# F Session Abstracts

## F1. New directions in academic literacies:  Research in the UK

**Networking across boundaries: Writing for learning on vocational courses**

Roz Ivanic
*Lancaster University, U.K.*
r.ivanic@lancaster.ac.uk

Researchers in the academic literacies field have shown that, for many students, entering higher education involves a renegotiation of identity, that the education system privileges certain literacy practices over others, and that studying seems to have little in common with the ways of knowing, valuing and communicating which students bring with them from other domains of their lives. This has raised an important theoretical issue for literacy studies: if literacy practices are socio-culturally situated, to what extent are the boundaries between one context and another impermeable?

In this paper I will draw on current research on the *Literacies for Learning in Further Education* (LfLFE) project to address this question. In this research we are investigating the interface between students' literacy practices in their lives beyond college and those involved in participation, learning and demonstrating learning on a range of college courses. Through a detailed analysis of aspects of literacy practices, I will show how vocational tutors, acting as partner researchers in the LfLFE project, made the writing demands on their courses more resonant with the literacy practices in students' everyday lives and with their imagined futures in the workplace. I will argue firstly that a key factor in mobilising resources across contexts is identification with the identities held out by genres, discourses and practices on college courses, and secondly that literacy practices outwith college are potentially resources for transforming the communicative landscape across the college curriculum.

**Academic Literacies in a Widening Participation Programme in London**

Brian Street
*King's College, London*
Brian.street@kcl.ac.uk

I will report on an Academic Literacy Development Programme, at King's College London which drew upon the academic literacies approach to student writing signaled in all of the papers for this panel. Critiques of the approach have argued that it has remained located in theory and research and needs to be worked through more in practice (Lillis, 2006). This paper takes up that challenge in describing a Programme that was intended to provide educational opportunities for "A" level students from the local area in London who were still in the process of learning English as an additional language.

A team of tutors conducted sessions based on some of the theoretical principles developed from the academic literacies model (Lea & Street, Lea & Stierer, Jones et al) combined with recent work on multimodality and genre (cf., Kress, 2003, Kress & Street, 2006; Van Dijk, 1997). In these sessions students were required to interact with different categories of text that we defined as different genres and modes.   We defined genres as types of text, both spoken and written, such as student discussions, written notes, letters, academic essays. etc. We wanted to help students be more aware of the different language and semiotic  practices associated with the requirements of different genres in academic contexts. In one of the early sessions attention was drawn to the shifts evident in classroom practice from free flowing thoughts / ideas to some explicitness in discussion with others, to taking notes, making presentations using overhead projector slides and finally, providing a page of written text based upon the discussions and overheads. In their educational histories, students had not always been made explicitly aware of the distinctive features of each of these genres/ modes. I will consider the implications of this approach for the broader discussions regarding academic literacies being addressed in this panel.

**Transformative writing research: issues of theory, method and goal**

Theresa Lillis
*The Open University, U.K.*
 t.m.lillis@open.ac.uk

The ideology of 'academic literacies' research can be broadly characterised as 'transformative', standing in contrast to the 'normative' ideology implicitly underpinning much writing research where the research aim is to 'identify' and the applicational goal is to 'induct'.  A transformative approach to writing research  usually involves an interest in questions of identification and induction, but in addition is concerned with: a)  locating academic conventions socio-historically and as contested within traditions of knowledge making; b) valuing and exploring the perspectives of writers on the ways in which conventions and practices impinge on their meaning making; c) seeking out alternative ways of meaning making in academia, not least by considering the resources that writers bring to the academy as legitimate tools for meaning making.

In this paper I will draw on two writing research projects to discuss the implications of adopting a transformative writing research ideology for theory building, and for developing methodologies and research goals. I will use data drawn from two contrasting studies, one locally framed and focusing on student writers (Lillis 2001, 2003)  and one globally framed and focusing on professional academic writers (Lillis and Curry 2006) to illustrate attempts at a transformative approach and the unresolved tensions that such an approach throws up.

## F2. Constructing a writing research project for EFL in higher education in Mexico

Maria Teresa Fátima Encinas Prudencio

*Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico*
*fatimaencinas@puebla.megared.net.mx*

Nancy Susan Keranen
*Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico*

Adriana Tellez
*Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico*

Andrea Vasquéz
*Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico*

lajoya108@yahoo.com

Often research frameworks in English teaching as a foreign language in Latin America, generally, and Mexico, specifically, are based on language research and pedagogical traditions from native English language contexts (e.g. Thomas-Ruzic, 1999; Warschauer, 2000). While these frameworks have greatly informed research, they nonetheless have often not considered the regional, national, and local contexts, cultures, and current or past research in the area. This is frequently the topic of debate in discussions of English as an international language and topics related to world Englishes. These factors play a role in interpreting, understanding, and working within specific contexts.
In a panel presentation, we will discuss an ongoing research project which aims to develop a line of inquiry about literacy learning and teaching practices both in the Latin American context, and specifically at our faculty of modern languages at the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, a public university in Mexico. The development of this line of inquiry about literacy learning and teaching practices in our context came out of our interest in exploring teaching practices as English as a foreign language teacher educators.

This project consists of four interrelated projects: 1) a database of literacy research in Latin America, 2) a research project related to the teaching and learning of undergraduate writing in research seminars, 3) an electronic corpus of texts written in English by Spanish speaking students in the faculty, and 4) the development of a writing center. The construction of the database of literacy research allows us to contextualize our line of inquiry within current literacy research practices in Latin America. Thus, we can situate our projects taking into account both Latin American as well as English speaking literacy research frameworks as we see fit. The research seminar project (2006-2008) allows us to explore and understand writing practices of this group of students. Furthermore, it provides the texts for the corpus of student writing, which, in turn, will be used in the writing center to generate research in reading and writing in this context. The writing center will also create a space for students to engage in dialog about their writing practices.

In this presentation we will discuss how this project was conceived, how it unfolded, and how it is being carried out.

### F3. Toward a theory of adaptation: A case study of how students adapt prior writing knowledge to new contexts

Michael DePalma
Mjdp1482@aol.com

Jeff Ringer
jeff.ringer@unh.edu

Leah Williams
leh6@cisunix.unh.edu

*How do students adapt prior writing knowledge and experiences to fit new writing tasks and contexts?* The central term in this question is *adapt*, which we define as a conscious or intuitive process of selecting and reshaping learned writing knowledge in order to apply it to new and potentially unfamiliar writing situations. *Adaptation* of a learned writing skill results from a perceived similarity between the familiar writing context in which the skill was learned and the unfamiliar context with which the writer is faced. Adaptation is related to—but not synonymous with—*transfer*, the contested idea that students can learn generalizable writing skills in one context and apply them consistently in others (Russell, 1995; Smit, 2004). Whereas transfer entails re*using* learned skills, adaptation implies re*shaping* those skills to fit the demands of particular rhetorical situations.

Although some composition theorists acknowledge that students do reshape some prior writing experiences to fit new tasks (Carroll, 2002; McCarthy, 1987), little theoretical work deals specifically with adaptation. Because of this, Composition Studies lacks a sufficiently articulated terminology with which to understand how students reshape what they've learned in prior contexts to fit new ones. Our study aims to address this gap through a series of case studies of freshmen students at the University of New Hampshire during the 2007-2008 academic year. By analyzing student texts, interviewing student writers, and describing the disciplinary and curricular contexts in which the writing occurs, we attempt to describe as fully as possible how students adapt from one writing context to another.

