

Parody and poesis in feminist fairy tales

Anna E. Altmann

Résumé: *À la lumière de la réécriture des contes de fées par, notamment, les écrivains féministes, l'auteur établit une différence entre la parodie, qui nous sensibilise à la nécessité d'un changement de mentalité, et la poesis qui, elle, crée une nouvelle image et une nouvelle compréhension de notre situation dans le monde.*

Two years ago I submitted to a scholarly journal a paper on Robin McKinley's *The hero and the crown*, in which I argued that McKinley had reclaimed the metaphor of the heroic quest for girls and women in a particularly significant way. One reviewer commented in rejecting the paper that I could more profitably have written about Patricia Wrede's *Dealing with dragons*. The suggestion was that Wrede's was a more feminist book than McKinley's, probably because it is a parody of the masculine heroic quest. We seem largely to assume that parody is the most powerful feminist tool we have to change oppressive social practices and rules implicit in children's literature, especially in fairy tales. This assumption is worth questioning.

Parody certainly has a very sharp edge, useful for exposing the ideological positions that our most commonly known fairy tales reflect and perpetuate. But parody is metafiction, a criticism of established forms. Criticism produces insight, but it does not necessarily make new use of the forms, create new meaning: it is not always poesis. That is its greatest limitation as a tool for opening new horizons, peopling a new landscape. Parody has other limitations as a feminist agent for socializing children. To achieve its intended effects, parody depends on pre-existing literacy. Readers or listeners must know not only the usual literary codes, but also that what they are reading is a parody, and what the conventions are that are being parodied. This is a demanding prerequisite. Further, in recalling the conventions it plays with, parody to some extent reinforces them. And, what I find irritating and retrograde, is the simplest form of feminist parody, which works like a see-saw: it merely inverts or reverses feminine and masculine gender roles as its main joke, and leaves us still trapped in a hierarchical structure of power relations.

The distinction between parody and what I have chosen to call poesis is one that must be considered if we are to evaluate feminist fairy tales as agents for social change. Parody, as I have said, is metafiction, a critical commentary on

an established form. Its most pronounced characteristic is self-conscious and pointed reference to established narrative conventions that are assumed to be known. If these established conventions are unfamiliar to the reader or listener, the primary storytelling tactic fails to have its anticipated effect. The reader may still make some sort of sense of the story, but it will not be the sense the writer intended. In feminist fairy tales that are straightforward parodies, the point, usually the main joke, is oversetting the readers' previously formed expectations, and in the process challenging the inevitability of those expectations. That is, parody looks back, plays with a particular genre or narrative form to comment on that form and on the meaning that has already been made with it.

Poesis, in contrast, looks forward, creates new meaning. The term poesis is not a tidy or commonly recognized antithesis to the term parody. It does not identify a genre, and the two terms are not mutually exclusive. But I need a word to set against "parody," to stand for what is not parody. The first meaning of the Greek word poesis is "a making: a forming, creating," and in that sense I juxtapose it to the critical nature of parody. Feminist fairy tales that are poesis rather than parody use the form of the fairy tale without commenting on it. Or, at least, commentary is not the main point, although such stories will undoubtedly revise readers' notions of fairy tale conventions. Where the parodies foreground in order to undercut the currently conventional characters and events of fairy tales, the stories that are poesis offer a new and wider world of meaning through reconfigured events and characters directly. Both types of story have a role in opening the language of fairy tales so that it speaks with equal meaning to both girls and boys, women and men. But they have two different roles, and I would argue that poesis is more powerful, that it moves beyond parody and takes us further.

I would like to use several feminist fairy tales, two simply parodic, one more complexly parodic, and two that are not parodies at all, but rather poesis in order to explore what new visions these forms offer. The stories are Patricia Wrede's *Dealing with dragons*, Robert Munsch's *The paper bag princess*, Catherine Storr's stories of Polly and the wolf, Jane Yolen's "The moon ribbon," and Katherine Paterson's *The king's equal*.

