mention other obstacles our students face inside (e.g., the legacy of No Child Left Behind; the rapid shift to online learning; the transition back to face-to-face sessions) and outside of school (e.g., work schedules, unreliable internet access, childcare issues, domestic abuse), I’m not hesitant to acknowledge that forces beyond my course impact students’ approaches to learning.

In my soundings, I must also consider the degree to which one-on-one meetings and technologies like Zoom (rather than in-person, small-group meetings) might better mediate expressions of confusion (see Gray-Rosendale and Stammen). In Di’s cohort, another student who frequently asked to compensate for missed meetings through Zoom also successfully passed the course. (His research paper, in fact, won honorable mention in a university-wide competition that celebrates student research.) No other student in the class accepted my offer to meet via Zoom when they could not attend

the in-person sessions. In the course's previous iteration, the small-group meetings were all conducted via Zoom, rather than in person, and they were well attended. A few of those Zoom sessions I facilitated during this ALP's first iteration would last no more than a quarter of the hour we'd reserved. I trusted students to say what needed to be said: if students had no questions or comments, I'd remind them of whatever assignment might be due next or maybe comment on/raise questions about some trend I'd observed in a recent batch of papers or Studio thread, and then we'd all head back into Canvas. I didn't have to worry about students commuting long distances only to have class dismissed after a few minutes: when we needed a site of engagement, these sessions were here for as long as we needed. Meanwhile, that cohort reliably completed the Canvas assignments (more reliably, I could argue, than any BW class I'd taught previously), and when conversations did occur in our Zoom sessions, they involved discourse on the content of students' projects as much as clarification of guidelines. In the end, all but one of those twelve BW students passed FYC. I'm wondering how fortunate I might have been to catch this first cohort in fall 2020. At this point, students weren't too removed from the on-campus interactions they'd been having the prior spring, before COVID-19 shut down in-person sessions, and at the same time, few were now neophytes when it came to virtual learning spaces.

The second ALP iteration, involving Di and her cohort, occurred at a point in the pandemic where schools were encouraging returns to campus. We sat spread out in our large classroom, sometimes just two or three of us, we all wore masks, and we were all perhaps more used to Zoom boxes at this point than we were the spontaneous give and take that one might hope for in a face-to-face course. No one expressed to me any reservations about the face-to-face arrangement, although looking at these sessions, espying these students gazing at their monitors while I attempted inquiries into their Canvas experience, you might reasonably guess that the students were still more inclined to their being home on their laptops than in any sort of on-campus, collaborative situation with peers and an instructor. Multiple factors could have contributed to the ineffectiveness of this second cohort's face-to-face sessions (not to mention their online participation), but what I do believe at heart is that the absence of confusion, or at least the absent articulation of confusion, kept those weekly meetings/windows closed to sites of engagement. As I remember them now, that second cohort's face-to-face meetings seemed always yet another *there*, never really becoming the sort of *here* I'd meant them to be. Few class members, as I recall, ever raised their hand; no one else could see Di's.

Di's raised hand (or, more literally, her "I'm confused") marked moments in which we needed to derail that linear tale of learning my online curriculum represented and to see that derailment as our deictic center, not as disruption or deficit, but as the point at which we might orient ourselves in relation to all those other points comprising our ALP and their role in our becoming. My seeking to centralize Di's confusion rather than merely eradicate it throws into relief ways an online curriculum (actually, any curriculum that values expediency over local circumstance) can enact an indifference to BW students' interests and concerns. Along with other limitations to hybrid developmental writing courses (see Harrington), I worry that online curricula, especially much of that swiftly developed in response to COVID-19, can trammel students' (lack of) engagement with material rather than invite the "embodied, dispersed, mediated, laminated, and deeply dialogic" experiences that BW students actually need at their points of need (Prior)—experiences that an ALP is especially positioned to provide. And, to repeat, I don't mean just to single out online learning: I target my online courses here because they made visible to me a prescribed tale, one where the raised hand can mark a discontinuity rather than the heart of the matter, and one where that hand is not always forthcoming nor easy to see. Almost any course in any form can falsely shepherd this sense of invisibility.

If I could turn back time, I would try to engineer a space in which confusion is expected and central, help establish a trajectory wherein the raised hand functions as destiny. If I could do it all again, I would use our opening face-to-face sessions (community building!) to introduce students to the concept of confusion that I developed in my exchanges with Di. In those early group sessions, I would try to help class members generate stories about confusion, and I would ask students to bring written summaries to each subsequent meeting (or write their summaries while within those sessions), summaries of what they perceive to be their current assignments' guidelines, where they feel most confused and least confused over any of those guidelines (see Angelo and Cross 154-158). I would, as well, arrange for online discussions on guidelines themselves, make homework about students' interactions with and about their suggested revisions to requirements, about where we've been and where we might go next, and above all, about how all that is being experienced (or not) right here/now.