Panelist 1 will describe the theory and methodology guiding our study.

Panelist 2 will discuss our findings and potential implications.

Panelist 3 will reflect on how the students in her first-year writing course were impacted by participating in this study.

### F4) Revision and writing processes
Chair: Patrick Ewing, U.C. Santa Barbara

pewing@umail.ucsb.edu

**Writers' shift between error-correcting and sentence composing**

Thomas Quinlan
*Educational Testing Service*
tquinlan@ets.org

Maaike Loncke
*University of Ghent*

Mariëlle Leijten
*University of Antwerp*

Luuk Van Waes
*University of Antwerp*

Writing is often referred to as a "complex process." Writers, especially skillful ones, often engage in formulating and solving complex problems. Limitations in cognitive resources constrain problem-solving, while use of strategies allows writers to partially circumvent these constraints. Much research has focused on the cognitive demands of writing processes. Planning, translating, and reviewing have all shown to draw considerable working memory resources. These results support an important conclusion, that writing involves cognitively demanding processes; however, the complexity to a great extent also resides in the fact that writers often switch between writing processes. While process-switching may be central to writing, it has received little research attention.

The present study examines the cognitive influences of writers shifting between generating sentences and correcting errors. In Leijten, Ransdell, and Van Waes (submitted), we examined whether error type influenced participants' abilities to correct errors. Participants completed a set of tasks, involving sentence completion and error correcting. The results showed that error-type affected the rapidity, duration, and success of task completion. Further, for large and small real-word errors, participants more often corrected errors first, before proceeding to finishing the sentence. How does error-type influence the coordination of error detecting/correcting and generating? In the present study, we investigate this question by replicating Leijten, Ransdell, and van Waes' study, focusing on the role of reading for error-detecting. Using the Eyelink II eyetracking system, we recorded participants' eye fixations as they perform sentence completion tasks. The results suggest that a high load in sentence composing influences process-shifting by constraining writers' ability to shift toward error detection and correction.

**The effect of corrective feedback on written output in content-based language instruction**

Catherine G. van Beuningen

*University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
C.G.vanBeuningen@uva.nl

Among scholars there is disagreement on the benefits of corrective feedback on learners' written output. Some researchers claim that all error correction is unnecessary, ineffective and even counterproductive (e.g. Truscott 1996, 1999, 2003). Others, however, advocate the usefulness of corrective feedback (e.g. Ferris 1999, 2004), albeit that although some studies have demonstrated the short-term effectiveness of corrective feedback (e.g. Ferris & Roberts 2001; Sachs & Polio 2007), studies that investigated long-term effects of error correction show conflicting results. These contradicting findings can be attributed to a large extent to methodological shortcomings, such as the lack of a proper control group and time-on-task differences (e.g. Semke 1984; Chandler 2003). The present study therefore tries to overcome these design-related drawbacks.

In this study the effect of two types of corrective feedback on high school student's written output was investigated, within a content-based language instruction environment. Participants in two experimental conditions received either *direct* or *indirect* corrective feedback on a first writing task (A) and thereafter revised their text. In order to control for possible time-on-task effects, participants in the first control group did not receive any feedback on task A, but performed an extra writing task instead of revising their text. Participants in the second control condition did not receive any feedback, and did neither engage in a revision task nor an extra task. One week later, all participants performed a second task (B). Comparing the output of task A both to the revised version and the output on task B, allowed us to determine the short- and long-term effectiveness of (in)direct corrective feedback. The influence of language proficiency on feedback uptake was also taken into account.

In the paper the results of the study and the implications for feedback on writing will be discussed.

**The question of inspiration: Genius, creativity, and the revision process**

David Stephen Calonne
*Oakland University*
davecal@hotmail.com

This paper is a continuation of a research program I began in an essay published recently entitled "Creative Writers and Revision" which appeared in Revision: History, Theory and Practice, ed. Alice Horning and Anne Becker (Parlor Press, 2006). My research in this essay explored the role of revision in the creative process of a number of writers including D.H. Lawrence, Eugene Ionesco, William Burroughs, Jack Kerouac and W.B. Yeats. I began in that essay to explore the relationship between genius, inspiration, revision and the creative process and to attempt to uncover how much of the actual production of great writers came from "intentional", disciplined, hard, conscious work and labor and how much derived from "inspiration" or what the Surrealists called "automatic writing" and what Henry Miller called "dictation".

My present research project continues this work, with especial emphasis on the question of "inspiration" and the role it plays in both revision and the creative process in general. Specifically, I have enlarged the scope of my research agenda to include Plato's Phaedrus and Ion  as well as Friedrich Nietzsche's ideas about inspiration in The Birth of Tragedy and Ecce Homo. I will also review some of the ideas in Poetry and Prophecy: The Anthropology of Inspiration, ed. John Leavitt; Genius: The History of an Idea, ed. Penelope Murry; and most recently Alice W. Flaherty's The Midnight Disease: The Drive to Write, Writer's Block, and the Creative Brain.

 I am specifically interested in my present research in exploring the intersection between creativity, revision and inspiration as it reveals itself in writers such as Robert Graves, Samuel Beckett, Robert Lowell, Charles Bukowski, William Saroyan, W.B. Yeats, Gloria Anzaldua, among others. In particular, recent studies have appeared since I began my initial research such as Elizabeth Bishop's recently published drafts and fragments which I will study in my presentation for the UCSB conference. In addition, the anthropology of inspiration has only recently begun to receive full attention, as evidenced by the Leavitt volume cited above. The prevalence of shamanic inspiration in "oral", "pre-literate" cultures brings to bear another dimension to the study of inspiration. And Alice Flaherty has also recently explored what neuroscience can tell us about ecstatic states of consciousness and the role inspiration plays in the lives of literary artists.


### F5. Personal and social transformations: The cognitive and the social in writing processes

Chair:  Mary Silva, U.C. Santa Barbara
mlourdes1013@gmail.com


**Interplay between cognitive and social processes in writing instruction**

Linda Allal
*Universite de Geneve, Switzerland*
Linda.Allal@pse.unige.ch

Research on the cognitive and linguistic processes involved in writing has had an important impact on the conception of writing instruction and has affected, in varying degrees, current classroom practice. There is also a substantial body of research on the social processes intervening in different contexts of writing that has led to increased instructional emphasis on the importance of dialogue about writing as a means of supporting writing. Although several models, developed in neo-Vygotskian research and in the work on situated cognition, have described how cognitive and social processes interact in learning to write, relatively little empirical data have demonstrated how this interplay works in a detailed way. Our presentation will review studies concerning two levels of social mediation of cognitive processes in the writing classroom: (1) whole-class discussion and one-to-one conferences during which the meaning of writing concepts and the criteria for writing are constructed by the exchanges between teacher and student(s);

(2) peer interactions during tasks of joint composition and revision or in situations of reciprocal response to individual texts. Each level will be illustrated by data from elementary school classrooms participating in writing research in Geneva. The data include direct observations and transcriptions of classroom interactions as well as analyses of the characteristics of students' texts and revisions. With respect to each level of social mediation, questions will be raised concerning the relations between the social processes and the cognitive/linguistic knowledge and skills under construction. Particular attention will be given to the interplay between dialogic, interactive regulation and individual self-regulation during writing and revision. Suggestions will be made regarding the types of studies that need to be conducted to understand more fully how the co-elaboration of social and cognitive processes takes place during writing activities in instructional settings.