Patricia Wrede's *Dealing with dragons* is an example of what Linda Hutcheon identifies as traditional parody in that it has a pragmatic ethos of ridicule (50). For 212 pages (in the paperback edition) the book cocks a thoroughgoing snoot at centuries of golden-haired princesses held captive by fierce dragons and rescued by brave knights and princes whom the princesses marry to live happily ever after. Wrede establishes her critical distance from the tales she imitates by means of reversals or inversions. Princess Cimorene, the protagonist, is a complete contrast to the obedient and boring princesses in various shades of blonde that are among the secondary characters. She has black hair, is too tall, and would rather learn fencing and magic and Latin and cooking and politics than the embroidery and dancing that are the appropriate curriculum for

princesses in her world. The official heroes, all princes and knights, are sticklers for etiquette, and because their brave deeds are done for the sake of following the correct form, heroism as social convention, they are reduced to self-centred, unimaginative bunglers.

Wrede's chief inversion is making the fabulous determinedly ordinary. The dragons, rather than embodiments of a chaos that must be overcome because it threatens to rob one of being, are just another civilized species, very like people in their politics and fondness for chocolate mousse. Motifs from the tales that are Wrede's target are sprinkled about liberally in order to be debunked: "I'd much rather have good teeth than have diamonds and roses drop out of my mouth whenever I said something," Cimorene said. "Think how uncomfortable it would be if you accidentally talked in your sleep! You'd wake up rolling around on thorns and rocks'" (69). The sense of wonder that fairy tales should induce is relentlessly dispelled (Zipes, "Changing function" 11).

In its feminist program, *Dealing with dragons* is both parody and satire. While the target of parody is always another text, satire mocks some aspect of society, and the two genres are often used together (Hutcheon 43). Wrede parodies fairy tales in order to attack through ridicule the patriarchal gender definitions of masculine as heroic, feminine as prize to be rescued. Perhaps the simplest way to change a pattern and to mark the difference with an obvious reference to the source pattern is to invert or reverse it. This is what Wrede has done both with the conventional gender roles of our society and with the fairy tales that have mirrored them back to us.

The problem with this tactic when it is used on the binary opposites of masculine and feminine gender roles as they have been constructed in our society is that simply inverting the binary does not displace it. The result is, rather, like the working of a see-saw: in order for one end to go up, the other must come down, and both ends are ineluctably separated but connected, whichever one is up. The see-saw is evident in Wrede's story. Every male character—prince, knight, dragon, or wizard, whether evil or well-intentioned—is in some way an ineffectual nuisance. Wrede does point out that gender roles are socially constructed rather than essential, through Cimorene herself and in a brief passage explaining that female dragons can be kings ("'King' is the name of the job. It doesn't matter who holds it." [85]). But the implication of the story as a whole is that a woman can be something other than a passive princess only if all men are ineffectual and most of them jerks. While this redefines gender roles to open new space for women, it does so at the cost of maintaining a hierarchical, and therefore oppressive, gender structure.

The feminism of Wrede's parody is also limited in that it opens new space only for the exceptional woman. For as Hutcheon points out, the paradox of parody is that "even in mocking, parody reinforces; in formal terms, it inscribes the mocked conventions onto itself, thereby guaranteeing their continued existence" (75). In *Dealing with dragons* this is particularly obvious. One of the

ways in which Wrede marks the difference of her story from the fairy tales that are her target is by surrounding the revolutionary princess Cimorene with doubly conventional princesses (conventional in social terms within the story and in terms of literary conventions). She thus inevitably holds up the passive feminine as social and literary norm.

Dealing with dragons is a particularly extended traditional parody of the see-saw type. It is doubly satiric in that the parody is aimed against the power of fairy tales as well as against traditional gender roles. While it makes considerable demands on the pre-existing literacy and life experience of its readers, the teenaged audience that it anticipates undoubtedly has had enough exposure to parody, fairy tales, and feminist issues to get most of the joke, and therefore the point.¹

