E Session Abstracts

E1. Writing among bilingual, second-language, and foreign-language writers

Positionality, mestizaje, and Tejano/a? counter discourse

Nancy Nelson
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
nancy.nelson@tamucc.edu

Estanislado Barrera, IV
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

Kim Skinner
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

At the border, which has been called a "paradoxical space" and an "in between-ness," different and sometimes competing and even conflicting peoples, languages, and customs come together. This is where new cultural forms often develop—from *corridos* to TexMex. However, the border is not a simple divide between this place and that, between this language and that, between these people and those, but is also a psychologically situated space. Various kinds of borders besides the transnational boundaries must be acknowledged, as postcolonial theorists, such as Perez (1999), have argued. They include those borders between genders and between the colonizer and the colonized.

This paper focuses on the relationship between two seemingly competing notions: positionality and *mestizaje*. Positionality is the placement of oneself relative to others (cf. Bakhtin, 1982; Darder, 1995), which often means differentiation from others, whereas *mestizaje*. is the hybridity that characterizes peoples and cultural forms as neither purely this nor that but a combination (e.g., Anzaldua, 1999; Keating, 2005). The latter is often applied to border matters, since borders are characterized by the mixing of peoples from various ethnic, racial, and cultural groups and also by the mixing of languages and other cultural forms and practices. Opposition to hegemony is a major element, and it is reflected in the characterization of border discourse as *counter-discourse*.

How then to reconcile the two: the mixed, the hybrid, the *mestizaje* with the distinctiveness associated with positionality? We can do so by considering a poststructural, postmodern, and postcolonial notion and seeing the both/and of the border as its distinctiveness--seeing positionality as arising from *mestizaje.*

Illustrating various points are examples of discourse forms and practices, some from published work, some from written and oral discourse of students in school and community settings, and others from such forums as poetry slams.

**An account of writing strategies for the development of professional competences
of modern language teaching students: Spanish and English[1]**

---

[1] THE PAPER IS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE HAVE EXPERIENCED FROM THE COURSES WE TEACH (ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND LITERARY THEORY).

Margarita Ulloa T.
University of Bio-Bio, Chile
maulloa@ubiobio.cl

José Gabriel Brauchy
Catholic University of the Holy Conception, Chile
jbrauchy@ucsc.cl

The international diagnoses (TIMSS, STEPS and OSD)[2] and the national ones (the nationwide PSU test for college admission)[3] reveal weaknesses in secondary education in Chile that compromise the academic success of postsecondary students. The low academic ability of our students results in a high desertion rate and delays in graduation.
Our project examines the close links between reading comprehension, and expository writing in both Spanish and English. We argue that undergraduate students receive little training to develop their reading comprehension and expository writing during their school life. Nevertheless, there is an uncertain perception that students have been able to develop generic and subject-specific competences as defined in the Tuning Educational Structure Model (2004).

The study seeks to provide understanding, context, and results in relation to the reading comprehension and expository writing among undergraduates in both Spanish and English, which is of interest to English Education Schools working for the effective implementation of a competence-based curriculum design. Considering the OECD[4] (2004) report for Chilean educational policies, we fully take their recommendation that higher education schools should deepen subject-specific skills and contents in a way that primary and high-school teachers may become more effective in their reading-writing practices.

The project has a threefold aim: (1) it presents the writing competences achieved by students of the Spanish and English Teacher Training Programs from two theoretical frameworks, Systemic Functional Linguistic and Tuning Model; (2) it describes how those competences map with the writing strategies and activities developed by teacher trainers, and (3) it challenges the national undergraduate Spanish and English curriculum designs by proposing the revision of links between reading comprehension, and expository writing among undergraduates in both Spanish and English. Through SFL (Halliday & Hasan 1990) we analyze the social systems and structures as well as the language system and structures realized in students' written texts; whereas the Tuning Project (2004), on the other hand, provides us with a framework for making explicit teacher trainers' strategies and activities that help develop students' academic reading and writing skills in English and Spanish along their BA Teaching Programs.

[1] UNESCO (2005), "Educational and equity in Latin America," *Newsletter* 1/33. (http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/newsletter/2005/jane05.pdf).

[1] VAA Universidad de Chile. PSU Lenguaje y Comunicación (http://www.pec.uchile.cl/elearning/psu.htm)

[1] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

E2. Strategies for second-language learners

Roots of reluctance: Dictionary use among non-native English speakers in a graduate electrical-engineering programs

Linda Dailey Paulson
U.C. Santa Barbara
ldpaulson@ece.ucsb.edu

One challenge I've encountered in working with doctoral students in Electrical Engineering is their reluctance to use a dictionary as they are writing and editing their work. Choosing the right word, the best possible word is an essential component of good, lively writing no matter the discipline. The dictionary is not simply a vocabulary building tool. Many students have expressed their surprise at seeing ME using a dictionary.

Why would that be? Are there different attitudes about linguistic proficiency in other cultures? Perhaps this is a result of how students learn English? Do they simply not like the thick book that it is? I don't know.

Students I've asked directly about this issue said they consider it is a sign of weakness to use a dictionary and it indicates they are not good English speakers. Yet, when I am working one-on-one with someone and a discussion about precision in language use occurs, we consult the pages of Merriam-Webster together to check a definition and read one or more aloud. When we do this, it's like a light goes off. You can see that the student grasps the nuances of the English language with the aid of the dictionary. Recent example -- previous vs. prior.

I'd like to devise a brief survey of attitudes about dictionary use for non-English speakers to find the roots of this reluctance and report the results. This would glean information that might contribute to such a bias, including linguistic and educational background as well as preferences for technical and social communication. It would be conducted first with the students in the four labs as respondents. Upon its completion, this may be expanded to native English speakers within the same discipline. The goal of this research is to provide optimal strategies to encourage dictionary use among graduate students.

Qualitative changes in the reading-writing connection

Myshie Pagel
El Paso Community College
University of Texas at El Paso
mpagel@epcc.edu

Roselia Galindo
El Paso Community College

In *Critical Academic Writing*, A. Suresh Canagarajah discusses issues of content in the pedagogies of language and literacy. An important pedagogical strategy is the reading and writing connection. Canagarajah summarizes three models: directional, non-directional, and bidirectional. Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) state "that the reading – writing connection undergoes qualitative change as the learners strengthen and diversify their literacy skills" (33). Our critical inquiry question is "Are there qualitative changes in a bidirectional model, and if so, are these changes significantly different than a directional model?" This paper will describe a study

conducted with the ESL credit courses at El Paso Community College (EPCC) in which directional and bidirectional models were implemented in two ESL writing and reading courses.

The ESL courses at EPCC are offered in six levels with four courses at each level: writing, grammar, reading, and listening and speaking. Historically these courses have been taught as separate entities following the directional and non-directional models. An ESL writing instructor and an ESL reading instructor collaborated on the teaching of an intermediate writing course and reading course. This collaboration involved the development of curriculum and qualitative inquiry based on Keith Richards' book *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. In addition to these two integrated courses, the two instructors taught a section of ESL writing and reading that was not integrated.

These results provide a critical analysis of the directional and bidirectional models posited by Ferris and Hedgcock, and the qualitative change they point to when they say that "the reading – writing connection undergoes qualitative change as the learners strengthen and diversify their literacy skills." This qualitative inquiry can further contribute to the question of whether writing and reading are isolated skills needed to access knowledge or if writing and reading are intersubjectively epistemic and necessary to make meaning.

