Pretty Bullets: Tracing Transmedia/Translingual Literacies of an Israeli Soldier across Regimes of Practice

Tracing the literacy practices of an Israeli soldier, this case study examines how his engagement in multilingual and multimodal (MML) composing affects his ways of thinking about and doing literacy. It specifically attends to how MML practices dispose writers to certain orientations to reading, writing, speaking, and design.

I first encountered the twenty-five-year-old combat veteran DaVe (his literary pseudonym; it is pronounced “Dave”) as part of a wider study on transnational literacies within Israeli society. He had completed his three years of military service as a soldier in the IDF (Israeli Defense Forces), and his military identity was densely intertwined with his literate identity. This was evidenced by the poems, jottings, drawings, and novels-in-progress from his backpack and leather pouch that he called his “kit bag” (IDF jargon for military gear). Woven into this mix was a range of other props or artifacts coordinated as part of his “identity kit” (Gee, Social 142) that he would set on the table for discussion: a bullet casing, thread for cleaning the bar-
rel of his M-16 grenade launcher, pocket knife, multisided dice, tattered Jerusalem bus station time schedule, military identification card, military issued notebooks, and Dungeons and Dragons (D & D) character sheets. In this study, I examine the ways that he would weave and reweave these complex assemblages into his literacy practices and even more broadly into his literate life.

In making this move, I extend efforts toward developing a multilingual and multimodal (MML) framework in the context of twenty-first-century globalization. In “Composition 2.0,” I articulated a theoretical and methodical approach for studying MML practices in translocal contexts. In parallel, I expanded the conversation on code meshing (Canagarajah) to code mashing. This concept, drawing from the Web 2.0 community, attends more fully to the complex blending of MML texts and ways multiple modes can be taken up, resisted, and transformed. Building on this material framework, the following case study offers fine-grained attention to how traversing languages, media, and modes mediates one’s orientation to language and fosters a critical awareness of all the semiotic modes. Despite scholarship in the field linked to these issues, there remains little direct evidence documenting the effects or specific nature of MML practices.

To accomplish these aims, I draw on the third generation of new literacy studies (Baynham and Prinsloo; Brandt and Clinton). In this area, there has been a shift toward a less bounded approach that attends to literacy practices in and across near and distant spaces. Concurrent with these moves has been a shift toward a focus on transliteracy (Hull and Stornaiuolo; You) or the ability to read, write, and interact in and across different genres, languages, media, and contexts. Taking up this focus, Jody Shipka suggests that working across languages and modes can instill a finer sense of attunement to the rhetorical nature of language and communication. This stance is characterized by a conception of language as one resource within a wider rhetorical repertoire with sensitivity to the ways that various semiotic modes afford and constrain communication. By engaging writers in the repurposing of texts and multimodal practices, this spatial framework moves beyond digital literacies (most traditionally associated with
multimodal scholarship) toward a broader focus on all available means of persuasion: sight, sound, text, talk, image, object, and gesture. Despite gesturing toward a broader approach, less attention has been given to the specific nature of students’ shifting orientations and beliefs about literacy or the ways that these carry over into other spaces. Moreover, the field is only recently starting to locate such work in translingual or transnational contexts (Fraiberg, “Military”; Gonzales; Horner et al., “Translinguality”; Shipka, “Transmodality”).

Turning to map out this process, I align this study with a growing body of work in composition identified as translingualism (Canagarajah; Horner et al., “Translinguality”). The prefix *trans* was adopted to better articulate the dynamic, contested, and transformative nature of language practices. This approach is characterized by a theoretical shift away from monolingual ideologies and toward a less discrete and bounded conception of language. Moreover, undergirding these moves is a shift away from deficit models toward a conception of language differences and diversity as a resource. Emerging from this scholarship (Guerra; Lorimer Leonard) are findings that multilinguals tend to develop a sensitivity to language as a result of linguistic boundary crossing and a lifetime of encounters with difference. Identifying this stance as “rhetorical attunement,” Rebecca Lorimer Leonard suggests that multilingual writers are aware of language as a complex “system of discourse beyond an immediate moment of communication” (231). This set of dispositions includes a conception of language as “a powerful conduit of domination and power” (244). Critically, how these processes are enacted and develop across the life span are “often understated in the scholarship” (244). Even more limited are accounts of ways that multilingualism and multimodality are jointly enacted and develop over trajectories of time. To fill this gap, I examine how traversing multiple languages and modes shapes (and is shaped by) writers’ rhetorical sensitivity or sense of attunement.

To understand how DaVe’s practices mediated his literate identity, I turn to transmedia scholarship (Alexander; Arroyo; Black; Jenkins; Williams and Zenger) on ways actors appropriate popular culture to serve their own interests and aims. Aligned with Shipka’s focus on repurposing texts and the engineering of rhetorical events, transmedia focuses on the social world of fandom and popular culture. Linked to Michel de Certeau’s tactics for resisting dominant ideologies and discourses, Henry Jenkins focuses on how fans appropriate media content through textual poaching. These grass-
roots literacy practices are part of a struggle—between media producers and consumers—intersecting with copyright, ownership, authorship, and control. Characterized as convergence or participatory culture, the wide-ranging activities include fan fiction, role and cosplay (costume play), mods and hacks (modifications and customizations on video games), and video remixes and memes. This relational process mediates transnational flows (Appadurai) as well as the formation of new global forms of consciousness and cultural competencies. The spread of English as a global language is bound up in these dynamics.