I would also organize our Studio discussions around aspects of confusion I hear articulated (or sense unarticulated) in our face-to-face meetings: "I noticed no one asked about what the guidelines meant by a 'nuanced solution.' Can you tell me what you understand 'nuanced solution' to mean?"

In my responses to drafts, I would make confusion central to what we do so that online hybrid ALP offerings might challenge tales of learning that discount BW students' complex approaches to writing and writing instruction: "Tell me why your paper looks like this here and not like that sample there? Why did you decide that this was the route?" I would do whatever I could to help students unpack the significance of their/our confusion, to view what's mixing right here and right now, what it all means, and what to do next.

Overall, I would advance confusion in a way that grounds ALP courses in students' own moments of becoming. I would, as well, make a point of unmuting my confusion. I would turn on my camera and raise my own hand in our in-person sessions, and I would keep it raised until someone there called on me. On some days, this might even be where I'd start.

Notes

1. My thanks to Aurora Matzke for her insights regarding the meaning of a raise hand.

Works Cited

- Angelo, Thomas A., and K. Patricia Cross. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*. Second Edition. Jossey-Bass, 1993.
- "Confuse, Verb." *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/confuse. Accessed 29 December 2022.
- de Saint-Georges, Ingrid. "From Anticipation to Performance: Sites of Engagement as Process." *Discourse in Action: Introducing Mediated Discourse Analysis*, edited by Sigrid Norris and Rodney H. Jones, Routledge, 2005, pp. 155-65.
- Gray-Rosendale, Laura, and Haley Stammen. "Using Blackboard Collaborate Ultra in a Graduate Course on Teaching Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2020, pp. 64-89.
- Grego, Rhonda C., and Nancy S. Thompson. *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces: The Studio Approach*. CCCC Studies in Writing and Rhetoric. Edited by Joseph Harris. Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Harrington, Anna M. "Hybrid Developmental Writing Courses: Limitations and Alternatives." *Research in Developmental Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2010, pp. 4-20.
- Holmes, Michael E. "Naming Virtual Space in Computer-Mediated Conversation." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, vol. 52, no. 2, 1995, pp. 212-21.

- Inman, Joyce Olewski. "Breaking Out of the Basic Writing Closet: Queering the Thirdspace of Composition." *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-23.
- Jones, Rodney T. "Mediated Discourse Analysis." *Interactions, Images and Texts: A Reader in Multimodality*, edited by Sigrid Norris and Carmen Dania Maier, De Gruyter Mouton, 2014, pp. 39-52.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?" *College English*, vol. 54, no. 3, 1992, pp. 887-913.
- Malesic, Jonathan. "My College Students Are Not OK." *The New York Times*, 13 May 2022. www.nytimes.com/2022/05/13/opinion/college-university-remote-pandemic.html?referringSource=articleShare&fbclid=IwAR0NCa5jm4A41H27dQyGCOSAXP1F4gbU8QhOxgVrBF0H4xNgQ-1fSN-HwvUw.
- McMurtrie, Beth. "A 'Stunning' Level of Student Disconnection." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 April 2022. www.chronicle.com/article/a-stunning-level-of-student-disconnection. Accessed 22 November 2022.
- Nawaz, Sadia, Gregor Kennedy, James Bailey, and Chris Mead. "Moments of Confusion in Simulation-Based Learning Environments." *Journal of Analytics*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2020, pp. 118-37.
- Ostroff, Elaine. "Universal Design: An Evolving Paradigm." *Universal Design Handbook*, edited by Wolfgang Preiser and Elaine Ostroff. McGraw Hill, 2001, pp. 1.3 - 1.11.
- Parisi, Hope, and Cheryl C. Smith. "Editors' Column." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-4. doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2016.35.1.01.
- Prior, Paul. "How Do Moments Add Up to Lives: Trajectories of Semiotic Becoming vs. Tales of School Learning in Four Modes." *Making Future Matters*, edited by Rick Wysocki and Mary P. Sheriden, Computers and Composition Digital Press/Utah State UP, 2018. ccdigitalpress.org/book/makingfuturematters/prior-intro.html. Accessed 25 December 2022.
- Roozen, Kevin, and Joe Erickson. *Expanding Literate Landscapes: Persons, Practices, and Sociohistoric Perspectives of Disciplinary Development*. Computer and Composition Digital P/Utah State UP, 2017. ccdigitalpress.org/expanding.
- Scollon, Ron. *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*, Routledge, 2001.
- Shaughnessy, Mina P. "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 27, no. 3, 1976, pp. 234-39.

Recalibrating Confusion

- Smith, Cheryl Hogue. "Diving in Deeper': Bringing Basic Writers' Thinking to the Surface." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, vol. 53, no. 8, 2010, pp. 668-76.
- _____. "Interrogating Texts: From Deferent to Efferent and Aesthetic Reading Practices." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2012, pp. 59-79.