E3. Engaging middle school students (ages 11-14)

Genre selection, student motivation and construction of student identity: Middle school students writing in Social Studies
Kevin A. Hooge, *U.C. Santa Barbara*

Persuading peasants and writing a five-paragraph essay: Genre and intertextuality in middle school social studies writing

George C. Bunch, Ph.D.
U.C. Santa Cruz
gbunch@ucsc.edu

Kara Willett
U.C. Santa Cruz

Interacting with a wide variety of oral and written texts is necessary both for succeeding in academic settings and living in what Bazerman has called a "complex literate world". This paper explores what young and inexperienced writers, including those still in the process of developing English, can do when they have access to and support in using different kinds of textual resources. The paper explores essays written by 40 students in six mainstream but linguistically diverse 7th grade classrooms at one predominantly Latino middle school in California. We focus on responses to one social studies prompt that asked students to "write an essay in which you try to persuade members of your family either to join or to oppose Martin Luther and his supporters in their campaign against the church". On one hand, the prompt asked students to construct an imaginary persuasive argument aimed at convincing family members to join (or not join) a major social movement. At the same time, students were expected to structure their argument in the form of an expository "five-paragraph" essay designed to display their knowledge of the content of the curriculum.

Some essays exemplified the five-paragraph organizational scheme, characterized by clear topic sentences, the use of cohesive devices commonly found in academic essays, and explicit evidence for each assertion made. Other essays instead emphasized a rhetorical stance more appropriate for convincing a group of peasants to join a social movement (emotional language, vivid imagery, and other rhetorical techniques to emphasize the self-interest of the audience,

foster sympathy for the plight of the peasants, or appeal to a larger sense of social justice). Many essays included elements of *both* genres. Adapting Bazerman's taxonomies of intertextuality, we explore the ways students drew on oral and written texts to address these different audiences and purposes.

E4. Factors leading to student success

Reading during writing: Using eye tracking to examine relationships between reading patterns and text quality

Scott F. Beers
Seattle Pacific University
sbeers@spu.edu

Tom Quinlan
Educational Testing Service
tquinlan@ets.org

Models of competent writing indicate the importance of reading the developing text as a part of composing (e.g. Hayes, 1996), yet we know little about the role reading plays in adolescent writing. Hayes (1996) proposed that reading "the text so far" influences cognitive processes such as text production, reflection, and text interpretation as the writer composes Empirical work has shown that reading during writing can serve text generation processes and contribute to text quality (Breetvelt et al., 1996; van den Bergh & Rijlaarsdam, 1999), but only when time is taken into account. For example, reading that occurs at the beginning of a writing session (reading the assignment/prompt) may serve different purposes and have different effects upon a writer's plans than reading to evaluate previously written sentences or paragraphs.

This study uses eye tracking technology to examine adolescent students' reading processes while composing two texts, and explores relationships between reading during writing, gender, and text quality. Two groups of students (boys and girls) composed narratives and persuasive essays while their eye movements were recorded. Reading patterns were coded according to the location of eye fixations upon the text: *reading at the point of inscription* (rereading the most recently composed 1-3 words); *local reading* (rereading the recently composed sentence); *global reading* (reading previously composed text, not including the most recent sentence); and *prompt* (reading the writing prompt). Using HLM to analyze relationships between reading patterns, time, and text quality, we found that those who wrote higher quality texts engaged in more *local* and *point of inscription* reading processes, while *global* reading patterns were not significantly related to text quality. Girls wrote higher quality texts and demonstrated more *local* reading than boys. *Local* reading and *reading at the point of inscription* may serve text quality by facilitating sentence-level and clause-level text generation processes.

Linking domain and situated motivation for writing with writing performance and experiences

Gary Troia

Michigan State University
gtroia@msu.edu

Rebecca Shankland
Michigan State University
shankla2@msu.edu

Kimberly Wolbers
University of Tennessee
kwolbers@utk.edu

Writing motivation, in terms of students' attitudes, values, beliefs, and goals, has a significant influence on writing achievement. However, much remains to be discovered about how this relationship unfolds over time, is affected by writing experiences, and is differentiated by general and context-specific motivation measures. This presentation will report findings from a study conducted with nearly 750 students in grades 4 through 12 in two states that was designed to examine the connections between general and contextualized writing motivation, frequency and types of writing experiences, and writing performance reported by teachers and measured independently through trait scoring.

Self-regulated strategy development for writing: What is needed next

Karen R. Harris
Vanderbilt University
Karen.Harris@Vanderbilt.edu

Consistent with theories on the development of competence and expertise across a range of academic domains (Alexander, 1997), learning to write is a multifaceted process that is influenced by changes in students' strategic behavior, knowledge about writing, and desire to write (Graham & Harris, 2003; Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2006). In addition, influential models of writing emphasize the importance of cognitive processes such as planning and self-regulation as central elements of skilled writing.

Development of the self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) model of cognitive strategies instruction has been informed by, and informed, theory and research on cognition, affect, metacognition, and self-regulation (Graham, Harris, & Zito, 2005). The SRSD approach to strategies instruction views learning as a complex process that relies on changes in learners' skills, self-regulation, strategic knowledge, domain-specific knowledge and abilities, and motivation. SRSD instruction addresses three major goals.
First, students learn to carry out higher level composing processes. Second, students develop the knowledge and self-regulatory procedures needed to apply writing strategies and regulate their behavior during writing. Third, SRSD is designed to enhance specific aspects of motivation, including self-efficacy and effort. There are over 30 studies investigating SRSD with students with learning disabilities and other struggling writers (Graham, Harris, & Zito, 2005). In one meta-analysis involving 18 studies (Graham & Harris, 2003), the effect sizes for large group studies for improvements in writing quality were 1.14 and 1.67 for students with learning disabilities and poor writers without disabilities, respectively. The average percent of non-overlapping data (PND) for single subject design studies for these two groups were above 90%, indicating that this treatment is very effective.

SRSD has resulted in improvements in four main aspects of students' performance: quality of writing, knowledge of writing, approach to writing, and self-efficacy. Across a variety of strategies and genres, the quality, length, and structure of students' compositions have improved. Depending on the strategy taught, improvements have been documented in planning, revising, content, and mechanics. These improvements have been consistently maintained for the majority of students over time, with some students needing booster sessions for long-term maintenance,

and students have shown generalization across settings, persons, and writing media (Wong, Harris,
Graham, & Butler, 2003). Improvements have been found with normally achieving students as well as students with LD. In some studies, improvements for students with LD have resulted in performance similar to that of their normally achieving peers.

In this talk, the components of SRSD that arose from different theoretical perspectives are identified, and what we have learned about their contribution to the impact of this intervention is discussed. Further, post intervention writing of students is examined to indicate what the next steps in both writing intervention and research should be, as SRSD is not a complete writing program, and more is needed to continue students' progress
as writers.

E5. Multimodal Writing Identities

Chair:
Mary M. Juzwik
Michigan State University

Much of the work on writing identities frames self-presentation in terms of an individual's relationship with his or her community. In contrast, this panel describes writing identities that emerged from relationships among modes. It examines the multimodal processes by which an autistic man, a National Writing Project participant, and a doctoral student came to identify themselves as writers.

Mediated identity: One writer's use of written language to bridge the "communicative canyon" of [his] autism"

Christine Dawson
Michigan State University

The participant of this case study, Scott, is an autistic young man who uses writing as a primary method of communication. A talented poet, Scott participated regularly in in-person and online writing groups, describing writing as a "bridge between myself and other people across the communication canyon of my autism." This presentation describes Scott's writing practices and the way he identified as a writer. It further explores the affordances/limitations of technologies that mediated Scott's written communication.

Collaborative identity: One teacher/writer participating in a National Writing Project summer institute

Jim Fredricksen
Michigan State University

As part of a larger study focusing on the ways in which teachers participating in a National Writing Project (NWP) summer institute talk about writing and learning to write, this case study explores how one teacher described her beliefs about writing and learning to write. The presentation explores this teacher's self-identification as a writer and as a teacher of writing, throughout her participation in the NWP summer institute.