Bringing together these multiple strands, I examine how the shifting nature of reading and writing in multilingual and transnational contexts is reshaping ways of thinking about and doing literacy. How do actors who engage in multilingual (or translingual) and multimodal (or transmodal) practices think about literacy? Does such activity dispose them to certain orientations to reading, writing, speaking, and design? If so, how do these dispositions carry over into other contexts? Examining popular culture in students’ digital literacy practices, Bronwyn T. Williams argues that digital youth are “like nomadic poachers roaming across texts hunting not just for meanings but for pieces they can incorporate and reuse in their everyday lives” (80). Despite these complex connections, scholarship has remained primarily limited to online contexts with less attention to the ways students’ shifting conceptions of literacy mediate their traversals across classrooms, companies, communities, and, in DaVe’s case, the military. The focus on a soldier in the Israeli military foregrounds issues of identity, power, and globalization. In particular this research is focused on the following questions:

- What are DaVe’s particular ways of thinking about and doing multilingual and multimodal composing?
- How can a fine-grained understanding of these activities inform composition pedagogy and research?

Theoretical Framework

To examine this relational process, I draw on a theoretical framework I have articulated elsewhere (Fraiberg, “Composition”) grounded in sociocultural and practice theories. This framework contends that individuals cannot
be understood apart from their tools-in-use (Wertsch). Tools are broadly defined as durable (written scripts, identity cards, military uniforms) and nondurable (talk, social scripts, national narratives) resources, globally distributed across near and distant spaces. Layered with histories and sedimented with ideologies, these complex constellations of symbols, objects, ideologies, and actors shape and are shaped in the context of everyday practices as part of an ongoing struggle. It is through this process that actors construct what Dorothy Holland et al. refer to as a “figured world.” The concept foregrounds the dialogic and historical nature of literacy and identity-making practices, with the process of identification produced in the context of culturally constituted activities. It is this process that mediates “trajectories of participation” (Dreier) in and across social systems as literate repertoires and identities stabilize and thicken over time.

While there are several key analytic frames related to ways actors figure (and are figured by) their worlds, I here foreground actor-network theory (ANT) (Latour, Reassembling). This analytic lens shifts from conceptions of context as a neutral backdrop or stage against which activity takes places toward an understanding of space as ideological and co-constitutive of everyday practice. Central to ANT is the principle of generalized symmetry or a breakdown of the binary between objects and people, as the two together form a “third agent” (Latour, Pandora’s). This analytic optic disrupts the myth of the neutral tool in its understanding of tools as agentic; just as people act on tools, so too do tools act on people. Apropos to a military recruit is an interrogation of the slogan “guns don’t kill people, people kill people.” Instead ANT reframes the analysis: “You are different with a gun in your hand; the gun is different with you holding it” (Latour, Pandora’s 179). This process of “translation” can be theorized in linguistic terms for understanding language uptake. But it can also be used to trace the transformation of an array of signs, symbols, genres, actors, spaces, and objects. Merged with sociocultural and practice theories, ANT does not remove notions of individual agency from the equation. As Ehren H. Plugfelder argues, generalized symmetry does not necessarily mean all things are equal, rather it simply presupposes no innate inequality (121).

Methodology

To understand how DaVe’s transmedia practices were bound up in the construction of his literate identity, I draw on data collected from text-based interviews gathered from 2007 to 2013. I recruited DaVe into my study (and
he enrolled me) following an English class at Tel Aviv University. Seeking to validate his identity as an English writer, he was interested in sharing his materials, while in exchange I received data for my study. In this manner, English was a form of capital brokering a complex transaction with our roles indexing our wider linguistic and social positions. While the original aim of the study was to understand the various social and cultural contexts shaping his English writing, the focus quickly expanded as I began to uncover how his literate activities were densely intertwined with a broad array of semiotic practices.

DaVe’s literate engagements incorporated a range of practices (gaming, movies, drawing, role play, reading, writing) linked to transmedia story telling. Transmedia stories are “story worlds” that extend beyond the confines of a single work (such as the Matrix designed around video games, movies, and comics). This generic form invites multiple points of entry, varied pathways through a story, and participation on the part of the audience, who is invited to seek out information. With transmedia informing DaVe’s own literate activities, much of my time was spent trying to unravel his texts and understand the various references and relationships between them. Thus, similar to the ways one inhabits a story world, I began to inhabit DaVe’s lifeworld by mapping out his literacy practices across contexts, as I gradually accumulated knowledge of these activities and situated them in wider social and historical contexts.

Our meetings included twenty hours of discussion extending over a period of five years. During the first four face-to-face interviews, I recorded our conversations (except the first) and photographed his texts, jottings, drawings, and other artifacts. Continuing to investigate DaVe’s practices over the years after my return to the States in 2007, I regularly emailed and interviewed him on Skype while digitally photographing binders with drafts, sketches and drawings on his shelves, posters on his wall, games on his shelf, magazines stored in his closet, t-shirts, gun magazine cartridges, and other souvenirs saved (or poached) from the military. The aim was to map out various assemblages and spaces mediating the production of his text and identity-making practices.

Similar to the ways one inhabits a story world, I began to inhabit DaVe’s lifeworld by mapping out his literacy practices across contexts.
To conduct the analysis, I followed the ANT principle of “follow the actors” (Latour, *Reassembling* 12) by tracing the production of DaVe’s texts across genres, languages, media, and modes (e.g., shifting from text to talk). Core to these analytic moves was a focus on moments of translation (Callon; Gonzales and Zantjer). For example, I would examine how a figure on a D & D character sheet was translated into a drawing in his journal and then how this drawing was translated into his written stories. Key questions were guided by who/what was doing the translation and who/what was being translated. Latour poses the question about the person with a gun: “Which of them, then, the gun or the citizen is the actor in this situation?” (*Pandora’s* 179). The answer is “someone else” (179). Central to the analysis was the question of “who is doing the action?”

