**Mariana Grohowski Narrative Transcript**

A quick glance at the evolution of my technological literacy and one might say I’m a late bloomer. Or viewed through the lens of Sherry Turkle’s (1988) research and like other women’s (see Abbate, 2012), one could say my technological literacy development has been gendered—but more about that in a minute.

Like other North American millennials, my earliest memory of computer use occurred in an elementary classroom, peering over classmates’ shoulders as they played The Oregon Trail. I found the dark green font and screen difficult to enjoy. Unlike my classmates, I rarely pursued the chance to play. I found little interest in computers until I learned about the Internet, specifically chat-rooms. In 1998 my mom bought her first computer “the original iMac.” I had no use for the machine until my mom showed me the Internet. I taught myself how to type out of desire to contribute to fast-paced conversations with strangers in chat-rooms.

My interest in computers and technology fell to the wayside during my adolescence for many of the reasons Sherry Turkle (1988) has written about—specifically, I felt the pressure to distance myself from the computer to ensure I didn't, “belong to a world where things are more important than people” (p. 47). Though I had perceived the computer as facilitating social connections, overtime peer pressure from my older sister and female classmates taught me to perceive that “the computer only shut people out” (p. 47). According to Turkle’s research, my computer use was extremely gendered—here’s how Turkle puts it: “women look to affection, relationships, responsibility and caring for a community of others and perceive technology as demanding separation” (1988, p. 51). For a number of years I carefully monitored my technological use and focused on establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships mostly un-mediated by technology.

Though I have bought myself a series of technologies to meet the demands of coursework and to keep in touch with friends and family, I had a careful and skeptical relationship with technology. That is until Dr. Kristine Blair ignited and encouraged my curiosity of computer technology’s power and potential for facilitating personal and professional interests. Specifically, that technology can foster personal agency and justice for women, girls, and individuals with disabilities. Dr. Blair introduced me to feminist approaches to science and technology studies and I’ve since grown increasingly fascinated with the affordances and constraints Web 2.0 and multimodal advocacy efforts by women who face physical, mental, and financial barriers.

Not unlike Cheris Kramarae’s 1988 edited collection *Technology and women's voices: Keeping in touch*, which Dr. Blair introduced me to, the three books Kris, Estee, and I review draw attention to women’s uses of technology exposing how social, cultural, and material factors influence and impede such practices. I think our review offers at least three implications for our audience:

1. It offers the potential to inspire other women and girls to share their technological literacy narratives. Scholars of computers and writing and rhetoric and composition have long stressed the power of storytelling to facilitate change. Indeed, scholars Cindy Selfe and Jacqueline Jones Royster, who I’ll quote directly, have reminded us that stories, “make visible many features, factors, relationships, people, and practices that heretofore were not visible” and that social resistance and change often begins with story (2000, p. 8).

2. Our review calls attention to action a need made by Dr. Royster in *Traces of a stream*—“that people who do intellectual work need to understand their ‘intellectual ancestry’ and people who do intellectual work need to understand power and how they are affected by it” (2000, p. 265). We hope our review signals to our computers and writing colleagues that the ancestry of our field has been shaped by feminist practices and advocates – though these feminist movers and shakers have not always self-identified as such and their labor has not always been visible – In echoing Royster’s (2000) call and as we've tried to suggest here—women’s technological labors need to be made more visible through the sharing of stories and narratives, which by their own accord, serve to challenge mythologies about technical use.

3. A third, last, and closely-related implication is that like Royster (2000), Selfe, and other scholars in rhetoric and composition, our review suggests that through the act of sharing stories can allow us to combat stereotypes about technological use all together and thereby we can create a more dynamic understanding of the influence of technology on our literate acts and lives.
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