Analytic identity: One doctoral student's development of internally persuasive discourse

Ann M. Lawrence
Michigan State University
annlaw@msu.edu

This case study describes the multimodal process by which one doctoral student, Laura, in preparing her first conference paper, came to identify herself as an academic writer. In discussing her emerging argument and her writing processes, Laura traversed oral and written, and narrative and expository, modes. Through this dialogic, multimodal process, Laura developed a single theoretical framework, which she used to interpret both her data and her experiences with analyzing her data, and both her newly claimed identity as an academic writer and the emerging professional identity of the beginning teacher she was studying.

E6. Material experience, visual displays, and learning environments

Displays of knowledge: Text production and media reproduction in liquid crystal research

Chad Wickman
Kent State University
cwickman@kent.edu

A wealth of research has examined the social, cognitive, and rhetorical dimensions of writing in various academic (Geisler 1994; Russell 1997), professional (Haas & Witte 2001; Bracewell & Witte 2003; Spinuzzi 2003), and scientific contexts (Bazerman 1988; Myers 1990; Blakeslee 2001). Scholarship in this tradition suggests that texts are most meaningful when understood not as static objects, but, rather, as products of dynamic human activity mediated by social norms, semiotic systems, writing technologies, and organizational structures. The Liquid Crystal Institute, a chemical physics research laboratory internationally known for its study of liquid crystals and development of liquid crystal technologies, provides an opportune setting in which to assess and extend existing research that has laid important groundwork for situated studies of writing and representation.

First, examining the way in which scientists "visualize" (Lynch 1998) their work through multiple semiotic systems and technologies can complement, and perhaps complicate, research on literacy that explores the relationship between new media, text, and writing as literate practice. Second, the Institute is home to an interdisciplinary graduate program in chemical physics and thus offers a setting in which to examine how students are initiated, through writing, into a community of practitioners. Finally, the Institute itself is involved in developing the very technologies and displays that mediate their own and others' work; exploring the relationship between research on liquid crystals and development of liquid crystal technologies offers one way to gain insight into science as a powerful modern institution. Through a descriptive account of ongoing field research, this paper traces the way in which scientists in this setting use a variety of mediational means—symbols, genres, technologies, instruments—to achieve personal as well as institutional objectives.

Writing research in mixed reality: Tools and methods for exploration

James K. Ford
U.C. Santa Barbara
jamesford@umail.ucsb.edu

As recognized by the theme of this conference, writing researchers have been extending a collective arm across numerous "borders." These borders may be distinct as with a classroom wall, a physical setting like a university campus, or an imaginary border shown only on a map or by a sign labeling the location of a border. Crossing any such border provides a time for a researcher to re-evaluate previously held notions about writing processes, products, technologies, etc. It also demands an evaluation of the researchers' tools and methods for conducting research and evaluating writing and all it encompasses.

Although this presentation will not discuss writing taking place across a traditional border, it will discuss writing research crossing the less obvious border of reality, virtual reality, augmented reality, and mixed reality. Research on writing and technology has been present in our field for numerous years, as have tools and methods for examination. However, writing research into the world of mixed reality is new, and thus learning which tools and methods are appropriate is a difficult process—a process that requires examination and discussion.

Specifically, this presentation will discuss the tools and methods that were in employed during a research project that examined the writing of physics students after interacting with a technology called FogScreen. This technology provides users with a unique experience of being able to interact with common physics concepts that are usually only taught in abstract mathematical terms or by 2D drawings.

The tools and methods discussed during this presentation are aimed at helping the researcher focus on specific text and image production, and ways to link text with interactions of the user by way of multimodal literacy theory, activity theory, tool internalization (Vygotsky), and textual analysis.

Stretching beyond borders: The multiple discourses of an anatomy laboratory and at an urban zoo

Carol Berkenkotter
University of Minnesota
cberken1141@comcast.net

T. Kenny Fountain
University of Minnesota

Zoe Nyssa
University of Minnesota

For Ph.D. students in the new Writing Studies Department at the University of Minnesota, science studies meets writings studies on equal terms. Many faculty encourage their advisees to take science studies courses outside the department believing that this cross-disciplinary training enhances young researchers' understanding of the unique discursive environments of the scientific professions. Drawing on research in anthropology of science, history of medicine, art history, and rhetoric of science, the speakers present two participant-observation studies of the multiple discourses and modalities of two very different research sites: a gross anatomy laboratory where undergraduates have their first experience with the human anatomy, and a well-known "new" zoo in a large metropolitan area. In the first of these sites, the laboratory, students' learning is verbal, visual, and tactile. Paradoxically, most human anatomy courses require no writing save the naming of bodily structures. Yet to learn in these spaces, students must make sense of, memorize, and recreate visual displays that resemble the human body, thus marking the visual as a dominant means of instruction. In fact, visuals function as a reasoning tool used by students engaged in a dialectical process of hypothesis-confirmation, one aimed at identifying structures on an increasingly dissected cadaver. Drawing from his ethnographic study of human

anatomy education in a cadaver lab, Fountain will describe how medical students and undergraduates make use of visual inscriptions (whiteboard drawing, color atlases, etc.). Using interview excerpts and student notes, he will show how students interact with and create visual displays that aid in memorization, dissection, and self-persuasion. Visual rhetoric, then, both presents anatomy and shapes their knowledge of the body.

The second site described in this presentation is the "new" zoo, *new* because in the last quarter century, zoos have shifted their institutional missions and communication practices to emphasize conservation activities characterized by sophisticated biological research on captive and wild animal populations. In attempting to communicate these new research priorities and activities, zoos must address diverse local and international audiences that include visitors, peer institutions, donors, animal welfare organizations, and communities around the world where field research takes place. The new zoo's scientific research and communication practices are complicated, however, by zoos' engagement in ethical, political, and environmental conflicts over the roles and the status of animals, as well as the incomplete and often inconclusive scientific evidence on which conservation policies must be based.

Using textual analyses of popular and technical zoo research reports and interviews and participant-observations collected over a twelve-month period at a prominent, research-oriented zoo, Nyssa will describe how the divergent epistemological and ethical commitments of zoo scientists and writers actually *constrained* the editorial staff, leading to interpersonal conflict reflected in the hybrid registers and narratives appearing in zoo publications. She will also discuss the outcome of this action-research project--namely how, at her suggestion, zoo writers and researchers implemented alternative information-gathering and writing procedures, measures that functioned successfully to reduce conflict between members of these groups and other zoo stakeholders.

E7. Making meaning: Authors, genres, and audiences

Do texts need an author? Production of text between constraints and freedom

Sylvie Plane
IUF de Paris, France
sylvie.plane@wanadoo.fr

This presentation will focus on the concept of the author, first by evoking the constraints that weigh on the production of text, then by determining among these constraints the ambivalent part played by the text itself.

• From the writer to the author
Our analysis deals with the opposition between the *writer* and the *author*. For the psycholinguist, the writer is the cognitive subject who produces a text, and whose activity of production can be modelled. On the other hand, according to the tradition of the literary studies such as they were founded at the XIX° century, the author is a singular being, who creates a singular work. Behind these dissensions one recognizes ideological oppositions and fundamental divergences between the theoretical and methodological apparatuses of two disciplines of research. We choose to be located at the interface between these two ideas of the subject and of the text production, by paying attention to the treatment of the constraints inherent in the act of writing.

Text production is indeed an activity subject to psycholinguistic and linguistic constraints. These constraints are distinguished from each other by the degree of freedom, which they offer and by the authority by which they are imposed. Thus, the constraints related to the limits of the cognitive apparatus of the writer and in particular of his working memory can be circumvented only with difficulty; on the other hand the constraints imposed by the language, by the genre, by the medium employed or by the text itself allow a broader range of treatments. To solve the

oppositions mentioned above between *writer* and *author* we consider the writer to be a generic entity subjected to the whole of the constraints imposing itself on the text production, and the author to be the singular subject who finds tricks to treat these constraints and to exploit in particular the space of freedom that the language and the text leave him.