Reviewing field notes, transcripts, recordings, still images, and texts, I organized the materials surrounding the production of DaVe’s texts chronologically. I then identified sequential “strips of activity” (Shipka, *Toward* 64) or meaning-making trajectories (Kell) to trace the transformations (translations) across space and time. As part of this analytic move, I listed actants related to the process: for example, humans (soldiers, officers, authors), objects (clothing, notes, shell casings), discourses (national, military, popular culture), practices (poaching). I further uncovered ways that these assemblages jointly coordinated activity and were repurposed across DaVe’s literate activities.

Guided by this grounded theoretical approach (Charmaz), I engaged in an iterative process of open and focused coding. Making continual passes through the data, I established the military and transmedia as key analytic frames (as themes continually interwoven into his activities) that structured various linkages and relations. Working along these two axes, I theoretically sampled all instances in which these categories converged in DaVe’s literacy practices. Using constant comparison, I developed more refined analytic themes and (in vivo) codes grounded in his own language and perspectives. For example, DaVe created a creature called the “hybrider” with the term *hybrid* becoming a key code. I then identified and categorized all instances of hybrid practices across his talk, writing, drawing, and performances. Emerging from this process, I identified key habitual practices mediating DaVe’s ways of thinking about and doing literacy. In this fashion, transmedia served as an interpretive frame with theoretical reach and sensitivity for making sense of his literacy practices.
DaVe’s Literate History

To situate DaVe’s literate history, I offer an overview of the social and linguistic landscape in Israeli society. Over the past thirty years Israel has transitioned from the socialist and Zionist (an eighteenth-century movement to establish the Jewish state) ideals of the kibbutz to a capitalist system grounded in globalized industries. Accompanying these transformations has been a shift from Hebrew as the dominant language to a situation in which English is commonplace in many domains (Shohamy). Despite these moves, the Zionist and national narratives of the state remain deeply embedded. This is indexed in rhetorics surrounding military service (Kaplan). Woven into everyday mundane and routine social structures is the requirement for all citizens to serve in the IDF. While the situation is changing, one’s service in the military is considered an important marker of status within the society. The more elite a position, the more social capital one carries. Depending on one’s position and experiences, one’s time in the military is often looked back upon nostalgically, and it is commonplace to hear Israelis tell stories from their service or refer to the army in the context of everyday conversations. These interactions further serve to reproduce common tropes and ideologies connected to national identity. In this fashion, these two competing forces converged in DaVe’s transliteracy practices.

When I first encountered DaVe as an English major at Tel Aviv University, he was at work on a fantasy novel and intended to find a literary agent in an effort to locate an audience beyond the narrow borders of the country (at the narrowest point only 15 kilometers across). To level the playing field, he decided on a pseudonym to hide his Jewish identity and avoid the potential of anti-Semitic bias against his work (though there were still playful clues as the capitalized letters served as an “Easter egg” hinting at his real name). DaVe became an alter ego that he took on across a range of contexts. In a sense, this identity was just an extension of his role-playing games.

DaVe’s literate trajectory was first strongly influenced by early exposure to science fiction through films and online flight simulators. With English deeply bound up in these activities (including in voice-over narration on video games), his language skills dramatically improved. After initially falling behind in the subject, he scored in the top percentile on a national English exam to his surprise as well as that of his teachers. As a hard-core gamer, he further learned English command lines for his modem at a mo-
ment before the World Wide Web had reached mainstream Israel. Learning to link to other modems for playing online games, he published an article in the online Israeli gaming magazine **פריק** ("Freak") about how to set up these connections using command lines. With English embedded in the title “Multi-Player,” the article similarly wove English terms and concepts into the Hebrew text. To optimize and upgrade his PC, he further consulted technical documents in English such as a computer manual (using the Hebrew manual to help him translate) for installing a Sound Blaster sound card. In this manner, English was deeply sedimented into his gaming and computer activity down to the level of the code itself. Drawing on flight simulator games for inspiration, DaVe decided to begin writing his own science fiction novel about a flight squadron.

Intertwined with these interests was a focus on fantasy role play. This included participation in role-playing games such as Dungeons and Dragons, developing story lines and maps for teaching D & D, playing fantasy-based video games, reading fantasy works, participating in LARPs (live action role plays), and beginning a fantasy novel. The novel itself was constructed from D & D character sheets (with multisided dice to determine characters’ powers), scenes based on maps, elements from video games, and other fantasy-based materials. Discussing *The Lord of the Rings* by J.R.R. Tolkien as the first work he had read entirely in English, DaVe noted that the Hebrew translation of *The Hobbit* was completed by nine pilots who had been imprisoned in Cairo during the 1967 war. The fact that DaVe related this anecdote points to ways the military was woven into his narratives. DaVe began his service in 2001 in the Ra’am (Thunder) MLRS battalion. MLRS is shorthand for Multiple Launch Rocket System and is both a military unit and mobile weapons system that is used to patrol the borders of northern Israel. Officially the military unit was known by its English name, and language competency was highly valued for selection into this unit, as the weapons control systems were in English. In this manner, the English DaVe had cultivated through his transmedia practices mediated his admittance. Unofficially, the soldiers referred to the MLRS as “My Life Really Sucks.” Notably DaVe’s frequent uses of such word play were deeply linked to his textual poaching (his habit of playing with signs and symbols). More broadly his language play was part of a set of dispositions that he developed that served as a lens through which he navigated military life.
Ways of Thinking about and Doing Literacy

Overall, the study illustrates the complex manner in which DaVe’s engagement in transmedia stories shaped (and was shaped by) a set of practices and dispositions toward language and literacy. Moreover, the study illustrates ways that transmedia served as a frame through which he lived his literate life. In particular, I identify four key practices bound up in his orientations toward literacy or what Brian Street defines as the “particular ways of thinking about and doing reading and writing” (qtd. in Knobel and Lankshear 4).