Parody's dependence on the previous knowledge of its audience does, however, limit its effectiveness as a socializing agent when it is written for young children. A fair example of this can be seen in children's responses to Robert Munsch's picture book, *The paper bag princess*. This book, another clearly feminist parody, has been enormously popular with the adults who buy picture books and read them to children. The soft cover edition has sold almost two million copies, and a 30-minute videocassette has recently been released by Cinar. Adults are amused by the parodic inversion that has Princess Elizabeth rescue Prince Ronald from a dragon and then not marry him after all, and they applaud the feminist lesson. Four- and five-year-olds respond differently. They enjoy the fairy tale action of burning castles and forests and flying around the world. They laugh at Elizabeth's last line—"Ronald ... you look like a real prince, but you are a bum." But what they find funny is coming across a rude word in a book. (Indeed, after the book was first published, "bum" was temporarily changed to "jerk," and in the British edition it has been replaced by "toad," although this may be a question of idiom rather than propriety.) What young children are unlikely to get is the parody and its feminist point. Bronwyn Davies, in *Frogs and snails and feminist tales*, a study that explores children's understanding of feminist stories, reports the reactions of a group of Australian pre-schoolers to *The paper bag princess*. For Davies herself, "[Elizabeth's] foolishness in loving someone so patently unworthy as Ronald and her capacity in the end to recognize that and walk away are the salient features ..." (140). But "most children believed she should have cleaned herself up and then married the prince" (60).

The children who reject the humorous lesson of the twist at the end know the rules of fairy tales, but they either don't recognize parody or refuse to accept it as a legitimate alteration of what they know of stories or the world. "Parody is a sophisticated genre in the demands it makes on its practitioners and its interpreters. The encoder, then the decoder, must effect a structural superimposition of texts that incorporates the old into the new" (Hutcheon 33). While the parody in Munsch's book is not at all subtle, unfamiliarity with the genre makes

it unlikely that young children will construct the meaning from it that adults do.

A review article (Foster) on politically correct children's literature published in *The Independent* in November 1992 gives further evidence that the feminist message of at least this particular parody was singularly ineffective in persuading young children to give up the fairy tale as they know it. Foster reports the story of an infant-school headteacher who read *The paper bag princess* with her class. (In the article, the book is misattributed, by either Foster or the teacher, to Babette Cole: the parodies are apparently becoming as generic as the tales they play on.)

"We had long discussions about that story," the headteacher told me, "focusing on issues like aggression, the dangers of judging people by their appearance and the empowerment of girls. We even wrote a script to dramatise the story." It was when the children handed in their suggestions for costumes that the teacher realised what she was up against: "There was no sign of a paper bag; every single outfit for the princess was some version of a ball gown, with tiara, satin pumps, the lot!" (Foster 43).

The teacher may have been wrong to judge the impact of her lesson entirely by the exclusion of the paper bag from the costume list. After all, the children may not have looked on the dramatization as primarily an exercise in accurate reproduction of the story in the classroom, but rather as an opportunity for imaginative play.² However, it is noteworthy that the paper bag did not capture their imaginations, although it is featured in the title of the story and is the instrument that reveals Ronald's unworthiness. For adults who see fancy clothes as an uncomfortable restriction associated with social duty and a required display of status, the paper bag is a good joke. For the teacher, it was the price and symbol of Elizabeth's empowerment. (In the last picture in the book, after "They didn't get married after all," Elizabeth dances off into the sunset dressed only in her paper bag.) The children ignored the paper bag as both joke and symbol. Their refusal to give up satins and jewels for the utilitarian bag may be read as a refusal to exchange the extra-ordinary, the wonder of fairy tales, for a moral in a plain brown wrapper.

Further evidence of the shortcomings of *The paper bag princess* as a feminist tale for young children is the effect on a young audience of the see-saw inversion of the gender roles. Like *Dealing with dragons*, this book makes the princess the hero by discrediting the prince. Davies has documented that this confuses the children, and some of the boys refuse to make sense of the story in this way (63, 65). Carol Anne Wien noted in her review of the book in *Canadian children's literature* that her five-year-old son "could not bear to hear Ronald called a 'bum' and instructed the reader, 'Don't read that part; don't turn the page!'" (57). Elizabeth, like Cimorene, fails as a princess precisely because she succeeds as an individual. Ronald ultimately fails as a prince because he's a bum. On the feminist parodic see-saw, a girl who fails as a princess becomes a hero. But the prince just can't win: his failure as a hero makes him a laughing-stock. Small

boys can find no acceptable role in such a story, and that is unfortunate. It seems to me a pity to visit the sins of the fathers on the heads of five-year-olds.³

The feminism of the two traditional parodies I have discussed is so easily recognizable, and so apparently powerful, because both are informed by the “negative evaluation” and “corrective intent” characteristic of satire (Hutcheon 54). However, as Hutcheon points out, parody need not ridicule, although ridicule is part of the common definitions of the genre. What Hutcheon calls modern parody respectfully works with or plays with the text it incorporates, and I would argue that feminism in such stories is considerably more productive, especially when the intended audience is younger children, than that which is grounded in mockery.