## Social and cognitive models of writing: A Vygotskian integration

Hunter W. Stephenson
*University of Houston – Clear Lake*
Stephenson@uhcl.edu

Initially developed as a reaction against writing studies based on principles derived from cognitive science (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Hayes & Flower, 1980; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986), the "social" model (Bizzell, 1982; Brandt, 1992; Faigley, 1985, 1986; Nystrand, 1986) has established itself as the dominant paradigm in writing studies over the past 20 years. Proponents of the social model often turn to Vygotsky (1978, 1986) to support their arguments, largely because of Vygotsky's interest in the impact of the social and cultural on human development. However, this reliance upon the social in Vygotsky ignores the importance of both the material and the individual in his work. In fact, a broader read of Vygotsky highlights the importance of the cognitive in his theories (Frawley, 1997; Joravsky, 1989; Yaroshevsky, 1989) and suggests that through Vygotsky researchers may be able to integrate various tenets of the cognitive and social models in writing studies. Such an integration can be achieved in three areas: First, the importance and function of mediation and semiosis; second, the ability to and importance of representation; and three, activity, the material basis of mind, and the nature of and relationship between physical and psychological tools, especially as these three components (i.e., activity, mind, and tools) impact the development of higher psychological functions. Although this paper only examines three areas of possible integration, a broader integration of the cognitive and social models of writing would seem to offer researchers an avenue for making needed theoretical and empirical advances in the study of writing by bolstering the strengths of each model while overcoming their weaknesses.

## Academic writing in Compulsory Educational Institutions of the Madrid Region (Spain)

Teodoro Álvarez Angulo

Isabel García Parejo
Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España
Grupo Didactext
www.didactext.net

The Didactext Group has been carrying out research since 2001 into educational contexts of writing production in order to intervene in teaching and learning processes so as to contribute to the improvement of this kind of writing practice (cf. Bazerman, Beaugrande & Dressler, Bereiter & Scardamalia, Grabe & Kaplan, among others).

Our research features a double-stage design: (i) an ethnographic approach to the sociocultural production context where the literacy practice is carried out (cf. Barton, Street): the school as an institution (through examining official and institutional documentation) and the classroom (through observation and gathering written texts); and (ii) the design of didactic sequences whose objective lies within the final aim of improving the literacy practices of the community that has participated in the research, and comparing the degree to which the texts derived from this intervention have varied with respect to the previous ones.

In the studies carried out in the 6th year of Primary Education and 4th year of Secondary, we have observed (a) a wide variety in the ways of approaching writing practices: from models that are very much centred on the final product, linked to a standard and normative variety, all the way to a more process-based vision that frames writing within a communicative act that takes into account both the topic and the addressee; (b) a greater awareness of the particularities of writing, in addition to a greater awareness of the type of academic text after the didactic intervention, since more paratextual elements are included (spaces, margins, numbers, letters, bullet points, letter types and colours, underlining, quotation marks, hyphens, parentheses, commas), that pertain to the informative function of the text.

The challenges we face for future research are related to the choice of school and subjects, the research participants (students from the School of Education involved in practice teaching, teachers, members of the Didactext Group), the design of didactic sequences and of the analytical instruments for observing and gathering data, in addition to the subsequent analysis.

## F6. 'Get the English corrected': An investigation of the relationships, meanings, and practices behind 'proof-reading' in four European universities

Nigel Harwood
*University of Essex*

Rowena Macaulay
*University of Essex*

Elizabeth Austin
*University of Essex*

Nicola Owtram
*European University Institute, Florence*

Joan Turner
*Goldsmiths' London*

Mary Scott
*Institute of Education, London*
m.scott@ioe.ac.uk

In this panel presentation we report on studies taking place in four universities, in the UK and Italy, where student writers routinely seek help, institutionally referred to as 'proof-reading', from a third party (i.e. not the subject teacher or research supervisor) in order to get their draft assignments or dissertations to submission-for-assessment status. The focus of the studies is on the meanings and practices that subject teachers, writing teachers, proof-readers and students associate with 'proof-reading'.

The studies deploy several methodologies and methods, which are differently emphasised by the presenters, in the collection and interpretation of data: semi-structured interviews with subject teachers, writing teachers, proof-readers and students; linguistic and critical discourse analysis of transcribed interviews, of descriptions of proof-reading in course handbooks, and of samples of proof-read student assignments and dissertation chapters.

'Proof-reading' emerges from the studies in each institution as a highly contested term, presented to students as 'getting your English corrected' but actually replete with conflicting ideologies around language and pedagogy that are related to different interpretations of the writer – third party relationship.

The primary purpose of this panel presentation is to make visible the writer - third party relationships and conflicting ideologies and briefly to suggest further research based on an evaluation and development of our research strategies and interpretive framings.


## F7. Cancelled

## F8. Theory and textual analysis

**Historical Research, Theories of the Middle Range, and Writing Practice**

Charles Bazerman
U.C. Santa Barbara
bazerman@education.ucsb.edu

Recent historical examinations of non-literary, non-theoretical texts within their activity settings aim to identify the historically developed communicative and rhetorical resources currently available and to reveal the dynamics of the formation, use, and evolution of those resources. These studies in examining communal literate practices combine theoretical, empirical and practical concerns in establishing, confirming, and extending theories of the middle range. This methodological presentation elaborates how theories of the middle range can guide research, through interrelated levels of research questions (originary, specifying, and site specific), and identification of strategic research sites. This article further elaborates methods of finding, selecting, and analyzing relevant texts and placing them within appropriate social and historical contexts.

## Corpus linguistics and composition studies

Ulla Connor
*Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis*
uconnor@iupui.edu

Corpus linguistics has revolutionized the study of language. Linguists involved in the building of computerized corpora in the last five decades have provided a powerful argument for studying actual language use rather than elicited language samples provided by native speaker intuition. Corpus analysis techniques have provided evidence about recurring language patterns and about lexical, grammatical, and lexico-grammatical aspects of language use. Such studies have been invaluable for constructing grammars and dictionaries of general language use.

While large general corpora are important and provide a critical foundation for the study of language structure and use, they are less conducive for language use in specific academic and professional situations, or for composition studies. Consequently, there is a strong and growing interest in compiling specialized corpora with focus on specific types of genres within specific contexts. Specialized corpora often focus on one particular genre (e.g. research papers, letters of business request, fundraising letters) or a specific situation (e.g. academic lectures, office communication). Examples of such specialized corpora – both oral and written -- collected in academic and professional settings are found in *Discourse in the Professions. Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics* (Connor & Upton, 2004) and *Small Corpus Studies and ELT. Theory and Practice* (Ghadessy, Henry, & Roseberry, 2001). Both volumes emphasize the application of corpus linguistics in teaching languages and writing.