Hybrid Practices

Central to DaVe’s literate life were hybrid discourse practices grounded in a process of “knotworking” (Prior and Shipka), or the tying and untying of an array of texts, tools, signs, and symbols. This disposition, for example, was manifested in and across his talk, dress, writing, and drawings, such as a series of creatures that he sketched in an idea book with a half-minotaur and half-horse named the “hybrider.” This theme of hybridity is one that extended across his literacy practices, as he wove together languages, signs, symbols, and social spaces. Evidence of DaVe’s beliefs about literacy was inscribed into the inside book jacket of a manuscript entitled Phoenix of Antarctica in which he wrote, “the theme of my story is about fantasy, a world without boundaries.” In this fashion, his literate practices were not isolated from other social spaces, but instead were deeply hybrid.

This blending was evidenced on the inside jacket of military-issued notebooks (poached from a storeroom) where he sketched, drafted, and wrote chapters of his stories. One of these had been used for an APC (armored personnel carrier) certification course for a driver’s license. Taking notes from the course on the grid-lined pages, DaVe recorded detailed procedural information (in Hebrew): how to safely raise and lower the ramp, turn the ignition on and off, and drive the vehicle. In addition to this technical information were drawings and sketches (Figure 1) filling the back inside page of the book: two medieval swords, two double-sided axes, a standard MP-5 German-issued submachine gun made by Heckler and Koch, and DaVe’s own weapon, an M-16 with an M-203 grenade launcher.
In this manner, the weapons from his fantasy world became intermixed with the weapons that he encountered and carried with him as a soldier. The weapons themselves were remixed into other drawings of characters for his fantasy story and then repurposed into his novel.

These moves extended into an array of DaVe’s other transliteracy practices. In his science fiction story, for instance, the main female character, Ophelia (poached from Hamlet), carried an assault rifle with a bullpup design. The compact configuration locates the action (the physical mechanism that operates the cartridges) at the base of a rifle, allowing it to be held tightly to the body for better accuracy. The bullpup served as the basis for the new standard Israeli assault rifle known as the Tavor (TAR-21) and was DaVe’s weapon of choice in the video game Call of Duty. Characterizing this complex interweaving, he further remixed language from the first-person shooter with characters able to “respawn” or regenerate after being wounded or killed in action. Even more directly mixed into his text were personal
military experiences: cleaning an assault rifle; the operation of the MLRS weapons systems; being reprimanded on guard duty for falling asleep; observing a soldier throwing a flash bang grenade (based on an incident patrolling the West Bank).

This framework extended into a constellation of material and embodied practices. For instance, in LARPs, DaVe donned a medieval dress while engaging in mock “battles.” In preparation for one of these battles he designed a fiberglass sword wrapped in a military field mattress. Further indexing how he rewove various objects from his everyday life was a costume designed for a Purim party (a festive Jewish holiday). Dressed as William Wallace from Braveheart (a Scottish revolutionary), he braided his hair, carried a plastic sword, striped his face with blue war paint, spoke in a Scottish brogue, and wore a kilt made from the mesh camouflage that had covered his APC in the field. In this fashion, these collections of artifacts, performances, and other bits and pieces served as the materials from which he assembled and reassembled his literate life (a process entailing actor-networks and “knotworks”).

Social Conceptions of Literacy

It is through these practices, moreover, that DaVe shifted from solitary notions of the individual writer in the garret toward an understanding of writing and literacy as a deeply social process (LeFevre). As one whose literacy practices were deeply intertextual (Bazerman), DaVe had developed a finely tuned sense of the various influences on his texts. This was manifested, for instance, in the discussion of the double-sided axe that appeared on the inside of his APC notebook: “I was very inspired by Sega’s Golden Axe game, so there is a character there, a dwarf who has a double sided axe, so basically it was my notion of how a double-sided axe would look, more rounded at the edges.” Central to such moves was the importance of giving credit (as a word that often surfaced) to the others (actors and objects) who had influenced the designs. This stance was signaled, for instance, in a tribute in his notebook (Figure 2) to those with whom he had served in the MLRS. This was marked in the title “End Credits.” In this context, the tribute marked a transition period with his reentry into civil society. More broadly, however, DaVe explained that the “end credits” indexed the production credits (of cast and crew) in video games and films. Listing two
Figure 2. Tribute.
different units, DaVe located himself in the “first unit” while listing his own role as “Co-director . . . Co-everything.” In addition to a reversal of the chain of command positioning himself in the lead role (a move related to the appropriation of authority discussed further below), this text referenced the Wachowskis. These sibling film directors and producers were forerunners of transmedia storytelling (as aforementioned) known for “co-creating” their stories across media platforms. The fact that DaVe expressed his admiration for their involvement in all creative aspects of their work indexed his orientations to literacy.