• The author and the text: partners and adversaries
 The relationship between the text and its author is far from being simple and peaceful, because the text's production does not result from a simple fitting together of linguistic segments. It also proceeds from a complicated mechanism of confrontation and collaboration between the text and its author.

Two series of phenomena show how these relations are complex:
- on the one hand the phenomena of "reprise-modification" and reformulation. These phenomena show how any discursive production progresses at the price of tiny readjustments. They also point to the gap between intention and formulation, and emphasize the need for and the difficulty in providing a first substrate which will be used as point of support for the generation of the text, even if this first point of support is turns out to be necessarily unsatisfactory;

- on the other hand the phenomena of self-genesis of the text, in which we are more particularly interested. By observing these phenomena we can see how the text, and mainly the beginning of a text, tend to program what will follow. The work of the author then consists of exploiting the program which the text proposes to him without being overly constrained by this program.

These series of phenomena will be illustrated in examples taken from texts written by beginners (texts of young students) and published texts (texts of authors).

Playing with genre(s) as a meaningful writing activity

Pietro Boscolo
University of Padova, Italy
pietro.boscolo@unipd.it

Over the past two decades, studies on writing from a motivational perspective have focused on three main topics: how to stimulate students' willingness to write (e.g., Boscolo & Gelati, in press; Hidi, Berndorff, & Ainley, 2002; Hidi & McLaren, 1991), the relationship between writing competence and self-efficacy in writing (Pajares & Valiante, 2006), and how writers – not necessarily students – organize and regulate the available cognitive and affective resources when writing (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1999, 2002). Regarding the first topic, writing researchers have tried to identify the conditions under which a writing task may be perceived as enjoyable by students. In general, empirical studies have shown that students are motivated to write to the degree to which a writing task is seen a meaningful activity for them, and one which they feel able to carry out (Bruning & Horn, 2000; Hidi & Boscolo, 2006, 2007). 'Meaningful', however, is a somewhat generic adjective, which, when related to writing tasks, may take on different meanings, such as 'authentic' or 'interesting'. A meaningful writing task is often one in which writing is not perceived by students as an "academic" ability, but as a tool for expressing personal experience and communicating important and involving classroom activities.

The objective of the presentation is to propose a different meaning of 'meaningful', by describing an intervention study aimed at teaching fourth-graders "to play" with narrative genre. This is an instructional approach consisting of teaching students to use writing in a flexible and "creative" way, by modifying the rules of a genre (e.g., introducing changes in the structure and/or characters or limitations in fairy tales), combining fragments from book or journal texts into a new one ("cento"), writing coherent texts by avoiding specific word categories, and so on. This teaching method helps young writers become aware of narrative genre as well as its creative possibilities, and to acquire the sense that writing may be an enjoyable tool for creating "new" texts and meanings. Two aspects of the results of the intervention will be emphasized in

particular: the improvement in children's writing abilities due to the intervention, and its motivational effects in terms of increased interest in writing as an activity and self-perception of writing competence.

Sociocultural environments and control of narrative tools at French pupils ranging from 9 to 14 years

Christina Romain
I.U.F.M. Académie Aix-Marseille, France
c.romain@aix-mrs.iufm.fr

This communication aims at presenting the results of a study concerning the articulation between the various linguistic tools in the service of the textual production in a corpus of three hundred narrative texts produced by pupils from 9 years to 14 years stemming from heterogeneous sociocultural environments. This corpus was collected in several establishments of various municipalities of Bouches-du-Rhône (department of the region Provence-Alpes-Côte of Azure in France) - among which we shall quote : Marseille, Gardanne and Vitrolles-. We shall underline that this analysis is contrastive in the fact that it takes into account the sociocultural membership of the pupils (determined membership following the localization of establishments and confirmed indirectly by the educational index cards and directly by the treatment of questionnaires subdued and performed by the pupils) [5]. The reserved indicators are the plan quinaire, the textual organizers, the anaphoras, the thematic progress and time norms of the narrative. Our objective was to establish possible relations on one hand between these various indicators and on the other hand between the textual performances and the sociocultural previous history. The data processing allowed to establish that if there are fundamental differences from the point of view of certain discursive skills which can let think that they result from the difference of sociocultural origin of the pupils, there are nevertheless resemblances concerning the other discursive skills without distinction between both populations of pupils.

[1] Besides the distinction inherent to the membership in a Zone of Priority Education or still to the membership in an establishment registered in districts said "discriminated" or said "facilitated", we were interested in the sociocultural data which are the most significant in the distinction between these two populations of considered pupils. For that purpose, we made questionnaires circulate with the pupils. At the conclusion of the treatment of the answers, we were able to establish the following observations. Contrary to the pupils of districts said facilitated, the pupils of districts said discriminated arise from large families ; they live for the greater part in Houses with moderate rent ; 2/3 of them speak about another language than French (to them and\or between peers, for the greater part Arabic) they do not go on holiday or go abroad (country of the Maghreb) ; their parents exercise occupations mostly not qualified, they have less often the high school diploma and 3/4 of the mothers are unemployed ; finally so almost all the parents of both schools buy *Provence*, those of districts said "facilited" buy more frequently magazines and national newspapers (notably *Le Monde*). We can notice thus indeed a difference of sociocultural nature between these two populations of pupils.

E8. Patterns, methods, and contexts: Case results from a longitudinal study of writing highlighting results from a five-year longitudinal study of college writing

Presenters provide an in-depth view of student writing development both in and out of college and in national and international contexts

Chair: Dr. Andrea A. Lunsford
Stanford University
lunsford@stanford.edu

Respondent: Jenn Fishman
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
jfishman@utk.edu

Longitudinal studies of writing (Beaufort, 2004; Carroll, 2002; Herrington and Curtis, 2000; Spack, 1997; Sternglass, 1997; Smagorinsky, 1997; Haas, 1994; McCarthy, 1987) often involve case studies because case study methods invite researchers to describe, explain, and explore the development of student writing over time in relation to "holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events" (Yin, 2004). Following in this tradition, speakers on this panel will present case studies of undergraduate students, drawn from a single longitudinal study conducted over five years at Stanford University.   Working from survey, interview, and writing data, presenters will highlight different contexts and patterns of writing development using multiple methods of analysis. Presenters will also discuss methodological foundations of case studies in longitudinal research, address extant criticisms, and argue for the value of case studies in understanding the complex realities of both learning and teaching writing in our changing world.

International perspectives: Writing across cultures and contexts

Erin Krampetz
Escuela Nueva International
ekrampetz@eninternational.org

Erin Krampetz will showcase findings from case studies of eight international college students who matriculated from four different continents. Reviewing data collected over five years, this speaker will explore the relationship between students' perceptions of audience and their writing development, focusing in particular on how students' perceptions of audience relate to their language use, their attitudes toward writing, and their concepts of writing culture in the U.S. and abroad. Beginning with a critical analysis of writing portfolio data, Speaker #3 will chart students' use of linguistic and cultural codes across different types of academic and nonacademic writing, and she will cross-reference interview and survey data to explore some of the social and environmental factors that may prompt or promote students' use of alternative and hybrid forms of communication. In addition, this speaker will address methodological and ethical issues that arise in her work, including the challenges of locating individual case studies in larger, data-driven contexts and the complexities of speaking about others in case-based research.

From data to findings: Coherence, contradiction, and cases in the study of writing development

Paul Rogers
U.C. Santa Barbara
progers@education.ucsb.edu

Paul Rogers will present results from four case studies in order to compare theories of writing development, and demonstrate how case studies can be used to rigorously and fairly present empirical data. This presenter will illustrate the value of cases for theory development using a logic model which ties together concrete description of writing abilities with a full variety of evidence, including holistic and analytic assessments of student writing samples from across the undergraduate years, comparisons of the same writers with a national sample, and linguistic and content analysis of student interviews over a five year period. Implications for teaching and curriculum will be discussed, with a special emphasis on key factors that contribute to trajectories of professional writing development.