Other developments in corpus linguistics are also taking place, with potential impact on composition research. Text and discourse analysis are having an effect on corpus linguistics. There has been a growing emphasis on the analysis of communicative functions of specific discourses and sections of discourses with an eye to identifying patterns and the distribution of these functions. Genre analysis, for example, has encouraged researchers to study the language use in the different rhetorical "moves" of research articles, grant proposals, and letters of job applications. Such "top-down"

computerized text analysis is one way for determining teachable discourse structures of texts. Another approach is to apply a "bottom-up" computerized analysis to texts in identifying discourse organization, as shown in *Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure* (Biber, Connor, & Upton, in press).

In this presentation I will discuss why these recent developments in corpus linguistics – specialized corpora and discourse-based analyses – should not be ignored by composition researchers. I will show examples of design and analysis from two specialized corpora -- fundraising letters and international medication labels. In addition, I will describe the newest directions in discourse-based corpus linguistics. On one hand, we are working to be able to tag discourse by computer. On the other hand, we strive to better account for the contexts of language and writing situations; corpora now include coding of both the text and talk part of the text production and consumption. Finally, considering the multimodality of texts is an issue getting attention among discourse-oriented corpus linguists.

**Text analysis as "theory-laden" methodology: Different questions, different approaches**

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

What can text analyses reveal? The answer to this question depends, to a great extent, on what one is interested in learning. Written texts are important sources of data in many disciplines, but the field of composition studies is distinguished by having, as its *central* research focus, the written text, particularly as performed by academic writers. This proposed paper, which focuses on the methodology of text analysis, is historical in nature, showing shifting patterns and emphases over the past forty years in this ever-expanding body of work. Attention also goes to issues of theory, ideology, and hegemony relative to analytic procedures and also to some heated debates over competing approaches and, more significantly, the assumptions that undergird them. This is, of course, because much more than the specific approach has been at stake in any discussion of method, given the "theory-laden" nature of methodology (Lakatos, 1974).

Thus, although the emphasis is on analytic procedures, my paper is more than a review of method; it is—and it must be--also a history of the differing and shifting theories and ideologies that have shaped the field regarding what counts as knowledge and as a source of data. Decisions about analytic approaches and choice of texts for analysis are guided by the questions asked, and these questions and their articulations arise from world views, belief systems, and theoretical assumptions (cf. Faigley, 1980; Kent, 1999, Matsuhashi, 1984; Nelson, 2001, in press; Steinberg, 1964).

After considering definitions of the now-controversial term *text*, I move to three broad questions that have guided inquiry employing text analysis and that have also engendered debate. They include the following: (1) *What is the nature of the written product?*

Reviewed here are analytic procedures applied to a "bounded" text (e.g., syntactic analysis, propositional analysis, and analysis of text structures) to learn about writers' linguistic and content knowledge. (2) *What is the nature of the writing process?* This second question, which was considered by many in the 1980s to be the appropriate one in a field too long obsessed with products, has two parts: What is the nature of the *cognitive* process of writing? What is the nature of the *social* process of writing? Although the cognitive "process" research has differed dramatically from the social research, both lines of work considered "process oriented" have put major attention on texts external to the participants' writing (e.g., protocols, transcripts). (3) *And what is the nature of discourse practices associated with texts and their production*? Within this culturally- and often historically- situated work, the text (extending beyond boundaries) becomes part of a larger context. A shifting theoretical orientation has been accompanied by a shift in analytic approaches, including such procedures as textual genealogy.

Although one can discern some kind of movement in the field of composition studies from a focus on one question to another, this review cannot be--and is not intended to be--a simple chronology, showing dramatic shifts in the field abandoning one issue and moving to another (Nelson, 2000). The research overlaps, and work continues today in all areas. For example, among European researchers there is much current interest in the nature of the cognitive process, as studied through various means (e.g., Galbraith & Torrance, 2004). Nevertheless, one can see something of a convergence of various kinds of text analyses, focused on both product and process, in current research on practices.

## F9. Researching fully online instruction: Assessment, pedagogy, and a new theory of hybrid online learning environments on the border of the "real" and "virtual worlds"

Christopher Dean
*U.C. Santa Barbara*
cdean@writing.ucsb.edu

Randi Browning
*U.C. Santa Barbara*
rbrowning@writing.ucsb.edu

Dr. Jim Donelan
*U.C. Santa Barbara*
donelan@writing.ucsb.edu

Peter Huk
*U.C. Santa Barbara*
kpatterson@writing.ucsb.edu

Dr. Kathy Patterson
*U.C. Santa Barbara*

phuk@writing.ucsb.edu

There has been a great deal of literature on what it means to teach composition in online environments, and the literature runs from theoretical and critical appraisals of the technology of online instruction (Selfe 1988, Clark 1996, and Atkins 2005) to sort of "how to" articles about online pedagogical practice (Newbold 1999 and Paloff and Pratt).

What has been lacking, generally speaking, is a look at how online courses do, or do, not match up with face-to-face courses in terms of student learning, the role of the teacher and programmatic assessment of courses.  Through our assessment research (involving student focus groups, survey instruments, teacher logs and journals, and assessment of student writing), our panel plans to interrogate, in online and face-to-face classes taught by the same instructors, this question:  what are the realities of a hybrid online learning environment, pedagogically and theoretically, from the perspectives of teachers and students?

To do this, our five presenters will tackle the following subquestions—making connections between extant research, or research, and pedagogical practice:

- What happens to composition teacher's view of him or herself once she begins to teach in a hybrid online learning environment?  What is, ultimately, his or her "role" in a hybrid online classroom environment?
- What does it mean to use computerized instruction in composition courses that still meet face-to-face—in a thoroughly hybrid setting?  How does this differ from teaching a composition class where almost all of the interactions are mediated by computerized technology?
- What does it mean to try and use course management software, like Moodle and Connectweb, to teach students almost entirely online?
- How does the teaching of texts in preparation for research differ in the two environments, and how does the teaching of research skills differ?  Are there ultimately differences in the qualify of writing that students present in their final projects?
- Programatically speaking, what can be said about online courses?  Are they ultimately equivalent, in terms of student and course outcomes, to the work that teachers do in face-to-face classes?

Ultimately, our careful assessment data will be at the center of a discussion of not only the practical "how to" teach in a hybrid online learning environment, but what sort of assessment methodologies might be most effective in assessing such instruction, what sort of theoretical and research issues arise in teaching in a hybrid online environment, and, ultimately, what ideas about teaching writing are, and are not, challenged by our work.

We ultimately plan to share the realities of teaching and learning in a hybrid online class that always has had, for ethical and pedagogical purposes, a face-to-face component.  In a sense, we have opted to live on the borders between a traditional distance education class

(where everything happens virtually) and a face-to-face class (where everything happens in a real classroom in "realtime").  Since most of us have taught what is the first hybrid online undergraduate writing course in the history of the University of California at Santa Barbara, we think that we have some interesting realities to share about the way that online instruction can, and maybe should, be done at a research one institution.