Evidence of this sense of social invention (LeFevre) further surfaced in the design of a typeface (Figure 3) for his book. To design the different letters DaVe drew on fantasy iconography: a castle, double-sided axes, a sword, blades, fortresses, snakes, bows and arrows. Discussing its creation and the various resources that he yoked together, he recalled advice from another soldier who had owned a font design company in civilian life. Moreover, many of the designs had been explicitly “poached” from other sources. For instance, Dave appropriated the design for his O from the video game Diablo (distinguished by a cross in its center symbolizing a shield) and tilted it on an angle to look like an X. He was able to explain the origins of each letter in detail. The L was designed to resemble an army boot or a composite of an IDF boot and a medieval fifteenth-century army boot. In this manner, DaVe reoriented and realigned an array of symbols and scripts as he drew on a broader “design grammar” (Gee, What 30). The fact that DaVe referred to the boot as a composite of both the IDF and fifteenth-century boot points to ways that these texts were widely distributed across time-space. DaVe was involved in a complex process of “translation” as he mobilized an array of actants into his literate activities. Useful for conceptualizing this process is what James Gee refers to as semiotic systems:

Semiotic systems are human cultural and historical creations that are designed to engage and manipulate people in certain ways. They attempt through their content and social practices to recruit people to think, act, interact, value, and feel in certain specific ways. In this sense they attempt to get people to learn to take on certain sorts of new identities, to become, for a time and place, certain types of people. In fact, society as a whole is simply a web of these many different sorts of identities and their characteristic associated activities and practices. (What 43–44; emphasis added)
Figure 3. Typeface.
Entangled in and across these webs, DaVe recruited and was recruited into wider semiotic systems. As illustrated in the next section, it was through this struggle that he developed a finely tuned sense of the ways semiotic systems mediated highly asymmetrical relations of power.

**Awareness of Links between Authorship and Authority**

In addition to a finely attuned sense of writing as a social process, DaVe also (as the flip side to this perspective) developed an acute awareness of the contested nature of authorship. Convergence culture calls into question who gets to own, produce, legitimate, and authorize meanings. Mediating struggles linked to power, control, and identity, Jonathan Alexander argues that “media convergence needs to be understood not only as a powerful way of manipulating 'texts' to create new meanings, but also as a site of *authorial* contestation” (4; emphasis added). The conditions under which DaVe developed his literacy practices had attuned him to these dynamics. Evidence of his attunement to the links between authority and authorship was manifested in parodies of standard copyright clauses written on the inside of his notebooks.

These rhetorical moves—contesting copyright regimes—were moreover mapped onto DaVe’s everyday mundane and routine practices as he contested military regimes. This was evidenced in many of his stories, such as one that DaVe recounted from the end of his basic training about a tradition called “lishbor distance” or breaking the distance. The ceremony is a symbolic rite of passage marked by the temporary erasure of the authoritative distance separating soldiers and their commanders. The context for the story itself is a sketch of two crossed double-sided axes that he had drawn on the inside of his military coat.

The public phone rang and one of the NCOs [noncommissioned officers] from another platoon passes, and he answered and he said that the sergeant of our unit wants to speak with us. I was in the first row of the three people standing, but someone from behind me pushed me, so I went to pick up the phone, and when he heard my name, he told me to get down to “the stance.” You know it’s called “second stance” because it’s when you do pushups and he told me already to get down to the stance and give him ten pushups of “don’t get sassy with your sergeant” and I did that and of course you need permission once
you are in this punishment to get up. So I was picking up the phone with one hand while I was still in the second stance and asking the sergeant if I may get up and he told me, “ok sure get up and tell everyone that the breaking of the distance ceremony is in one of the classes there, so get everyone to the class.” When they spoke with us, one of the people said they should see my inner side of the coat, and there I showed it [a drawing of double-sided axes] to everybody who hasn’t seen it yet, and they [NCOs] said they could have put me on court martial for destroying IDF equipment, for what I did, but they were trying to be nice to me after all the shit they had me go through.

The focus of this story on the tradition of “breaking the distance” indexes wider themes in relation to the negotiation of authority in the military, with the end of basic training serving as a liminal period where the new recruit transitions to a member of the MLRS battalion after four months of training. The narrative itself foregrounds ways that DaVe is positioned in this system: “pushed” forward in line by the other soldiers, forced to assume “second stance,” told what to do (pushups) and say (“don’t get sassy with your sergeant”). Indexing the absurdity of the ways he was twisted and disciplined within this regime, DaVe was forced to contort himself by holding the phone while face down as he asked for permission to stand. Even in a ceremony designed to symbolically reduce the authoritative distance between soldiers and officers, DaVe was reminded of the distance between them, as the officers called to his attention the fact he could have faced a court martial for defacing IDF property. The story thus illustrates how DaVe was disciplined in being ordered what to say, do, and even wear. Yet the story is also structured around his efforts to subvert this system through appropriating his IDF-issued materials. The act of putting inscriptions on officially sanctioned spaces was a way to subvert social structures (i.e., breaking the distance). Central to these moves was a conception of semiotic acts as a way to contest authority.