Catherine Storr’s stories of clever Polly and the stupid wolf mark their difference from conventional fairy tales by bringing the conventions of the fairy tale into our every-day world. The wolf is a fairy tale wolf, whose role is to eat little girls, and who reads fairy tales for instructions on how to catch Polly for his next meal. Polly is a clever seven- or eight-year-old school-girl who saves herself from the wolf by using her wits. Although the parody is delightfully funny, the wolf is a real danger to Polly in the story because Storr plays with rather than debunks the tales she incorporates into her own. The joke is on this particular wolf, not on the fairy tales themselves. One example of Storr’s understanding of what fairy tales are about, of what the wolf is in fairy tales, comes in “The wolf at school” in *Last stories of Polly and the clever wolf*. Polly’s class is putting on a play, Hansel and Gretel. The wolf says to Polly:

“I know that story! They get lost in a wood, don’t they? I’m sure there must have been a wolf in that wood. Woods in fairy stories always have wolves in them.”

“This one didn’t. It had a witch who lived in a gingerbread house.”

“Why gingerbread? Nasty stuff. It makes my throat tickle.”

“To catch children who liked it. Then she cooked them and ate them.”

“That sounds like a good part. I shall be the witch.” (8)

The wolf recognizes his role at once, as Storr does. He is the threat, the embodiment of the possibility of annihilation, whatever form it takes.

The feminist force of these stories is not, perhaps, obvious, because it is not a direct protest against the past. Polly is a hero in her own right, as Polly, rather than because she is an exception to a constricting convention. But Storr gives us an independent female hero whose competence is all the more persuasive because it is unexceptional, and she does so without closing out male readers. Such modern parodies have more of poesis in them because they are not so much concerned with kicking the stuffing out of the old as with making something new.

Two feminist fairy tales which are not parodies at all and are, as I read them, very good examples of feminist poesis, are Jane Yolen’s “The moon ribbon” and Katherine Paterson’s *The king’s equal*. “The moon ribbon,” written for older readers, was published in 1976 in a collection of Yolen’s stories to which it gives

its name. The collection is now, regrettably, out of print, but this story is included in Jack Zipes's *Don't bet on the prince. The king's equal* is a new picture book. Both stories use the structure and tone of a fairy tale, with no nudging or winking to mark their difference.

"The moon ribbon" is a Cinderella story without the ball, the slipper, and the prince, but with all the magic and high seriousness of the wonder tale. Sylva, the Cinderella figure, acts to save herself from the misery of life with her stepmother and stepsisters. Her courage comes from despair, but it is courage. Her helper, a numinous female figure whom Sylva is invited to claim as both mother and sister, teaches her that there is always a choice, and that the jewel of one's heart, oneself, can only be given with love, never under coercion. There are no men in this story, except for the father who dies on the first page "in order to have some peace" (81). It is a woman's tale of self-definition, but both women and men may choose to find meaning in it.

The king's equal is also a serious story. Rosamund, a poor farmer's daughter, saves her people from oppression, and a cruel, grasping prince from his own arrogance, because she is kind and truly wise. She passes the prince's three tests with a little magical help and two shrewd insights of her own, and then refuses to marry him until he has passed *her* tests and is truly *her* equal. While the prince learns to know himself, Rosamund undoes all the evil he has done in the kingdom. The story ends in marriage, but Rosamund is not a prize for the prince, nor is he her salvation. Rather, she is his.

It seems to me that fairy tales like Paterson's and Yolen's are more deeply feminist than the ridiculing parodies. They are about what women can be and are, not about how women have been constructed in the past, and so they are far more immediately transformative than the parodies. Their challenge to constricting gender roles is made within the form of the fairy tale, by creating a new vision rather than contesting the old. They thus have all the power of the wonder tale to give them force, a power that is lost in ridiculing parodies. And because the expected form and tone are not altered, young readers or even younger listeners are not disrupted or confused by demands for critical reflection that they are not prepared to meet.