## F10.  Cancelled

## F11. Writing centres abroad

**Developing academic literacy in context: a cross-national investigation**

Jan Skillen
*University  of Wollongong, Australia*
jskillen@uow.edu.au

Emily Purser

The improvement of learning outcomes through the development of academic literacy is increasingly being seen as an important pedagogic aim for universities around the world. Where and how universities teach academic literacy varies, but the model of contextualising teaching inside disciplinary subjects is increasingly being recognised internationally as a valuable model for teaching academic literacy/writing.  Our version of this model has been seen as innovative, well-researched and able to achieve extremely positive outcomes not only in academic writing but also in student success and retention. This paper reports on a research project that is assessing the replicability of our teaching strategy across national borders and the ability to achieve the same significant outcomes whatever the country. The project is a collaborative venture between the University of Wollongong in Australia and colleagues at the Universities of Stanford, Cornell, Iowa State, Queen Mary, Coventry and the Open University.  At this point the project has trialled this model of contextualised teaching in a number of universities, using teaching, testing and evaluation procedures identical to those used in our earlier research. Although the evaluation stage is not yet completed, it is expected that positive results will be obtained, both in terms of being able to implement the model across national borders and in terms of student learning outcomes.

**The writing centre abroad: Researching its efficacy in the UK**

Kathy Harrington
*London Metropolitan University, U.K.*
k.harrington@londonmet.ac.uk

Peter O'Neill
*London Metropolitan University, U.K.*

Savita Bakhshi
*London Metropolitan University, UK*

In North America, the model of a Writing Centre staffed largely by undergraduate peer tutors has long been widespread in universities.  In the UK, however, explicit teaching of writing has traditionally been undertaken by lecturers in learning development (Devet *et al*, 2006), and there are only a few Writing Centres or dedicated writing support schemes which adopt the North American peer tutoring approach.  In October 2006, funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) enabled London Metropolitan University to open a Writing Centre and implement a Student Writing Mentor Scheme that is largely unique in the UK[1].  The Scheme is collaborative in approach, following the insights of Bruffee (1984), and informed by Rogerian principles of non-directivity and empathy; it's purpose is to enable students to become confident and competent academic writers in their disciplines.

In this session, we report on the evaluation of our first year and a half of operations through discussion of the research methodology employed and an analysis of the findings.  The aim of the evaluation was to assess the efficacy of the Writing Centre model in the context of a large, urban, relatively young British university with a high percentage of students from non-traditional backgrounds and representing a diverse range of ages and cultures.  Our evaluation concentrated on the following areas: 1) perceptions and experiences of the Mentor Scheme in relation to other forms of writing support available at the University, 2) motivations for visiting the Writing Centre and using the Mentor Scheme, 3) expectations of the tutorials, the relationship between expectations and actual experiences, and post-tutorial views of the purpose and usefulness of the Scheme, and 4) the nature of the relationship between peer tutor and student, and how this compares with the collaborative and non-directive approach of the Scheme.

Our research has been conducted in two phases, the first focussing on peer tutors', and the second on students', experiences and perceptions of student-led writing tutorials.  As findings from the first phase have been reported elsewhere, the current session will present a summary of those findings, along with a more extensive account of findings from the second phase.  Our evaluation draws on written feedback following over 700 tutorials, and on qualitative and quantitative data from focus groups and electronic surveys with both students and peer tutors.  We also reflect on the research method used in this study in relation to other approaches to researching student writing.

**Building bridges: The role of writing centers for L2 graduate writers**

Talinn Phillips
*Ohio University*
tiller@ohio.edu

---

[1] The London Metropolitan Writing Centre is an initiative of Write Now, a Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning funded by a grant from HEFCE.  See http://www.writenow.ac.uk for further information.

This presentation discusses the role a U.S. writing center plays as L2 graduate students develop into disciplinary writers. Writing center scholars know little about their roles in the long-term development of L2 writers' abilities; they know even less about the value of the writing center when the challenges of writing in an L2 are compounded by the challenges of becoming professionals writing for specialized disciplinary audiences. However, the L2 writing center research to date has primarily focused on cultural differences and communication breakdowns between tutor and writer and on discourse analyses of individual tutoring sessions. Furthermore, graduate students are virtually absent from writing center scholarship.

This qualitative case study investigated the writing development and the nature of writing center interactions of five L2 graduate writers during their first year of graduate study. The participants provided a range of writing center interactions, several different fields of study, and several different L1s. The research was driven by these questions:
- What role can, does, and should the writing center play as L2 graduate writers "join the conversation" by becoming professional disciplinary writers?
- When tutoring graduate students, whose writing is highly specialized, what are the strengths and limitations of a generalist tutoring staff?
- How can writing centers improve services to L2 graduate writers?
- What non-writing-center supports do L2 graduate writers use?

The length of the study was one academic year, double the length of most L2 writing case studies.  Each week the writers engaged in semi-structured interviews to discuss their progress on their academic writing projects and their confidence in writing. The researcher also collected multiple drafts of all papers and the tutoring observation reports, which noted the writer's stated goals for the session and described the tutor's perceptions of the session. At the end of each quarter, participants' teachers and writing tutors were interviewed in order to triangulate the data. By interviewing the participants, their teachers, and their tutors, the study provides the writing center and L2 writing communities with thick descriptions of how these writers developed and how the writing center might serve L2 graduate writers more effectively.

Findings to be discussed include:
- Writing centers lack theories and pedagogies that are inclusive of L2 writers.
- L2 writers may choose editing services over writing centers because writing centers do not (or are perceived as not) providing sufficient help with sentence-level writing concerns. However, L2 writers want more than "grammar help" and may be disappointed if tutoring sessions address only sentence-level concerns.
- Both writing centers and L2 writers might benefit from actively recruiting more L2 tutors who could tutor writers in their native languages.
- While some writers do seek out tutors with compatible disciplinary backgrounds, the generalist writing center tutoring model can be effective for students who primarily want assistance with style or grammar.

## F12. The university as the writing curriculum

**Training college-level writers through cognitive apprenticeship**

Ronald T. Kellogg
*Saint Louis University*
kelloggr@slu.edu

College graduates are expected to be able to compose effective, extended written texts. Advanced writing skills not only prepare students for today's knowledge economy, they further serve as markers of a successful college curriculum in teaching critical thinking and communication. Because incoming freshmen are often unprepared for the demands that lie ahead, it is critical that the students receive the best available preparation during their undergraduate years. Research in the cognitive science of developing expertise suggests that writers must be trained, as well as instructed, in much the same way that musicians and athletes are trained. It is only through rigorous training that physical and cognitive skills attain high levels of performance and the degree of self-regulatory control required in complex tasks. A cognitive apprenticeship approach to such training is advocated here as a way to optimize college-writing instruction. It stresses the social dimension of writing in that the apprentice must learn by observing the behavior of a model with expertise in a specific discourse community. At the same time, it recognizes that the composition of an extended text occurs privately, inside the writer's mind, where the apprentice's limited cognitive resources are tested and strained. The cognitive demands of serious writing are addressed in part by providing a scaffold that boosts training performance beyond what the apprentice can achieve on his or her own. In addition, the apprentice must deliberately practice writing skills with (1) effortful exertion to improve performance, (2) intrinsic motivation to engage in the task, (3) tasks that are within reach of the individual's current level of ability, (4) feedback that provides knowledge of results, and (5) high levels of repetition. Evidence on the effectiveness of modeling, scaffolding, and deliberate practice is briefly reviewed. The paper then concludes with a discussion of the practical difficulties of trying to train college students using the cognitive apprenticeship model.

**What university professors in art, biology, and psychology looked for when evaluating senior-level student writing**

Monica Stitt-Bergh
*University of Hawai'i*
www.mwp.hawaii.edu

Research on writing standards and evaluation criteria for university-level writing placement exams, SAT-Writing, and ACT English/Writing is plentiful. Less can be found on university seniors' writing. To help address this, I investigated, from a cultural-historical perspective, the standards and criteria that professors applied to senior-level writing. I conducted this study because our university will assess student writing for

accreditation purposes. We needed to determine what constituted good senior-level writing and whether differences across academic fields existed.

My study was a qualitative case study of three fields. I interviewed professors in Art, Biology, and Psychology. The professors read writing by seniors in 400-level courses for majors. They explained the characteristics of the writing (e.g., organization) that contributed to its quality. The professors also explained their rationale and the sources of their beliefs.

My presentation will answer these questions: What characteristics did the professors value? What were the sources of their beliefs (e.g., experiences with peer review)? I will describe the overlap and differences across the three fields to paint a picture of good senior-level writing in each.

There were several characteristics that all of the professors valued. However, other characteristics were only shared by Biology and Art professors or Biology and Psychology professors. Additionally, each field had at least one unique characteristic. Analysis of the professors' rationale indicated that their prior experiences with writing-- from childhood to professional publication--influenced how they evaluated student writing.

My results suggest that professors' standards and criteria for senior-level writing vary across fields and thus program-level writing assessments should be tailored to fields. Although I focused on our university, I believe these findings will be compelling to others involved in writing assessment and writing-across-the-curriculum.

**You can take it with you: Portaging writing lessons across academia**

Elizabeth Vander Lei
*Calvin College*
bvlei@calvin.edu

Dean Ward
*Calvin College*

This presentation reports on a campus-wide study of academic writing that drew together a multi-disciplinary focus group of faculty and students. Each faculty member provided two samples of excellent writing: one that had been published in a premier peer-reviewed journal in their field and one written by a currently enrolled student who was subsequently invited to join the group. The focus group met over for four days to discuss the readings with the goal of fostering good writing instruction across campus.

The results are two-fold: first, "portage" seems an apt metaphor to describe how writers learn to write in a discipline. While writers may face unique challenges in each academic discipline, they do not do so empty-handed. Rather, they carry with them rhetorical strategies from previous writing experiences, strategies that they can adapt to the

particulars of the new situation. When writers understand their writing as a process of adapting rhetorical strategies to disciplinary particulars, they more easily see writing as a means of understanding what they have done and learned and communicating that understanding to readers. This model of "portage" engages and complicates not only recently proposed WAC models that use concepts of genre but also older composition models of modes as organic ways of thinking.

Second, when the cross-disciplinary study team discussed writing, they easily transitioned to explaining (and even justifying) habitual ways of doing and knowing in particular disciplines. In these conversations, participants quickly realized the value of the students' experiences. While students typically write in multiple disciplines in a given semester and thus experience the need for—if not enact the practice of—portaging habits of doing, thinking and writing, faculty typically do not. Faculty reported that these discussions helped them see new opportunities for their own writing and especially for their teaching of writing.

## *F13. Using Writing to Build Professional Identity, Knowledge and Practice: Writing and Learning among K-12 Teachers*

The National Commission on Writing included in its 2006 report "Writing and School Reform" a call for increased attention to writing in all areas of schooling and a particular emphasis on professional development for teachers that is ongoing, that is not top-down, and that engages teachers as writers.  This session responds to that call, focusing on the intersections between writing and professional development for classroom teachers. Across three settings—the preparation of beginning teachers, teacher leadership in the area of writing, and writing for publication—these three studies explore the relationships between both a teacher's own writing and his or her thinking and engagement in the teaching of writing as they contribute to professional development in general and to changing professional identities in particular.  The session will present data from three studies and will include ample time for discussion and interaction.

**Teaching writing and the professional identities of preservice teachers teaching writing and the professional identities of preservice teachers**

Tim Dewar
*SUNY New Paltz*
tdewar@education.ucsb.edu

The National Commission on Writing has issued a series of reports to highlight the importance of writing proficiency to the public (2003, 2004, 2005). *Writing Next*, their 2007 report, aims to highlight "specific teaching techniques that work in the classroom" (4). Pre-service secondary English teachers must negotiate such research-based approaches to teaching writing with their own memories of learning to write. University course work, cooperating teacher's lesson plans, and commercially available curricula also all offer competing views of what is means to teach writing. As one learns to be a

teacher and to teach writing, where does one turn to for answers? How do different "turns" reveal not only different theories of writing and instruction, but also different identities as professionals?

This presentation will explore how a small group of credential candidates examined sometimes conflicting and sometimes complimentary views of teaching writing and curriculum through a series of university assignments and how their burgeoning professional identity evolved. Using discourse analysis and analysis of written texts, the research provides a picture of how new teachers view themselves as teachers, writers, teachers of writing, and professionals.

**Writing and professional development: Learning from teacher leaders**

Linda Friedrich
*National Writing Project*

Tamara Mieles
*National Writing Project*

Roles for teacher leaders to improve the teaching of reading and writing are expanding rapidly. These roles bump up against traditional norms in the teaching profession that discourage teachers from taking public leadership roles. The National Writing Project (NWP) has worked for the past 33 years to improve the teaching of writing in America's schools by drawing on teachers' expertise and cultivating their leadership capacity. We examine teachers' leadership in this context. How do teachers develop the practices, knowledge, and dispositions to lead professional development focused on the teaching of writing? How do teachers' identities as leaders and writers get cultivated? In particular, how does a deep understanding of writing processes facilitate teachers' leadership?

We will address these questions drawing on data and analyses from two research studies underway at the NWP. The Legacy Study offers a broad overview of how involvement in the NWP has shaped the careers, publications, and leadership efforts among a generation of educators. Data include 2,114 professional history surveys and 110 follow-up interviews collected from individuals who participated in an NWP invitational summer institute prior to 1994. The Vignette Study selected 31 educators from writing project sites around the U.S. to draft vignettes that describe the nuances, challenges, and practices embedded in their leadership work. We will describe this novel and counternormative approach to data collection.

**Classroom teachers as authors of the professional article**

Anne Whitney
*Pennsylvania State University*
alw17@psu.edu

The circumstances of classroom teaching are not usually conducive to teachers' writing for a professional audience; for instance, lack of time and infrastructure for writing are

obstacles on a practical level, and the problems of claiming authority to write and of writing for a distant audience are obstacles on a rhetorical level.  Yet there exists a robust journal literature written for teachers by teachers, teachers in professional development settings such as the National Writing Project (NWP) or in teacher research groups have frequently been encouraged to try writing for publication as a form of professional development, and the notion of the teacher as a writer is particularly pertinent in the field of language arts. This study examines classroom teachers who have published articles in professional journals.  When and why might a teacher find it necessary or important to publish an article about his or her teaching?  What obstacles face teachers engaging in writing for publication, and what resources do such authors draw upon?  How does publication affect a teacher's ongoing professional life in and out of the classroom?  This multi-phase study explores what motivates teachers to write for professional publication, the actual practices in which teachers engage when doing so, the challenges they experience and the support systems upon which they rely, and any benefits they might attain from doing so, either for classroom practice or for their professional development.  Initial data is drawn from the NWP Legacy study.  Later phases of the study include follow-up interviews with teachers who have published journal articles, both within NWP and in the community of K-12 teachers generally, in language arts and other fields.

## F14. Undergraduate writing in the sciences

**"A structure that hints at a function": Learning to write in a biological engineering laboratory class**

Neal Lerner
*MIT*
nlerner@mit.edu

Research on student writing has relatively rarely crossed the border from English composition classrooms to science and engineering classrooms and laboratories. Nevertheless, learning to write in science and engineering settings potentially offers powerful examples of "communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991) or "affinity groups" (Gee, 2004) and the importance of student identity formation within those theoretical constructs. This presentation describes a semester-long study of a sophomore-level biological engineering laboratory class at a research-intensive private university.

Through interviews with faculty, students, and staff; analysis of student writing, assignments sheets, and syllabi; and an in-depth focus on four student participants, I attempted to understand the role of writing in this particular class and in these students' developing identities as biological engineers. The structure of the class and the texts students produced—a "white paper" on re-engineering a virus and a laboratory report/scientific article—functioned as a means of professionalization as students learned the forms of communication, the use of writing to convey scientific content, and the claims necessary to allow readers to accept a relatively new and potentially controversial line of research. Perhaps even more powerful, the overall learning environment was one

in which the social nature of learning and the interdependence between knowledge and context were key elements that had significance and direct application for the students as future biological engineers. That is not to say that every element of the learning/writing situations was successful. Students were often working at the edge—if not beyond—of their competencies. Given the time-intensive and highly competitive science and engineering undergraduate program in which students were operating, writing expectations, communication, and performance sometimes suffered. Nevertheless, this study offers an example of the dynamic nature of learning to write in science and engineering classes and helps to push writing research beyond boundaries.

**"It's a whole different mindset": Perceptions of disciplinary writing among upper level zoology and civil engineering majors**

Joleen Hanson
*University of New Hampshire*
jrhanson@cisunix.unh.edu

This presentation will provide research-based insight into undergraduates' journey across the borders of their chosen disciplines, focusing on their perceptions of disciplinary writing.

Writing specialists as well as professors in other fields agree that learning to write eloquently and efficiently would benefit students in every discipline. What varies widely between institutions is the way writing instruction is provided within the specialized university curriculum.

This presentation will be drawn from dissertation research that investigates what Zoology and Civil Engineering students are learning about writing at an institution that requires first year composition followed by three writing-intensive courses.  The research is intended to identify gaps, strengths, and weaknesses in writing development among students in these programs.

Preliminary observations indicate that students in Zoology and Civil Engineering need an explicit understanding of rhetoric. Many could also benefit from a critical awareness of their own writing practices in order to make the act of writing more satisfying and efficient.

The proposed presentation will focus on student awareness of rhetoric, specifically the need to craft writing according to the demands of a particular rhetorical situation. Guiding questions include:
- What are student perceptions of differences between lab reports and other kinds of writing?
- How is it that some students are more aware of these differences than others are?
- When and how do students learn that different disciplines have different definitions of "good writing?"

Answers for these questions will be based primarily on student self-reports in surveys (n=120) and in interviews (n= 30) conducted by a writing specialist who also has a background in chemistry and environmental health and safety. Data will have been collected for three semesters and will also include observations of lab sessions and lectures in four courses in two departments, graded student lab reports, and in-depth interviews with all instructors (n=6).

**To my dear and loving uncle T.C.: The challenges of assigning writing in an animal science course**

Christina Saidy
*Purdue University*
csaidy@purdue.edu

This presentation reports on the results of a research study investigating the effects of writing instruction that crosses a border into an animal sciences course. The project evolved out of a grassroots WAC partnership (Anson) between rhetoric and composition faculty and graduate students and an animal sciences professor at a large Midwestern university well known for its science and engineering programs. While studies of this kind exist (Anson; Dannels; Bayer, Kurto, Kriley; Osborne), this study is distinctive since it develop out of a desire to measure the effectiveness of writing instructions in non-humanities disciplines in a university *without* a formal WAC program.

The research focused on the following questions: Is student writing improvement in a non-humanities WAC course at a university without a formal WAC program related to: (1) direct instruction of course materials; (2) direct instruction on the features of the rubric; (3) use of the university writing lab; (4) the student belief that use of the writing lab improves writing; (5) the student belief that writing is important to the major. Researchers collected and analyzed a variety of data including: pre/post student surveys, student writing assignments (in the form of letters, memorandum, and abstracts), student scores on the course rubric, writing lab attendance, and evaluation letters composed by the students.

The study results provide insights into many areas of scholarship including the development of assessment practices between WAC scholars and disciplinary instructors, development of writing abilities, development of writing attitudes, occurrences of student resistance in interdisciplinary writing and assignments, and the range possibilities for writing across the curriculum practices in a university without a formal WAC program.

## F15. What is writing now?  Writing on mobile devices and in cyberspace

**What is writing now?**

Christina Haas

*Kent State University*
chaas@kent.edu

Pam Takayoshi
*Kent State University*

Technological advances in communication technologies over the past two decades have lead to rich and innovative ways to understand new ways of "writing."  Most obvious, perhaps, is the rise of what are often called 'new media texts,' or written forms that combine image, video, sound, and animation.  This new kind of "writing" is ubiquitous in modern life in the form of webpages, youtube, blogs, video streaming, etc.  Researchers worldwide have explored what 'writing is' in our age of new media.

Our take on the question "what is writing now?" is somewhat different.  Through our ongoing research with young people (between the ages of 12 and 24), we have been struck not only with how rich young people's writing is in terms of integrating modalities, but also in what is happening to their "writing" at the level of printlinguistic symbols.   In this paper, we focus on three types of 'new' writing that--at this historical juncture at least--are produced with conventional alphabetic and numeric symbols (via keyboard or phone key pad):  Instant Messaging, Text Messaging, and Facebook 'wall posts.'

In this paper we will review what is known about recent and fascinating changes in the printlinguistic character of writing, and we will present results from our ongoing studies.  Specifically, over the last three years we have been engaged in a long-term project to understand the linguistic and orthographic symbols used by young people as they write using new and emerging technologies.  These emerging language forms reveal not the "lazy" and "error-ridden" habits of young people (as popular media often has it), but rather a conscious and highly conventionalized new language form.  Of particular import methodologically has been the inclusion of young people themselves as co-researchers.

In addition to presenting our results on frequency of 'non-conventional' language forms and innovative uses of conventional symbols, we will also will address theoretical questions about the technological constraints of  keyboards and keypads for composing and about the possible contemporary emergence of a new writing system.

**Mobile technologies, experience sampling research and composition studies**

Joanne Addison
*University of Colorado-Denver*
Joanne.Addison@cudenver.edu

In her introduction to *Literacy in American Lives* Deborah Brandt makes this case:  "Only recently have we begun to accumulate more systematic and direct accounts of contemporary literacy as it has been experienced.  Nevertheless, many current debates about literacy education and policy continue to be based largely on indirect evidence,

such as standardized tests scores or education levels or surveys of reading habits." She goes on to emphasize that the purpose of her study is "to characterize literacy not as it registers on various scales but as it has been lived." (p. 11, 2001). The field of rhetoric and composition is well positioned to contribute to systematic and direct accounts of literacy as it has been lived that can positively alter educational practices and policy decisions. Doing so requires the type of phenomenological approach taken by Brandt as well as an increase in the number of longitudinal, large-scale, and multi-site research projects.