These dynamic struggles were ongoing and distributed across a wide repertoire of semiotic practices. This was evidenced in another scene involving a Hebrew text that unfolded during a period of service on an armored personnel carrier, which was designated with the task of providing radio coordinates to the mobile rocket launchers. Just above the ramp of the vehicle beside holsters for M-16s was a list of the commanders who had served on the unit.
This was the tradition of the APC’s NCOs, they had a tradition to write their names there with a permanent marker on the inside of the APC just under the ramp, actually above the ramp. So I decided one day because I was on it [the APC] for so long, so I supposedly deserved this NCO like recognition, to add my name to the list. At any rate I don't think they liked this very much [...] Even though NCOs are not officers, they still have four months of courses to go through and have to take a lot of bullshit to become commanders. They thought I wasn’t respectful for the job. So of course I had to delete it, it wasn’t easy, I had to scrub it off. They made me wipe it out, they gave me some, I don’t know if it was alcohol-based or some detergents. With all this trouble of me deleting it, it didn’t matter in the end because I think at one point the grease monkeys decided they should repaint the inside of the vehicle, so the entire list was gone. They tried I think to recreate the list, but they probably didn’t know way back then at the time who initially was on the list.

In this narrative, texts were bound up in the negotiation of authority with the list on the APC naturalizing military hierarchies and subject positions through the construction of tradition. DaVe highlights how acts of writing served to legitimize, reproduce, and maintain the distance between soldiers and commanders. Notable is the “permanent” marker that was used to establish and fix the identities of the officers. Considering himself a veteran of the APC and having earned the right to sign his name to the list, he disrupted the rules and rituals surrounding it by inscribing his signature. Sharply contested by the NCOs, the warrants underlying these conflicts were claims for respect. Indexing the militancy with which these boundaries were maintained, DaVe was forced to “wipe out,” “delete,” and “scrub off” his name with a detergent or alcohol-based solution. Notable is the end of his story in which the officers suffer a similar fate with their names erased by the grease monkeys, that is, mechanics in noncombat roles who occupy an even lower status. Moreover, the officers are ultimately unable to reconstruct the historical record of all those who served on the vehicle. In this manner DaVe’s story serves to set the record straight and level the playing field (as a redemption narrative) with the soldiers and officers again on equal footing. DaVe’s narrative thus establishes ways that he was complexly positioned among human actors (grease monkeys, officers, fellow soldiers) and nonhuman actors (APC vehicle, lists) that served to align and coordinate his activities and identifications. The narrative more broadly foregrounds the ways texts mediated the positions and identities of the participants. In this fashion, this story indexes his own sets of beliefs.
surrounding “texts” as contested spaces that could be rewritten, redrawn, and remixed. Once again DaVe's textual poaching served as a framework through which he engaged in a wider struggle with authoritative military discourses.

Literacy served in this ongoing struggle as an instrument that was deployed by DaVe to reposition himself across near and distant spaces. This was manifested in his extensive uptake of English and Western popular culture. One key example was narrated by DaVe after pulling out a folded and tattered paper from his wallet on which he had written a poem entitled “Pretty Bullets.” The poem had been written during a period of DaVe's military service near the separation fence dividing Israel and the West Bank during which he had been disciplined for infractions while on guard duty. DaVe felt particularly betrayed by a friend (whom he referred to as a “frenemy”) from his hometown and draft period who had written him up for sleeping at the base gate.

Despite one of them being from my own period, he put me to one martial trial and threatened to use his authority [emphasis added] to take me to others. He was the driver and others could have cared less that I was sleeping at the gate. But he just wanted to be this model officer or something.

In this narrative DaVe was entangled in an incident in which he was disciplined by an officer characterized as abusing his “authority.” Sentenced in a military tribunal and stationed without leave at an outpost in a West Bank settlement, he felt boredom, isolation, and a sense of injustice. Describing the indignity of being assigned to guarding a settlement outpost for twenty-five days, he situated himself within the military hierarchy: “it depends on the longitude [length] of the service, the more you serve the more respect you should have, and I think it was kind of strange to explain to the new ones, why someone as old as me is doing simple guard missions instead of reconnaissance.” It was during this time period that DaVe wrote the poem “Pretty Bullets” (Figure 4) composed on the back of a bus station time schedule while his M-16 grenade launcher leaned against a wall:

Pretty bullets—gets you in the eye,
Pretty bullets—causes you to die.
Pretty bullets—getting in my clip,
Pretty bullets—it’s your guts they wanna rip,
It doesn’t matter if the weapon is Colt’s made or IDF,
The bullets will bring you to your death.
An M-16 or sub-Galil,
Your body’s temperature will soon chill . . .
The poem written to the tune of *Pretty Woman* brings together military culture and American popular culture. Replacing the word *bullets* for *woman,* it ironically paints the portrait of a combat soldier in battle who meets a “chilling” death. However, in this scenario the bullets “ripping” into flesh also indexed a fantasy, as DaVe was not seeing any action standing guard in an isolated settlement outpost. The poem was a creative outlet and escape from the tedium and physical strain of standing for eight-hour shifts. The act of writing itself, moreover, was a form of defiance that violated one of the “basic commandments of soldiering: ‘Thou shall never lay down your weapon’” (Kaplan 212). Yet as a native Hebrew-speaking soldier in the IDF, why would he perform such an act in English? And why did he continue to carry the peeling document with him in his wallet? The private nature of the act serves to underscore the manner in which his beliefs about English—as a language ideology weighted with status, power, authority—were deeply infused into his social habitus. English and Western popular culture were powerful symbols that could be marshaled and deployed as a means to “command” respect. The global spread of English has been characterized as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson); however, in this instance it was taken up as means to resist the IDF (even as it “hailed” DaVe into subject positions). DaVe was repositioning himself through the construction of a pop cosmopolitan identity (Jenkins, “Pop”) as “an escape route out of the parochialism of [his] local community” (152). Significantly, DaVe still carried the tattered poem with him as he continued to translate his experiences (as in retelling to me). The poem moreover was linked to a wider constellation of mobile objects that traveled with him as he reassembled his world.