From college freshman to classroom teacher: A case study of five years in writing development

Laurie Stapleton
Stanford University
lstapleton@stanford.edu

Laurie Stapleton will present results of a case study investigating the writing development of a college student during her undergraduate years, and co-term (fifth) year in a joint MA/Education and teaching certification program. More than 300 samples of this student's writing were collected as she worked towards her Bachelor's degree, and her graduate degree/certification in elementary teaching. Other data sources include surveys and interviews conducted during each of the five years of the longitudinal study. The speaker will highlight key findings of the case analysis, and will discuss methods of analyzing multiple writing samples (i.e. preparation/organization of data, identification/application of rubrics, procedures for text analyses and analysis of writing development, software for coding, construction of matrices, etc.). A discussion period will allow for audience members to share knowledge and pose questions related to case analyses in longitudinal studies of writing development.

E9. Results from the National Survey of Student Engagement

Writing's relationship with highly valued educational activities and outcomes: Correlation studies of data from the *National Survey of Student Engagement*

Paul V. Anderson
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
anderspv@muohio.edu

This paper is one of three presented at this conference that use data from a nationwide survey to investigate the contributions that writing makes to effective undergraduate education in the United States. In the U.S. educational effectiveness has been defined in two ways: (1) gains in knowledge and skills and (2) student engagement in activities, often called "active learning" activities, that are believed—with some empirical evidence—to enhance learning in any discipline or course (e.g., Tagg 2003).

This paper examines data from the spring 2006 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which was taken by more than 180,000 first-year and senior students at 523 baccalaureate colleges and universities in the U.S. The researchers analyzed correlation of responses to NSSE questions about the students' school-related writing with their responses to questions about the educational activities in which they engaged and about the extent to which they attribute their knowledge and skills in various areas to their experiences at their college or university. The analyses compensated for the size effects created by NSSE's large data pool.

Preliminary results indicate strong correlations between writing and the highly valued activities and outcomes about which NSSE asks. In a related paper, Gonyea describes a path analysis of the same NSSE data to investigate the causal relationship between one measure of writing activity and some of the activities and outcomes discussed in this paper. In a third paper, Krallman compares results from correlation and path analysis studies of national and institution-specific data. This comparison is one element in Krallman's discussion of ways academic administrators can use NSSE studies to shape curricula at their colleges and universities.

The research methods used in these NSSE studies have international application. NSSE is developing versions for use outside the U.S. Similar surveys are being created in other countries.

The catalytic role of writing within student engagement: Causal modeling of data from the National Survey of Student Engagement

Robert M. Gonyea
Indiana University

Student engagement is a measure of both the time and energy students devote to educationally purposeful activities. The amount of writing and the writing process, key aspects of student engagement, are known to correlate with important collegiate outcomes such as critical thinking and problem solving skills, general knowledge, learning within a discipline, and self-awareness. The study reported by Anderson at this conference shows positive correlations between writing and other forms of student engagement such as deep learning, student faculty interaction, and active and collaborative learning. The purpose of this study is to test a theoretical model by which student writing has a *causal* relationship on other forms of student engagement, suggesting that it may drive engagement rather than simply be one form of it.

Writing is represented in this study as the approximate number of pages written by the student in the academic year. This assumes that the amount of student writing is a function of high expectations and making writing an expectation throughout the curriculum.

The data for the study come from over 180,000 first-year and senior students enrolled at 523 baccalaureate colleges and universities in the U.S. who completed the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2006. Using path analysis techniques, it is possible to estimate the total effects of writing as the sum of both direct and indirect (mediating) effects on students' self-reported gains in student learning and development. Path analysis is a statistical procedure that uses simultaneous multiple regression equations to estimate causal models.

Preliminary results show that writing has moderate to strong causal effects on several engagement variables, and that these variables have positive effects on students' self-reported gains in learning. So this study shows that writing does not only produce learning directly, but also takes on an elevated role as a catalyst to increase forms of engagement that promote learning and development.

Institutional uses of the results of analyses of data from the National Survey of Student Engagement

Denise Krallman
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

The analyses of nationwide data from the National Survey of Student Engagement that Anderson and Gonyea have described (at this conference) provide substantial evidence that student writing makes an important contribution to effective education at U.S. colleges and universities. Other NSSE data suggest that, in general, colleges and universities are not fully exploiting the potential of student writing to increase student learning.

At individual institutions, advocates for writing can use results of the correlation and path analyses of national NSSE data to urge faculty and academic administrators to give writing a more prominent place throughout the curriculum.

Because the national findings are based on such a broad sample (more than 180,000 students at 523 baccalaureate colleges and universities), individual institutions will achieve the best outcomes if they place these results within a local context. In discussions and presentations this contextualization can be achieved by looking at current faculty expectations and experiences within the institution and at the institution's student learning objectives and trend data that can focus on institutional changes.

Institutions participating in NSSE can also contextualize the national results by analyzing their own NSSE data in the same way that the national data has been analyzed—and by then comparing the results. Such a comparison has been done at one institution. It demonstrates that, while local results parallel national results in many ways, they are not identical with the national results.

Finally, the NSSE analyses reported in this paper and the papers by Anderson and Gonyea represent only one use of national survey data for research and curricular reform. Other recent work that is being done and the instruments being used will be described.

E10. Preparing pre-service and In-service teachers of writing across the curriculum

Interdisciplinary conversations on bringing students into a community of writers

Janine Utell
Widener University
jmutell@mail.widener.edu

Patricia Dyer
Widener University

Rachel Batch
Widener University

David Coughlin
Widener University

This paper will consider the questions of how and when students develop a vocabulary of critical thinking in their disciplines through their writing. How do they develop a sense of authority and enter into the work of their field, while also recognizing the connections among disciplines so necessary to academic life and writing? What is the connection between writing in the disciplines and the development of critical thinking, and how do students enter into these conversations?

As a result of ongoing conversations with colleagues across the disciplines -- History, Art History, Biology, Chemistry, Nursing, and so on -- we are using our own inquiry to challenge ideas about general education and the place of critical thinking within it. We see the major, the entrance of a student into the conversation of a field, as a crucial site of critical thinking, a major goal of our general education program; likewise, we see these ongoing conversations among colleagues as crucial for the same kind of crossdisciplinary awareness in us that we seek to foster in our students through general education. Thus, in our own collaborations with colleagues, we model such conversations for our students as they move forward in their studies, themselves becoming partners with faculty members in research and dialogue.

These practices feed back into our assessment and curricular design, as we hope to show through our discussion of the creation of research methods courses in English and History, and the design of a new iteration of our university's Values Seminar, "The Uses and Misuses of Science," team-taught by members of the History and Biology faculties. In our ongoing conversations with colleagues over the past three years we have begun to focus on the need for expertise in assignment design and strategies in writing pedagogy that will allow us to build on critical thinking, effective reflection on both local urban concerns and global issues, and foster burgeoning identities of students challenged to confront their interrelated worlds.

In this presentation faculty from four disciplines, History, Biology, English and Linguistics consider what we are learning from our crossdisciplinary conversation that will promote self-analysis of writing by students, a metacognitive awareness of process and product, and aid them in achieving a sense of authority over their work and a place in their disciplines and across disciplines.

Writing in subject specific contexts: Examples from Norwegian secondary education

Frøydis Hertzberg
University of Oslo, Norway
Froydis.hertzberg@ils.uio.no

Anne Kristine Øgreid
University College, Norway
Anne-Kristine.Ogreid@lu.hio.no

The new national curriculum in Norway (2006) introduces *writing* as one of five basic 'skills', to be integrated in all subject areas at all school levels from primary through secondary. The intention is that teachers from different subject areas should cooperate in promoting not only subject specific writing but also writing skills across the curriculum. The organisation of, and responsibility for this cooperation is still far from clear.

Our project aims at describing and analyzing textual and organizational challenges experienced by secondary school teachers when collaborating on teaching student writing. The focus will be on the relationship between teachers of Norwegian as language experts and other teachers as they include e.g. genre structure and writing styles in subjects such as science and social science.

The project is designed as an action research project where we cooperate with teachers from one or two secondary schools. The investigation will concentrate on writing cultures and styles in different school subject areas - similarities and differences, and the practicalities of teacher cooperation: organisation and responsibility. The fieldwork is in its initial phase and will be completed during the school year 2007/2008.

Our presentation will elaborate on the relationship between subject teachers' knowledge of specific disciplinary writing and mother tongue teachers' contributions within the field of genre and text theory in general.

E11. Exploring the kairos of writing program assessment

Nicole B. Wallack
Columbia University
nw2108@columbia.edu

Alfred E. Guy Jr.
Yale College Writing Center
alfred.guy@yale.edu

Kerry Walk
Princeton University

Writing program reviews create rich opportunities for research. WPAs gather and analyze important data about their programs. Internal committees bring departmental perspectives that

can illuminate and shape what's been learned in the self-study. Finally, external reviewers have inter-institutional context and vast experience in the field of composition. The potential for such rich conversation should produce substantial new knowledge about writing. Why, then, is so little composition scholarship generated out of the ever-growing corpus of program assessments?

This panel explores what keeps this generally urgent and carefully conducted study from being accepted as research. Some obstacles are predictable—limited data, truncated research design, or sensitive findings kept from widespread dissemination. But the very visibility of these obstacles should also make them manageable. What we suspect, instead, is that the kairos of program assessment prevents findings from becoming knowledge, i.e. that the urgency of the local occasion makes it impossible to place assessments in the intellectual context necessary to constitute research.

This panel will explore the *kairotic* challenges of program review at three Ivy-League Universities (Yale, Columbia, and Princeton) that have made substantial recent investments in writing programs, but which—having no faculty of Rhetoric—have struggled to know what they were getting for their money. At Yale, despite a general atmosphere of contentment with student writing, faculty projections for program assessment reveal a desire for certainty and standards. At Columbia, a recent program review repeats the recommendations of two previous assessments: when will these evaluations be accepted as knowledge? At Princeton, the self-study and the internal review seem to agree on what students are learning, but propose wildly divergent suggestions for improvement. By looking more closely at the status of "findings" in these three cases, we hope to explore the fraught context that keeps so much that we know to be true from being granted status as research, which in turn prevents us from acting on it.

E12. Uses and abuses of sources in research writing
Causes of student plagiarism

Robert Lankamp
University of Leiden, The Netherlands
R.E.Lankamp@let.leidenuniv.nl

During the past twenty years, there has been much scholarly discussion about plagiarism in academic settings: how extensive it is, how to define it, how to deal with it, and what its causes are. One cause of plagiarism has been identified as a moral failing of plagiarizers. Other studies prefer to speak of a normal stage in the development of student writers, where they purportedly rely heavily on others' texts in creating their own. From another angle, the ubiquitousness of the Internet, with all its tempting possibilities for quickly copying and buying text, has been identified as the main culprit. Yet other studies point at non-English-speaking cultures which are supposedly permissive of plagiarism. In its first half, this paper will argue that these alleged causes of plagiarism can be discounted: either there is no evidence, or the argument is fallacious.

An alternative and rather more plausible cause of plagiarism, or at least more plausible factors which influence the prevalence of plagiarism, is discussed in a number of studies that point at teaching practices in especially native English-speaking and West European contexts, such as the reluctance of instructors to address the problem of plagiarism, and in spite of the plagiarism guidelines published by almost all teaching institutions, confusion about what is and what is not plagiarism. In this paper, such practices and the argument linking them to plagiarism will be reviewed. Lastly, the results will be presented of a qualitative study (in part a replication of two existing studies) on the effects of skills in text attribution and the production of original text on the occurrence of plagiarism. Subjects will be native and non-native English speaking graduate students at the University of Leiden (Netherlands) with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Step into my scenarios: Student identification in issues of ownership

Kalo Clarke
Northeastern University, Boston
kalo@clarke.org

Lynn Dornink
Northeastern University, Boston

Henry Jenkins, Professor of Humanities and Director of MIT Comparative Media Studies and author of *Convergence Culture,* argues that more and more our students live in a "participatory culture" of the 21st century where collaboration and networking are central to learning and socializing. Many teachers say, "I know plagiarism when I see it," but until we make ourselves aware of the "new rules" that many students are living by, how effective can we be? How can we help students understand the University's position on plagiarism? What do students "think" they know about plagiarism in an academic context and what do they "actually know"?

At the "Originality, Imitation, Plagiarism" conference held in Ann Arbor in fall 2005, Lisa Emerson, from the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University in New Zealand, talked about testing for attitudes as well as for knowledge. Building on this research, we have developed **Attitude Scenarios** to get students and instructors talking about what constitutes ethical behavior and **Knowledge Scenarios** to reinforce the academically accepted practice of documenting sources. Over the last year, we have piloted these scenarios in our own classrooms and now are asking other instructors to likewise incorporate both types of **scenarios** in their classes. In this presentation we will report on outcomes from the following: How do the attitudes in the **scenarios** invite students to rethink pop culture attitudes about borrowing, sampling, riffing, and parodying of sources? How do these scenarios help instructors understand the students' attitudes about ownership? Do these **scenarios** help students internalize rather than just intellectualize the concepts of intellectual property? Are the **scenarios** effective in promoting knowledge transference from the writing classroom to other university classes and then on to work/life practices?

An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines

Nigel Harwood
University of Essex, U.K.
nharwood@essex.ac.uk

This paper reports on a study which used the discourse-based interview method (Odell et al 1983) to investigate the functions of citations in computer scientists' and sociologists' academic writing. Twelve informants took part in the research, commenting upon citations in a journal article or book chapter they had written. Twelve citation functions were identified and described, although five functions accounted for around 80% of instances. These five were: (1) S*ignposting* citations, which direct readers to other sources (i) to help/interest less informed readers; (ii) to keep the argument on track; and/or (iii) to save space; (2) *Supporting* citations, which help authors justify (i) the topic of their research; (ii) the method/methodology employed; and/or (iii) the authors' claims; (3) *Credit* citations, which acknowledge authors' debt to others for ideas or methods; (4) *Position* citations, which allow authors to (i) identify representatives and exemplars of different viewpoints; (ii) explicate researchers' standpoints in detail; and (iii) trace the development of a researcher's/field's thinking over time; and (5) *Engaging* citations, which appear when authors are in critical dialogue with their sources.

Three functions, position, supporting, and credit, were relatively frequent across both disciplines. However, while computer scientists used signposting citations more often, sociologists' texts

featured more engaging citations. The type of paper informants were writing (e.g. theoretical/empirical), the anticipated audience, and the publication outlet also resulted in intra-disciplinary differences. Over half of the citations in both fields were said to have more than one function. The insights and implications of the study are discussed, and the strengths and weaknesses of utilizing the discourse-based interview method outlined.

Although some applied linguists (Hyland, Swales) have conducted citation analyses, most research to date has been conducted by information scientists and sociologists. This paper draws on the literature from all these areas, and is truly interdisciplinary.

E13. Writing in doctoral programs – Student perceptions and identities

The perceived difficulties of doing a doctorate: is writing one?

Rochelle Skogen
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada
rochelle.skogen@ualberta.ca

This is a pilot study that I am beginning in which I am interested in discovering how 10 students enrolled in a doctoral program at a research intensive university in Western Canada define 'what is most difficult about completing a doctoral program?' Here I will attempt to identify whether of not there is a 'discourse of fear and difficulty' in this program. If it is determined to exist, then I will move to identify exactly what activities, situations or experiences are deemed to be so difficult and cause the most fear in these students.

If, as I presuppose, beliefs in regards to the writing process emerge as a contributing factor to the difficulty of completing the program then I will undertake the second part of the study where I will attempt to understand how these students feel about the act of writing in general. The following questions are possible at this point: "Does the type of writing students must do in a PhD program change their feelings about writing in general? How do students and professors speak about the act of writing in the program? What do they conclude are the general beliefs of students and professors in regards to writing in their department? How does the general discourse in the department tie into their own beliefs about writing in general? For instance, if before entering the program they felt that writing in general could be a pleasurable activity, did this change once they became part of the doctoral community in their department? If so, what do they feel caused this? Have they simply 'bought into' the community discourse or have they actually questioned the validity of what is being said? From these types of questions, I will attempt to understand how students' beliefs about writing tie into the more general discourse of difficulty in the program, and how both may be impacting upon their ability to finish their degree in a timely manner.

In this individual presentation I will speak to the construction of the study and the preliminary results that emerged.

Conceptualisations of doctoral writing and pedagogical framings of writing development: The case of formal writing support provision in UK humanities graduate education

Lia Blaj-Ward
The Open University, UK
l.l.blaj-ward@open.ac.uk

This presentation draws on research into formal writing support (outside the supervision context) for doctoral students in humanities disciplines in the UK. It aims to explore the ways in which

several salient themes from research into academic writing (differences among disciplinary discourses; differences in writing expertise; the relationship between doctoral writing and identity; writing as knowledge-production vs. writing as decontextualised skill; learning how to write framed as a social activity) are reflected in current writing support initiatives. The overarching concern of this research is to identify projected and experienced educational outcomes of formal writing support sessions which bring together native and non-native speaker students from various humanities disciplines.

The data collected as part of the research:

·   Content analysis of descriptions of writing support provision (outside the supervision relationship) at ten universities across the UK

·   Content analysis of "how to" guides on doctoral writing

·   Ethnographic data from eight formal writing support sessions for doctoral students in the humanities (in cross-disciplinary, rather than discipline-specific environments) provided multiple perspectives on doctoral writing and writing development.

The findings from this research will be linked, in the presentation, to existing research literature on supervising writing (e.g., Dysthe, 2005), doctoral writers and apprenticeship in communities of practice (e.g., Belcher, 1994; Hasrati, 2003) and formal writing support for doctoral students (e.g., Caffarella and Barnett, 2005; Starfield, 2003).

The aims of the presentation are: (1) to summarise research findings; (2) to propose, on the basis of the findings, a framework for analysing policies and practices related to supporting doctoral writers in the UK humanities; (3) to invite the audience to explore potential implications of the framework for doctoral writing support in different disciplinary contexts.

Constructing professional identity through log-writing

Nancy Lea Eik-Nes
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
nancy.lea.eik-nes@hf.ntnu.no

Until relatively recently, writing classes in Norwegian universities have been almost non-existent. One exception, however, is a 20-year-old scientific writing course for doctoral students in engineering at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. The course was originally conceived as a "fix-it" or "how to" course for engineering students who needed to publish in English. Over the years, the focus has moved away from the "fix-it" approach and from a prescriptive genre approach, toward an approach that includes various types of reflective writing.

When I took over as teacher of the course, I asked the students to write logs about their projects once a week, and submit them as e-mails instead of on paper. The changes I thought I was seeing in students' participation in class, as well as the authority they seemed to be developing in their other scientific writing assignments, prompted a comparative study of students' e-logs and paper logs. The results of the study imply that writing logs – and especially e-logs – enhances students' writing competence.

An important finding from the study was that students use logs as a medium of dialogue not only with their teacher, but also with themselves. Through these dialogues, the students experiment with and develop their knowledge in their field as they try to explain their doctoral projects to a non-expert reader. They establish themselves in their discourse community through observing and questioning their own identities – both personal and professional – as well as the identities, the values, conventions, and practices of the research community they are becoming part of.

Instead of acting as objects constructed by the possibilities and constraints of their community, the students take over as the subjects who are constructing themselves.

E14. Expectations and pressures on student writing

The impact of expectations in writing for two different student populations: A longitudinal study

Margot Soven
La Salle University
soven@lasalle.edu

La Salle University has begun a longitudinal study which seeks to discover how expectations in writing for three different populations- students admitted under the regular standards, students in the Honors program, and students with special needs, whose acceptance to the University is contingent upon successfully completing an additional writing course, affect their perceptions of themselves as writers and their development of writing ability. Students in the special admit programs take three composition courses; students in the regular program take one or two composition courses, while those in the Honors Program are exempt from freshman composition. Guided by Lee Ann Carroll's study *Rehearsing New Roles: How College Students Develop as Writers*, we are especially interested in examining the role that explicit as opposed to tacit writing instruction plays in this process.

Information about attitude and engagement is being collected through interviews and surveys. An examination of student papers for particular rhetorical features will form the basis of a comparison of their writing.

The students in the Honors program are the subject of a doctoral thesis which will be completed this summer, by Jaime Longo, Temple University, who was recently hired as a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at La Salle University.

Crossing disciplinary borders (or not): Problem-posing and transfer in first-year honors students' writing

Jaime Lynn Longo
La Salle University
jlongo01@temple.edu / longoj@lasalle.edu

Writing by university Honors students is a neglected area in the composition field, what C. McKenzie, the founder of the fledgling e-journal *First Year Honors Composition* has called an "unexplored backwater." Recent research by Annemarie Guzy has sketched a rough outline of composition requirements in Honors curricula, but to date there is no body of qualitative research on Honors writers analogous to that on basic and mainstream college writers. My longitudinal study of first-year students in a rigorous liberal arts Honors program attempts to address that gap by providing a "thick description" of these students' development of problem-posing.

My research combines the ethnographic methods of participant-observation and case study interviewing with analysis of students' writing from all six of their first-year, writing-intensive Honors courses (two semesters each of English, History, and Philosophy). Preliminary data analysis shows that students make considerably more sophisticated rhetorical moves in their Philosophy papers than they do in either History or English, particularly with regard to questioning

sources, considering counterarguments, and engaging a genuinely open question without having a pat answer at the ready. Their willingness to experiment with uncertainty in their Philosophy papers invokes a sense of disciplinary freedom that is absent from their rigid, constrained arguments in other courses. This insight, and others drawn from my research, strongly suggests that first-year Honors students are cognitively capable of these more sophisticated moves, but are inhibited from transferring their abilities into other domains, a puzzle that requires more investigation. Moreover, and more importantly, I believe that similar studies conducted with basic and mainstream writers might yield similar results; in other words, cross-disciplinary writing research may demonstrate that students are cued to employ strategies in one domain that are not cued in others, even when those strategies are expected and/or reified.

The company literacy: How big business is buying the schools, the children, and the discourse of the future

Jeffrey W. Perry
Kent State University
jperry5@kent.edu

Current demands created by the information and technology driven economies of fast capitalism (Gee, Hull, Lankshear) have created a new reality for institutions of both secondary and higher education. The corporatization of America and the current wave of globalization bring in their wake new demands on the schools and educators of America. These new demands can best be seen in the practices of college communications and composition.

The main focus of the presentation is the new writing initiative at a large state funded university that stresses computer mediated composition, multimodality, process, and a student centered educational environment. The presentation explores whether this new writing initiative serves the students or is simply another instance of an educational institution training workers for the information/technology oriented workplace? Central to my research is a large scale survey of 31 instructors and 861 students who participated in the computer mediated courses. A discussion of the survey data and the insights it offers will be the major focus. For instance, the data appears to reveal that the computer classrooms are used more often as "word processors" than as sites for "critical" thinking and reflection. The presentation will also offer a brief comparative analysis of the writing program's new initiative to understand how it relates to the central tenet of the New London Group which argues that education "provides students the opportunity to develop skills for access to new forms of work…but at the same time…students need to develop the capacity to speak up, to negotiate, and to be able to engage critically with the conditions of their working lives."

The detailed examination of how writing instruction is evolving to meet the needs of students, both as citizens of a democracy as well as future members of the workforce, provides researchers with valuable insights into the current role of teachers and writing programs.

E15. Enmeshed in a social network: Collaborative writing in the workplace

Risk and representation: A tumor board study

Christa B. Teston
Kent State University
cteston@kent.edu

Contemporary scholars who research multimodality suggest that ways of constructing and representing knowledge exist beyond linear, print-linguistic models of composing (Kress & van

Leeuwen, 1996; Gee, 2003; Wysocki, 2004; Selfe 2004). Some theorists, in fact, argue that when discussing complex, abstract concepts such as time, states, change, and causation, we rely upon non-textual modalities such as image (Kress, 2003) and conceptual metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1993, 1999). Researchers in embodiment (Emig, 1978; Haas, 1996; Perl, 2004; Wolfe, 2005) explore actual writers in acts of composing and argue that it is the corporeal body that is central to constructing and representing knowledge. Additionally, others (Tufte, 1997, 2001, 2003; Sauer, 1998; Haas & Witte, 2001) investigate the ways in which experts employ various non-textual modalities when constructing knowledge in *risky situations*—situations where decisions about the future have lasting implications. This project takes as its object of study this very kind of critical decision-making event: the Tumor Board.

The Tumor Board is a weekly meeting at a state-of-the-art cancer care facility wherein various medical professionals (i.e. oncologists, radiologists, nurses, and surgeons) debate and deliberate about treatment plans for patients. This study, based on sixteen months of grounded research at a Midwestern hospital, asks: What modes of representation are employed by healthcare professionals as they collaboratively negotiate the risks associated with, and make decisions about, options for cancer treatment?   Findings from this ongoing study suggest that healthcare professionals rely on text, metaphor, image, and gesture as they consider the risks posed to their patients' health when making treatment decisions (i.e. administering chemotherapy, radiation therapy, performing surgery, or pursuing palliative care). This research contributes to contemporary debates in writing and rhetoric studies about the affordances and constraints of various modalities in collaborative decision-making, particularly when issues of life and death are at stake.

Self-efficacy in the workplace: The collaborative writing process of central documents within a social network system

Mary Lourdes Silva
U.C. Santa Barbara
mlourdes1013@gmail.com

In educational contexts, pedagogical responses to student writers with low self-efficacy consist of modifications to course content. Writing for standardized tests, for example, is often blamed for low self-efficacy in students and a typical modification is the implementation of literary practices and activities. However, although some students respond positively to the change in course content, the construction of meaning during the writing process—planning, translating, and reviewing (Flower & Hayes, 1981)—is primarily an individualistic process. This leaves few options for students who fear public ostracism for their individual writing efforts. In many workplace contexts, members participate in a collaborative writing process where the construction of meaning is the result of the collective cognitive structures of participants. Do these individuals perceive their efforts and contributions as non-evaluative? Is self-efficacy positively impacted by this process? Understanding self-efficacy in social network systems that employ collaborative writing processes is central to understanding the low self-efficacy of students in educational contexts.

In this presentation, I report on case studies regarding the self-efficacy of accountants as writers at a public accounting firm. I draw on open-ended and text-based interviews with three accountants, rhetorical analysis of tax memos and emails, and observations of the social and individual activities that contribute to the composing of central documents. Participants in this study engaged in a collaborative process by which the cognitive structures included shared knowledge about the purpose and goals of the given task (Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Converse, 1993; Klimoski & Mohammad, 1994). At any given point during the composition of a central document, the participant is cognizant that s/he could consult another colleague regarding the writing process without fear of ostracism. Thus, I draw attention to the social practices and

activities in collaborative writing tasks that have positively impacted the self-efficacy of accountants as writers.

Content management technology and workplace writing: Reshaping technical communication in a global age

Alison Hammerstrom Butler
San Diego State University
abutler3@yahoo.com

The proposed presentation is a sociohistoric account of the literate activities surrounding the implementation of a content management system (CMS) in a writing department of a global technology company. CMS technology is gaining popularity in writing departments in businesses because it can reduce translation costs and allow contributions from virtual writers, many of whom are located overseas. Adapting the technology, however, necessitates modifications to traditional writing practices and organizational patterns of writing departments, since CMS technology changes the very nature of text (by modularizing it) and effectively separates it (at the moment of "writing") from context. CMS thus turns text into another "object" or product with interchangeable parts for "just in time" assembly and disassembly for various purposes. The "writers" of the individual specialized segments may be located all over the world, while their contributions are assembled and reassembled elsewhere by master "writers" for contingent purposes driven by the company's global agendas.

The project investigates how form, content, context, and the roles and agency of writers are affected by CMS technology. The microhistory traces a cycle triggered by the development of a new Web-based application, including the review and translation processes, and culminating with the delivery of an online help project assembled from a set of disparate topics stored in a CMS. By combining the perspectives of subject-matter experts, writers, and information architects, this microhistory focuses on the following questions:

1) How are the expectations for form, content, and roles communicated to writers?
2) How do writers interpret and negotiate those expectations?
3) How do writers execute their writing tasks?
4) How is writers' agency affected by the new technology?
5) How are their contributions assembled and reassembled to result in always contingent texts?

In addition, the experiences of implementing a CMS are analyzed in terms of structured writing activities, the actions of information architects, and the histories of the writers that help shape their respective representations. The emerging picture of the new "technology" of writing that may soon become standard in America's increasingly global workplaces challenges fundamental assumptions about invention, arrangement, context, audience, and agency in technical and professional writing.

E16. The International WAC/WID Mapping Project: Objectives and Current Results

Chris Thaiss
U.C. Davis
cjthaiss@ucdavis.edu

Tara Porter
U.C. Davis

Erin Steinke
U.C. Davis

The International WAC/WID Mapping Project: Objectives and Current Results

Writing instruction in the disciplines is widespread around the globe, but no comprehensive overview of the diverse ways this instruction is delivered and administered at different institutions within and across national contexts is readily available.

The International WAC/WID Mapping Project (http://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu), begun in 2006, is building a database of scholars and programmatic initiatives worldwide focused on student writing in disciplines in higher education. This research seeks to find commonalities and differences in objectives and practices, as these are influenced by traditions, policies, and local structures. What terms, teaching practices, and organizational structures can we find mutually helpful while also honoring differences in languages, traditions, and policies?

By early 2008, the Mapping Project will be able to begin to report on the two main components of its work: (1) a statistical survey of some 2500 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada that is the first effort of its scope in twenty years, since the study conducted by McLeod and Shirley; (2) a preliminary survey of institutions of higher education in Europe, Asia, Australia/New Zealand, Africa, and Central and South America, this survey conducted with the help of such cross-national groups as the European Association of Teachers of Academic Writing (EATAW) and the European Writing Centers Association (EWCA), as well as many individual scholars and teachers.

The presentation will report statistical results of the U.S./Canada study (more than 1100 respondents) on such concerns as number and longevity of existing WAC/WID programs, components of these programs, sources of funding, importance of new technologies, and administrative structure. From the preliminary study of initiatives worldwide, data from some 150 to 200 respondents will cover such topics as scope of writing in disciplines in given institutions, writing support services such as academic writing centers, staff/faculty development initiatives, and dedicated writing courses. Because one goal of the international research project is to build a network of scholars and institutions, the presentation will also describe the recent merger of the WAC Clearinghouse and the International Network of WAC Programs and its value in building (1) a database of program models from many places across different countries and (2) a network of writing researchers.

Part of the session will be in a workshop format that will enable discussion by participants of the survey questions, methodology, and near- and long-term objectives. Thus, the session should contribute data to the project and contribute to our mutual understanding of the challenges we face in our work as teachers and administrators.