The ridiculing see-saw parodies seem to work from the premise that in fairy tales told straight the questing hero must inevitably be male, and the object of the quest, when it is a person, must inevitably be female. But these roles are not fundamentally male or female at the basic level of the narrative, although storytellers or readers, because of their own ideological positions, may see a particular function or relation to the events of the narrative as necessarily masculine or feminine (that is, as gendered).

I am suggesting that in considering feminist critiques of fairy tales it is important to observe the distinction narratologists make between fabula and story.⁴ The material of the story, what I have called the basic level of the narrative, is the fabula. In Mieke Bal's definition, "A story is a fabula that is

presented in a certain manner. A fabula is a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused and experienced by actors" (Bal 5). At the level of the fabula, which is the material that is worked into a story, actors are not yet characters. They cause or experience events, and, as classes of actors determined by their relation to the events (actants), are distinguished only by their function as, for example, subject, object, sender, receiver, helper, or opponent. "An actor is a structural position, while a character is a complex semantic unit" (Bal 79). Neither sex nor gender (the behaviour that is deemed to be properly characteristic of one sex) is essential in the fabula. The distinct traits that transform the actors into characters are aspects of a specific story (Bal 7). The elements of the fabula—events, actors, time and location—are manipulated in their presentation as a story. "The fabula is 'treated,' and the reader is being manipulated by this treatment. *It is basically at this level that ideology is inscribed*" (emphasis added, Bal 50).

In my discussion of *The hero and the crown* I compared two quest-romances, McKinley's novel and Northrop Frye's epitomization of the stories of St. George and Perseus (Altmann 150). There are salient differences between the two at the level of the story, including the fact that McKinley's hero is a young woman, while St. George and Perseus, like the heroes of most traditional quest tales, are men. But at the level of the fabula, these differences disappear, and I argued that the sex of the hero is not one of the basic elements of the quest-romance. Maria Tatar makes a similar point in discussing the interpretation of fairy tales.

Once we realize that German female Cinderellas did not outnumber male Cinderellas until the eighteenth century, we look at the Grimms' version of the story with different eyes. The discovery of male Cinderellas and Snow Whites in modern Turkish folklore invites further meditations and investigations. That Russian folklore has a male Sleeping Beauty reminds us that we must show caution in drawing generalizations about female developmental patterns on the basis of that plot. And we are obliged to think twice about male hero patterns when we come across a collection of tales depicting heroines who carry out tasks normally put to male heroes alone or who denounce fathers too weak to protect them from evil-minded stepmothers (47).

Tatar confuses the issue somewhat by using the word "heroines" to refer to female heroes. She has just warned her readers that the actor who embodies the structural position of the hero at the level of the fabula is not always characterized as male at the level of the story. To label male heroes as "hero" and female heroes as "heroine" conflates actor and character, fabula and story. But in grouping Cinderellas and Snow Whites and Sleeping Beauties, Tatar is, in fact, making that distinction by recognizing similarities at the level of the fabula among different stories.

My point, then, is that at its basic level, the level of the fabula, the fairy tale does not promulgate or enforce gender roles of any type. That happens at the

level of the story. Certainly, as Bal suggests, "The suspicion that the choice of a hero and of the features attributed to him or her betrays an ideological position is a reason not to ignore the problem but rather to study it" (93). But that study, and the protest or indictment that may follow from it, are properly aimed at particular stories and the societies in which they are told. For the actor becomes a character, and ideological positions are inscribed, at the level of the story, not the level of the fabula. Our images of rescuing princes and rescued princesses are formed from the fairy tales we have heard, or heard about. These stories are shaped by tellers, and, just as importantly, by listeners, in their own time and place, according to their way of understanding the world. Other fairy tales, new and old, use the same type of fabula differently.

When we are shocked into cooperative laughter by a grubby princess dressed in a paper bag or one who wants to live with dragons, it is because these characters challenge our preconceptions of what a princess in a fairy tale should be. It is important to understand that the challenge is really to our preconceptions, rather than to the material of fairy tale itself. There is no need to condemn fairy tales altogether because the ones we know seem to teach or reinforce gender roles that we have begun, for very good reasons, to question.