**Rooted Cosmopolitan Practices**

As the “Pretty Bullets” poem indicates, DaVe’s transliteracy practices were linked to an effort to reposition himself within a broader globalized society. This repositioning, however, was not wholesale resistance to the institutions of the IDF or state. Instead he was constructing a rooted cosmopolitan identity (Appiah) as he simultaneously affiliated as a national citizen and as a citizen of the world. In this fashion, DaVe constructed multilayered identifications across near and distant spaces.

First, at a local level was a strong identification with the IDF and his role as a combat soldier in the MLRS. Even more locally was his strong sense
of identification with his APC unit named the C-alef (alef is the Hebrew letter a). Twice per year the unit would refurbish the vehicle and change the mesh camouflage covering it. It was during this time that DaVe poached a red scrap of cloth, drew two medieval axes crossed like a skull and crossbones, and tied it around a flag mast to use an emblem for the vehicle. The design of the axes was borrowed from the inscription on the inside of his winter jacket. While his commanding officer deemed the flag too “extreme” to fly on the APC, DaVe expressed his admiration and respect for the officer.

He was also my commander at the time that I was sent to the military detention because of sleeping on one of the guard duties and so he told me and the other guy [also sleeping] that […] they still love us despite that we failed this guard duty. They are a bit disappointed with us in that regard but nonetheless they care for us anyhow […] I think [he was] one of the best NCOs that I had at that time.

In this narrative, DaVe’s transmedia practices marked his allegiance to his officer and unit. In this scenario, the commander supported and even showed his “love” for his men even when they were reprimanded. In relating this event, DaVe said, “He [the commander] sort of knew that we were coming back and that we would rise like the phoenix.” Echoing the title of his fantasy novel, DaVe’s framing of this event was mediated by his fantasy world. Moreover, embedded in the narrative was a trope related to honor and respect. This was evidenced in a design on his computer (Figure 5) of an official-looking military seal comprised of multiple elements: two crossed swords (remixed from the flag), his vehicle identification C-א (alef), and the phrase שיא הכבוד (si hkavod, or “highest respect”). The word שיא (highest) was a play on the American letter C. Moreover, the refashioning of the icon with two swords was intended as more “regal.” DaVe then repurposed the insignia (Figure 6) by incorporating flames from the video game Diablo for flight uniforms (as part of a costume wardrobe) for a film version of his science fiction story. The mixture of these various elements—multiple languages, medieval iconography, military rhetoric—foreground the rich array of materials reassembled into DaVe’s military and literate identity.
Figure 5. APC insignia.

Figure 6. Repurposed APC insignia film version.
Signaling local identifications was also the repurposing of the term *respect* in a journal entry containing a four-page memorial (Figure 2) written soon after his departure from the service (aforementioned in the section on "End Credits"). The format of the entries follows standard IDF practice of organizing names by draft date with the month abbreviated in English followed by the year. Significant was the text written beside his own draft date: “Nov 2000: most respected ever.” As DaVe explained, the term *respect* was a regular part of military discourse.

Everything in the army is something respect. Doing one thing and then the phrase goes with it. Like your draft period. I was November 2000 so it would be November *alpeyim kavod* [2000 respect].

The term *kavod* (along with the draft date) was tagged by soldiers on trees, military vehicles, walls, and buildings. DaVe spray-painted “Nov 2000 *kavod*” on the inside of a watershed. These practices were bound up in what Tamar Katriel refers to as the “rhetoric of cohesion” in Israeli society. Grounded in the socialist and communal ideals on which the state was founded, these rhetorics are diffused throughout the society and manifested in sets of rules and rituals fostering a sense of the collective. As Reuven Gal writes in his portrait of an IDF soldier,

> the organizational structure of the IDF insures highly cohesive units both in regular forces and among the reserves. This level of cohesion is expressed in a sense of brotherhood, especially among members of front-line units, hence its extreme impact on unit morale and combat effectiveness. However, the prevalence of cohesion in the IDF’s units is not just a result of military organization. Above all, it reflects the nature of educational and social values in Israel. (Qtd. in Katriel 26)

Even as DaVe identified with these ideologies, however, he also displayed cosmopolitan forms of identification. This was indexed in the references to Western popular culture and English (e.g., wordplay on the letter *C*) in his texts. His multilayered identifications, however, were perhaps most forcefully illustrated in the memorial to soldiers listing names by draft date. Marking affiliations beyond his local MLRS unit was the translation of the soldiers’ Hebrew names into English. This transformation is particularly salient when placed into a wider historical context as the Hebrew language has been traditionally closely associated with the Zionist enterprise (Al-
The uptake of English reveals the depth to which it was infiltrating DaVe’s national consciousness in a society in which the military served as a key emblem of the state. In this manner, DaVe was signifying not only solidarity with his fellow soldiers but also what Matt Hills calls a “semiotic solidarity with others worldwide who share his tastes and interests” (qtd. in Jenkins, “Pop” 156). DaVe was developing multilayered identifications distributed across near and distant spaces with his military and cosmopolitan identities deeply knotted.

Traversing Scenes of Literacy

As DaVe’s case illustrates, his repeated movements across social, semiotic, and geographic borders fostered a sense of rhetorical attunement to translingual and transmodal practices. Not merely drawing on a prefabricated repertoire of resources, his literate activity was also negotiated creatively and on the fly. It is through a lifetime of these engagements that he developed a set of dispositions and practices that became sedimented into his literate identity.

More specifically, this case study suggests at least four key ways his literate practices and beliefs were shaped through these engagements.

First, the study suggests that his boundary work fostered a critical awareness of textually mediated activity. DaVe acquired an understanding of language as always in translation (Pennycook) or as dynamic, contested, changing, and co-constituted. More particularly through his poaching, or repurposing, he developed meta-awareness of linguistic uptake. This is “knowledge of what to take up, how, and when: when and why to use a genre, how to select an appropriate genre in relation to another, how to execute uptakes strategically and when to resist expected uptakes, how some genres explicitly cite other genres in their uptake while some do so only implicitly, and so on” (Bawarshi 653). Working across multiple modalities, DaVe more broadly developed a sense of attunement to all available means of persuasion, or sensitivity to the uptake of multiple signs and symbols, as elements that were always in translation.

Second, through this process, DaVe became attuned to how spatial and design grammars were bound up in regimes of practice. The concept of a literacy regime (Blommaert) characterizes ways literacy mediates the
maintenance of social structures. As part of an ongoing series of engagements within complex semiotic systems, DaVe developed a conception of literacy as a site of struggle mediating asymmetrical relations of power. Through repeated moments of translation, DaVe cultivated a holistic orientation to literacy as well as a critical awareness of the semiotic potential or affordances and constraints of signs and symbols, each sedimented with ideologies and meanings that oriented (and were oriented by) actors.

Third, DaVe adopted a less bounded and spatialized approach to literacy practices as he traversed near and distant social spheres. Literacy for DaVe was everywhere all the time. Central to his activities were not only rhetorical choices about what to write, draw, or design, but also where to locate and deploy semiotic artifacts: flag poles, watersheds, the inside of his APC, the inside of his jacket, the back of a bus station schedule. These material structures were complexly intertwined with wider social structures distributed across far-flung semiotic chains. Literacy was both a habit and a world that DaVe inhabited. These objects (poems, scraps of cloth, journals) traveled with him as they shaped and were shaped by his ever-evolving figured world.

Fourth, DaVe’s views about the word and the world (Freire and Macedo) were inextricably intertwined. Through mobilizing a repertoire of signs, symbols, and objects, DaVe reassembled a rooted cosmopolitan identity, as he repositioned himself across near and far-flung social spaces. In this fashion, his transmedia practices were not only bound up in a shifting set of beliefs about language and literacy, but also multilayered forms of identification within a globalizing Israeli society. His learning and use of English was deeply intertwined with this process.

Grounded in these findings, I extend current calls for a less bounded approach toward language study that integrates translingual and transmodal perspectives. Jonathan Alexander argues that one of the most pressing areas in need of attention is the ways that scholars have “separated out and divided” (3) various aspects of composing lives. The case study of DaVe points to the necessity of this work. As DaVe’s case illustrates, one’s literate identity cannot be accurately defined by a single language, mode, genre, institution, or social space, but instead is deeply relational and linked to how actors continually weave (and are woven into) complex webs of activity. Pedagogically, DaVe’s case adds weight to calls for broader
conceptions of writing as remix and design (Johnson-Eilola and Selber). The findings also align with Shipka’s multimodal composition classroom in which students are invited to engineer rhetorical events (Toward). DaVe’s case supports this theoretical and pedagogical framework while situating it in translocal contexts.

Scholars in transmedia studies may feel this study is limited in its attention to digital practices. However, this focus (from an emic perspective) is due to the nature of DaVe’s practices; he did not significantly participate in online affinity spaces that are staples of most participatory culture research. Though he was technologically savvy and on the periphery of this online world, many of his literacy practices were decidedly “low tech.” Similar to his literate identity, his practices were not easy to categorize. This issue is a key point of significance. It suggests how overly determined assumptions about digital technologies might prematurely filter out the participants and practices that we select for study. As Shipka argues her “concern is that a narrow definition of technology coupled with the tendency to use terms like multimodal . . . as synonyms for digitized products and processes will mean that multimodal . . . will be . . . severely limited by the texts, tools, and processes associated with digitization” (Toward 10). Lending credence to this argument, DaVe’s case uncovers the rich resources that actors may develop through engagements in and across digital and nondigital spaces. Often less visible in multimodal scholarship, these connections are key to a framework that imagines digital technologies as densely intertwined with face-to-face contexts as opposed to a domain of “a self-enclosed cyberian apartness” (Miller and Slater 5).

However, the findings of this single case study point to the need for more fine-grained attention to what multilingual and multimodal composing entails and the ways these practices mediate wider beliefs about literacy. Critically beyond these aims is the need to understand ways these beliefs travel across contexts (and into classrooms) as they shape and are reshaped in moments of everyday practice. While an individual case that could be interpreted as “extreme” (as DaVe’s commanding officer characterized him), it is this precise aspect of his story that makes visible shifting conceptions of literacy in the context of twenty-first-century globalization.
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Note
1. Code meshing is a way for multilingual writers to incorporate their home languages into the dominant discourse. While Suresh Canagarajah’s subsequent scholarship has moved toward a broader focus, code meshing points to a more holistic and embodied approach. While code meshing may imply blending two different worlds, code meshing indexes a more complexly mediated process with actors weaving together multiple semiotic modalities. Indexing the material nature of this process, it can also extend to objects.
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