To this end I propose a discussion of the ways empirical researchers in literacy studies across social, economic, and geographical borders can adapt mobile technologies to better understand literacy as it is lived. In addition to discussing the basic research uses of these technologies I would also like to discuss the ways in which these technologies allow for the incorporation of research methods and methodologies new to literacy studies. One such method is the Experience Sampling Method. This research method "make[s] variations in daily experience, often outside the domain of ready observation, available for analysis. . .it provides a way of getting detailed data about important subjective elements of people's lives in ways that cannot always be matched by other methodologies" ("Educational Battlefields in America," Yair; also see http://www2.bc.edu/~connert/esm.htm ). The results of on ongoing research project using the Experience Sampling Method will be presented.

**Preparing for a cyber future: A reflection on blended learning in the college writing classroom**

Marlowe Miller
*UMass Lowell*
marlowe_miller@uml.edu

In a recent issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Arden Bement asserts that "We are entering a second revolution in information technology, one that may well usher in a new technological age that will dwarf, in sheer transformational scope and power, anything we have yet experienced in the current information age." Bement sees the formation of a "cyberinfrastructure" resulting in "cultural communities that support peer-to-peer collaboration and new modes of education. They are distributed-knowledge communities in an institutional context, not of bricks and mortar like the traditional university, but rather virtual organizations that work across institutional boundaries — and ultimately around the globe." In light of Bement's prediction of a radically altered educational "space," I am concerned about a growing disengagement in students in both high school and college that is documented in reports from the American Diploma Project (ADP) and elsewhere, which indicate that not only are more and more students poorly prepared for both, but that many of them drop out of high school or enter college only to drop out after their first year.

As a forty+ year old teacher addressing a generation of students whose ease with technology like instant messaging, blogging, pod-casting, blackberries, and cell phones

appears to be second nature, Bement's predictions and the evidence of student disinterest lead me to wonder if students might be more engaged in our classrooms, and we might be doing a better job preparing students for the literacies of their future workplaces, if we incorporated and studied these new literacies in our classes? In their introduction to policy research on multimodal literacies, NCTE states that, "In today's world literacy means--in addition to interacting with print texts--recognizing how texts are produced and understanding how multimodal forms of representation convey meaning." I am convinced that "multimodal" literacies should be taught *and* composed by students, whether in the form of blogs, video documentaries, web site designs, or other technologically current "documents."

But this shift requires a radical transformation in instructional delivery and assignments, which necessitates a revolution in methods and modes of evaluation as veteran teachers learn to work in new media. This talk will address my experiences with teaching and learning in a blended course, one that combines both face-to-face and web-based class time. Through our web-site, students "meet" to study the "literacies" of blogs, on-line video essays, and podcasts. We develop a critical language for evaluating these literacies, and students compose in one of these modes and collectively reflect on what it allows them to express and how. My conclusions about student outcomes will draw on a pre and post test I use to evaluate student engagement and other qualitative and experiential information. Based on this experience, I will suggest possible changes in pedagogical practice that might assist composition instructors as we move forward into the radically transformed "cyberinfrastructure" that Bement predicts is our future workplace.

## F16. Cancelled

## F17. Writing across continents – Writing and research between North America and Africa

**Research on the writing of US and South Africa students: The discourse of liberation and equity in online and offline contexts**

Arnetha F. Ball
*Stanford University*
arnetha@stanford.edu

Warren Liew
*Stanford University*

Much has been written on the pedagogical capacities of offline versus online learning tools such as discussion boards for electronic conferencing. Studies on the use of computer-mediated communication have also focused on the advantages of using electronic conferences in both distance education courses and traditional classroom-based

instruction. These studies point to the need for informed instructional design and continuous management of the technical, intellectual, and social aspects of using writing as a pedagogical tool for teaching and learning. These dimensions have been analyzed in terms of particular discourses (e.g. rhetorical and linguistic structures). Little, however, has been written on the ways in which these discourses relate to students' ideological becoming, students' and instructors' relationships, roles, and identity development across both online and offline contexts, and how these in turn affect teaching and learning. We believe that a discourse analytic approach to teaching students' about using writing as a pedagogical tool for learning will make them more critically self-aware and generative in their thinking.  This presentation on the writing of US and South Africa students on issues of liberation and equity in online and offline contexts will explore these issues more deeply and will shed light on the following questions:

1) How are US and South African students' identities, roles, and relationships expressed, explored, and expanded in the writings produced within two course contexts?

2) Do online versus offline discussion forums enable individual students to engage more critically with classroom discourse?

3) How do students' interactions with peers and the course instructor through online versus offline discussions contribute to and make visible their learning?

The data include:

(1) offline written course reflections of US and South Africa students

(2) electronic copies of students' written assignments;

(3) instructors' weekly lesson plans, fieldnotes, and correspondences with students;

(4) electronic archives of students' online postings in a discussion forum;

(5) semi-structured interviews with students.

Drawing on this data and the growing scholarship on ideological becoming, professional development, and digital pedagogies, this presentation reports on a study that investigated how teaching that uses writing as a pedagogical teaching tool can facilitate the learning outcomes of students in the areas of generative thinking and critical analyses. In this presentation we share insights into the potential benefits and pitfalls of online versus offline learning for graduate students in college courses.

**Intellectual and technological hospitality in an online, international, collaborative teaching and research project**

Suzanne Blum Malley
*Columbia College*
sbmalley@colum.edu

John Ruiters
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
*Port Elizabeth, South Africa*
John.Ruiters@nmmu.ac.za

Six years ago, as a result of an initial Fulbright Alumni Initiative Award, Columbia College Chicago, USA (CCC) and the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa (NMMU) entered into a relationship through the Sharing Cultures project, an educational effort to connect developmental writing and first-year experience classrooms at each institution through online interaction. The idea was to leverage the Internet and digital technology to create two interconnected, international writing and research exchanges, one between students at each institution and one between a teaching team of faculty at each institution.

We have been successful in achieving and measuring success for our basic learning outcomes for students and accomplishing a certain amount of collaborative research and scholarship as faculty members. Nevertheless, sustaining institutional support and recognition for this type of classroom collaboration as well as creating a level of acceptance and understanding of our "research" in dramatically different institutional and scholarly cultures has been daunting.

 In this presentation, we share some of the research and writing that comes out of this collaborative project itself. We also hope to illuminate what we have learned about sustainability for long-term international, intercultural, writing and research partnerships. As part of our work in progress, we posit that hospitality, rather than a divide (digital or otherwise), provides a way to frame and ultimately support this kind of writing research. Considering technological and intellectual hospitality necessitates the recognition of a variety of relationships, ones that very often not only imply, but also require the presence of a gap or divide in order for them to be recognized. In other words, it is precisely because the divides in this type of project are so large, that there are so many, that we are able to see the value of teaching, collaborating, and writing research across borders.