It is also important to understand that a feminist parody that ridicules fairy tales is not a feminist fairy tale. The intended response to a ridiculing parody is derisive laughter, rather than the wonder that a fairy tale evokes. Fairy tales aren't reclaimed or replaced by feminist see-saw parodies. Rather, they are discounted.

Certainly the critical distance of parody, particularly when it is satiric, can bring us to an awareness of the need for change, and clear the ground for it. As Stephen Jay Gould has written in another context, "We must have gadflies ... to remind us constantly that our usual preferences, channels, and biases are not inevitable modes of thought" (381). Criticism is useful because it exposes the structures that prevent us from realizing the wonder of our lives. But poesis, fairy tales like Yolen's and Paterson's, creates new images that deepen our understanding of what it is to be human and to live in the world.

NOTES

- 1 Wrede's *Dealing with dragons* has been a success with reviewers (it was a *Booklist* Editor's Choice, a *School library journal* Best Book of 1990, and a nominee for the Young Reader's Choice Award in 1993), and teachers and librarians report that it is popular with teenagers. I am not challenging these evaluations. The somewhat sophomoric humour of the extended joke is appropriate for its audience, and the writing is both competent and clever. My point is that to prefer it to *The hero and the crown* as a more feminist version of the same sort of tale is to confuse two genres. I do find the sequel, *Searching for dragons*, more engaging: while it is also funny, it has more magic in it, and less of the see-saw.
- 2 It seems to me that any sensible child given the option will choose a ball gown over a paper bag for dressing up. A young friend of mine was dressed as the Paper Bag Princess, in a brown grocery bag, by her parents for Hallowe'en when she was two. Any doubt about the character she was impersonating, and about the authors of the impersonation, was settled by the caption

- written in large letters on the bag: "Our Paper Bag Princess." Now that my young friend is six, her own choice of dress-up clothing is a swirling, purple satin cape, a truly royal garment sent to her by a sensible (and feminist) aunt, and worn on every possible occasion.
- 3 Zipes, in his *Fairy tales and the art of subversion*, acknowledges that children resist the changes in what he calls emancipatory fairy tales, but he argues that "The quality of emancipatory fairy tales cannot be judged by the manner in which they are accepted by readers but by the unique ways they bring undesirable social relations into question and force readers to question themselves" (191). Perhaps their quality cannot be judged by the manner in which they are accepted, but I think their efficacy can. The responses that Davies, Foster, and Wien report show no signs of young readers questioning themselves, but rather simple avoidance or resistance.
 - 4 My use and understanding of these terms relies on Mieke Bal's *Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative*.

WORKS CITED

- Altmann, Anna E. "Welding brass tits on the armor: An examination of the quest metaphor in Robin McKinley's *The hero and the crown*." *Children's literature in education* 23.3 (1992): 143-56.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.
- Davies, Bronwyn. *Frogs and snails and feminist tales: Preschool children and gender*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1989.
- Foster, Aisling. "Narratively challenged." *The independent* 22 November 1992: 43-44.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A theory of parody: The teachings of twentieth-century art forms*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Munsch, Robert N. *The paper bag princess*. Illus. Michael Martchenko. Toronto: Annick Press, 1980.
- Paterson, Katherine. *The king's equal*. Illus. Vladimir Vagin. New York: HarperCollins Children's Books, 1992.
- Storr, Catherine. *Clever Polly and the stupid wolf*. Harmondsworth: Puffin, 1967.
- . *Last stories of Polly and the wolf*. London: Puffin, 1990.
- Tatar, Maria. *The hard facts of the Grimms' fairy tales*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Wien, Carol Anne. "Problem-solving models for children." *Canadian children's literature* 22 (1981): 56-61.
- Wrede, Patricia. *Dealing with dragons*. New York: Scholastic, 1992.
- Yolen, Jane. "The moon ribbon." *Don't bet on the prince*. Ed. Jack Zipes. New York: Methuen, 1986. 81-87.
- Zipes, Jack. "The changing function of the fairy tale." *The lion and the unicorn* 12.2 (1988): 7-29.
- . *Don't bet on the prince: Contemporary feminist fairy tales in North America and England*. New York: Methuen, 1986.
- . *Fairy tales and the art of subversion*. New York: Methuen, 1988.

Anna E. Altmann is an Associate Professor in the School of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta.