M Session Abstracts

M1. Levels of language in assessment and instruction: Lessons from longitudinal studies grades 1 to 7

Panel Organized by: Virginia W. Berninger, *University of Washington*
Chair:Brett Miller, *NICHD* Discussant: Gary Troia, *Michigan State University*

Virginia W. Berninger, *U. of Washington*
Noelia Garcia, *University of Washington*
William Nagy, *Seattle Pacific University*
Scott Beers, *Seattle Pacific University*
Amy Augsburger, *University of Washington*
John R. Hayes, *Carnegie Mellon University*

Following an introduction to the symposium, presentations will be made by Noelia Garcia on spelling; William Nagy, Scott Beers, and Amy Augsburger on syntax; and Virginia Berninger and John R. Hayes on writing essays by pen and keyboard. Then Gary Troia will discuss each of the presentations and add his own perspectives from his research on writing. These presentations, which are based in large part on a five-year NICHD-study of typical writing development and its connections to listening, speaking, and reading, will present their findings within a levels of language framework for synthesizing the word- , syntax-, and text- levels of writing. The spelling study focuses on the phonological, orthographic, and morphological contributions to spelling. The syntax study offers new insights into the role of syntax in writing development. The composing study compares texts composed using different modes of writing-conventional paper and pen and computer-assisted word processing. Instructional implications of the findings will be discussed.

Linking Domain and Situated Motivation for Writing with Writing Performance and Experiences

Gary Troia
Michigan State University
gtroia@msu.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.

M2. Learning to write and writing to learn among elementary school students

Build students' capacity for writing to learn: A design experiment

Perry Klein*, The University of Western Ontario*
Boba Samuels*, The University of Western Ontario*

Mary Johnston, *The Thames Valley Board of Education*

Boba Samuels
University of Western Ontario
bbsamuel@uwo.ca

Perry D. Klein
University of Western Ontario

Student attitudes towards writing, including their beliefs and intentions, are expected to influence both the quality of their writing and their capacity to learn from writing. Approaches to Writing (Lavelle 1993; Lavelle & Guarino, 2003), is a construct drawn from an attitude questionnaire validated with undergraduates, the Inventory of Processes In College Composition (IPIC). Factor analysis of the IPIC revealed five distinct factors, two associated with a deep approach to text, and three identified with surface approaches. To date, the IPIC has also been used with secondary students, but not with elementary students. We adapted the survey for elementary students and used it in three separate studies in a 3-year project investigating writing-to- learn.

Factor analysis of data from the first two years of the project (n = 94) indicated 12 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00, accounting for 70.06% of the variance in approaches and KMO sphericity of .74. Varimax rotation produced four clear factors. The first factor, loaded positively with items reflecting intrinsic motivation and enjoyment, accounted for 24.48% of the variance in approaches. The second factor (8.21% of variance), revealed moderate positive loadings on items concerning elaboration. The third and fourth factors reflected extrinsic motivation and planful approaches, bringing the total variance accounted for by these four factors to 42.82%. This model suggests that relative to secondary and postsecondary students, elementary students' approach to writing may be a relatively unitary construct, reflecting a deep versus shallow dimension.
Data from the third year of the study (n = 145) will allow us to further explore the factor structure of this survey and validate students' approaches against their writing grades, quality of written arguments, and performance in a writing-to-learn task. This data is currently being analysed and will be presented at the conference.

Metatextual awareness and the establishment of textual cohesion: An intervention study
Kátia Leal Reis de Melo, *CE – UFPE – Brazil*
Alina Galvão Spinillo, *CFCH – UFPE – Brazil*

Kátia Leal Reis de Melo
CE – UFPE – Brazil

Alina Galvão Spinillo
CFCH – UFPE – Brazil
katiamelo@hotmail.com

Spinillo (1996) observed that the written production of well-elaborated stories tended to be more cohesive (number, diversity and complexity of cohesive links employed) when compared to stories with an elementary narrative structure. Thus, the production of cohesive stories appears to be associated to awareness of textual structure. Based on this observation, the aim of the present intervention study was to investigate the relationship between metatextual awareness and the written production of texts. For such, the study was conducted with 34 children in the first grade of Elementary Learning, divided into two groups: Experimental (EG) and Control (CG). Only the EG participated in the intervention program, which was based on Ferreira and Spinillo (2003), involving a series of metatextual awareness stimulation activities. Both groups took two posttests involving the written production of stories. The analysis of the texts produced was performed through a survey of the types and frequencies of cohesive links. Comparing the posttests of the two groups, the Experimental Group had a better performance than the Control Group. The

children who underwent metatextual awareness stimulation produced more cohesive texts, with a greater number of cohesive resources and tended to use cohesive elements that involve a higher degree of complexity (ellipses and substitutions). Moreover, the performance of these children in the production of cohesive links improved from the first posttest to the second. These data suggest that metatextual awareness appears to contribute toward an improved performance in the establishment of cohesion and such an effect persists over time.

Improving first grader's writing through genre study and reproduction
Sara B. McCraw, *University of Delaware*
Sara B. McCraw
University of Delaware
sarab@udel.umd.edu

As young writers begin to express themselves in written forms, they are often overwhelmed with a process that requires focus on both idea development and application of the alphabetic principle (Donovan & Smolkin, 2006; McCutchen, 2006). O'Flahavan (2005) developed a consume-critique-produce instructional framework (CCP) which is designed to support students as they develop as writers.   This approach is grounded in the sociocultural basis for teaching students how to write, and argues that students need multiple, scaffolded experiences reading (or consuming) a genre before being expected to write (or produce) that form (Hillocks, 1984). In the CCP approach students learn to manipulate intact writing samples and orally produce examples of their own. Over a period of months, high-quality samples are cut apart and students reproduce these samples in small groups by trying different configurations and reconstructions, sometimes revising the stories.

This study was designed to explore the effectiveness of using reproduction activities as an instructional approach to support students as they move from learning about a specific genre to producing the genre on their own. A quasi-experimental design was used with four first-grade classrooms. In order to measure progress in quality, analytic and holistic rubrics were designed specifically for narrative text and used to score six specific qualities of writing. Word length was also determined as an additional measure of writing quality.

Overall, results from this exploratory study indicate that instruction which is focused, in part on genre through the use of reproduction activities and repeated oral practice, increases the quality of students' narrative texts in first grade. In this presentation, we will discuss the use of reproduction activities and repeated oral practice as ways to scaffold first graders' writing, the design of the study, the initial findings, and implications for writing research and instruction.

M3. National study of writing instruction: A close look at three settings

Linda Baker
LALBAKER@aol.com

Renee Banzhaf
rsbanzhaf@hotmail.com

Chin Ee Loh
chinzlove@gmail.com

Kristen Campbell Wilcox
kwilcox1@uamail.albany.edu

A close look at writing in the academic disciplines as it is taught and experienced in six secondary school settings is the focus of this report on the second year of the National Study of Writing

Instruction, a collaboration of the National Writing Project and the National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement. The case studies were conducted in 2006-2007 across grades (6, 8, 10, and 12) and across subjects (English, math, science, and social studies) in middle and high schools in three diverse districts. Student writing samples, classroom observations, and interviews with students, teachers, and administrators provide the data for an in-depth description of students' writing experiences within and across subject areas as well as within the school contexts. This presentation focuses on the particularities of each case study to paint diverse portraits of writing across the curriculum in three very different school settings.

Skansen, a diverse urban district, facing the challenge of raising high stakes test scores, turns to a focus on test-typical writing for lower performers. The gap between expectations of writing among students of differing performance is most pronounced in this setting. In the Mayfair district where students typically do well on high stakes test, there is less concern with writing for test purposes and a willingness to experiment with literacy initiatives and research-based pedagogy that promise to improve students' writing beyond testing. Finally, administrators and teachers in Riverside schools, situated in a small-town farming community with economic challenges, take pride in emphasizing writing throughout grade levels and subject areas, and in engaging students in a wide variety of writing activities, often incorporating innovative ideas and technology into a strong base of traditional instruction.

M4. What spelling errors can tell us about writing development
Spelling errors in written French: an on-line investigation

Harriet Jisa
Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, France
Harriet.Jisa@univ-lyon2.fr

Séverine Maggio
Université Blaise Pascal, France

Michel Fayol
Université Blaise Pascal, France

The orthographic system of French is one of the most difficult to learn and to use (Jaffré & Fayol, 2005; Sprneger-Charolles, 2003). Paradoxically, it is also one of the least studied. Indeed, no study has examined spelling in French using on-line methods during the production of texts. The aim of our presentation is to address this issue by analysing the evolution and the distribution of spelling errors in child and adolescent French writers.

We will describe the evolution and the distribution of spelling errors during text production. Written texts were collected from 120 children and adolescents attending priority education schools in Lyon, France and representing three age groups: 10-11-, 12-13- and 15-16-year-olds. Each age group is divided into two subgroups, one consisting of children experiencing difficulty in school and the other of children showing no difficulty. All of the subjects are low SES (based on national statistical norms) native speakers of French. Each subject was required to produce a rough draft and a final version of a narrative and an expository text on an electronic writing tablet. Thus, for each individual four texts were examined.

Our analyses addresses different categories of spelling errors (phonological, morphological and lexical), their position in the text (beginning, middle, and end), the types of spontaneous corrections during production, and the distribution of errors as a function of grade level.

The error analysis is interpreted in relation to models of written language production with the aim of ascertaining 1) at what moment during production the writers' systems do not perform optimally and 2) to elucidate the underlying mechanisms to which the errors can be attributed.

The effects of an adapted writing program on elementary school students' ability to write coherent narrative texts: A longitudinal Canadian study in a Francophone minority situation

Martine Cavanagh
Campus Saint-Jean, University of Alberta, Canada
martine.cavanagh@ualberta.ca

In response to the difficulty of francophone minority students in Canada to master the textual aspects of written French, we adapted for narrative writing a program for learning to write opinion texts that had previously been developed from a socioconstructivist perspective and validated with elementary students in Quebec. Our objective was to evaluate the effects of this program on the new population's writing competence and the information presented here corresponds to the first phase of a longitudinal research spanning three years from Grade 4 to Grade 6. It includes a presentation of the issue, the main elements of the intervention program's conceptual framework, the methodology used, the quantitative results obtained in textual coherence and in planning in Grade 4 and a conclusion indicating certain possible program improvements.

Invented spelling activities and the phonetization of Portuguese pre-school children's writing

Margarida Alves Martins
Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Portugal
mmartins@ispa.pt

Ana Cristina Silva
Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Portugal
csilva@ispa.pt

Marta Sousa
Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Portugal

The processes by which children understand that letters represent sound components of words have been recently analysed within the framework of children's use of written language and of the knowledge that they acquire about the writing system before they begin formal education, namely by participating in invented spelling activities. Our aim in this study was to test 2 programmes designed to lead preschool children to use conventional letters to spell the initial consonants of words in which the context of the initial phoneme varies.

The participants were 45 5-year-old children whose spellings were grapho-perceptive (Ferreiro, 1988) or pre-communicative (Gentry, 1982). They were familiar with the vowels and with the consonants B, D, F, P, T and V.

They were divided into 2 experimental groups and a control group. Their age, level of intelligence and phonological awareness were controlled.

Their spellings were assessed in a pre- and a post-test, in which they were asked to write 36 words beginning with the above consonants: in 18 the initial consonant was followed by an unstressed vowel and in 18 by a stressed one.

In-between, ExpG1 wrote words where the initial consonant was followed by an unstressed vowel and ExpG2 words where the initial consonant was followed by a stressed vowel. We expect a better post-test performance (mobilisation of appropriate consonants) from ExpG1. The fact that, in Portuguese, the stressed vowels coincide with the name of the letters that represent them

means that they are easier to mobilise in spelling than the consonants (Treiman et al., 1998). Consequently it is probable that this effect will be smaller when the initial consonant is followed by an unstressed vowel.

Both Experimental groups achieved better results than the control group. ExpG1 achieved better results than ExpG2.

M5. Multimodality in teaching and research

Steven Forbes Tuckey
Michigan State University
tuckeys1@msu.edu

Disciplinary-oriented science education researchers (such as the author) can learn a great deal from different perspectives on writing research. A great deal of research exists that is oriented toward helping students develop strategies for reading and writing in the sciences (e.g., Duke, Purcell-Gates, Hall, & Tower, 2006/2007; Holliday, Yore, & Alvermann, 1994; Keys, 1999), and a growing body of discourse-oriented researchers are keenly aware of science as a fertile ground for future work on literacy. Gee suggests that "all of literacy education has a great deal to learn from scientific literacy" (2004, p.42) in light of the regular multi-modality of texts in science – charts, diagrams and equations, as well as a strong presence of expository texts. Gee makes a strong case for the intriguing range of texts in science classrooms that are "central to scientific meaning-making … [including] verbal accounts, mathematical expressions and calculations, schematic diagrams, abstract graphs, and hands-on actions" (2004, p.41). It is this idea that motivates this paper: a closer look at how the multimodality of scientific texts in the classroom can benefit writing (and reading) research across boundaries. The substance of this paper will address characteristics of multimodal scientific texts and the ways in which considering such texts allow for a broad range of contextualized writing research and a more nuanced view of narrative with respect to the material world. Through this discussion I will consider writing research on scientific texts, in hopes of extending the possibilities for how it is conceived and carried out.

Multimodal texts: Situating narratives across borders

Kevin J. Burke
Michigan State University
burkeke5@msu.edu

hooks (1994) reminds us that "theory finds different uses in different locations (p. 64). Adrienne Rich coined the term re-vision to mean "the act of looking back, or seeing with fresh eyes" (as cited in Osborn, 1991, p. 261). The possibility of re(visioning) writing classrooms—at the secondary and tertiary levels—lends itself to multimodal texts (particularly in the burgeoning fields of Digital Rhetoric) rooted in the genre of narrative "not because they are inherently better," as Brodkey (1996) notes, "but because theoretical discussions exclude those who lack the leisure to become fluent in theory" (p. 171 First year writing students are bridging the gap between their former home lives and the—often harsh—realities of a college existence; similarly, the graduate students who engage these young men and women in the classroom exist in a world characterized by (but not limited to) constant tensions rooted in their semi-professional status within the Academy. These 'boundary times' are uniquely suited for mutual self-discovery through narrative classroom discourse centered in visual writing techniques as a way to re-vision the ways teaching and theory (and learning) "authorize" and disauthorize "the subjects of educational discourse" (Brodkey, 1996, p. 104). Located at the site of two First Year Writing classrooms, the piece draws on "perspective-taking and making" (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995) as well as Positionality theory to examine the uses of movement and vision exercises to aid in the development of narrative voice.

Re-presenting scientific literacy: How subjectivity emerges in multimodal contexts

Kelly Zacha Merritt
Michigan State University
zachakel@msu.edu

What texts do pre-service science teachers legitimate when accounting for learning in the students they teach? How do they legitimate these texts? How do they de-legitimate others? As a member of this panel, I, an English educator, seek to re-present (Hall, 1997) the narratives of pre-service science teacher candidates interviewed in a multi-year study at Michigan State University. Funded by the Carnegie Institute for Learning, undergraduate science students interact with videotaped segments of science teaching, voicing their discourses of science teaching and scientific literacy. This paper traces how subjectivity in these burgeoning science teachers emerges through their "sticky engagements" (Tsing, 2005) with notions of science, literacy, and multimodal texts, particularly as they "write" into being their notions of what it means to be a science teacher.

M6. *Cancelled*

M7. *Critical, democratic pedagogy and participant observation: Methodology to uncover students' understandings and reactions*

William H. Thelin
University of Akron
wthelin@uakron.edu

Kara Taczak
University of Akron
ketaczak@yahoo.com

Tricia Rashidioun
University of Akron
trashidioun@msn.com

This panel will discuss results from a classroom research project into the efficacy of critical, democratic pedagogy, which frontloads the students' concerns and experiences while backloading the instructor's agenda of challenging the status quo and raising critical consciousness. The instructor under study uses: grading contracts, generative themes, problem-posing, shared authority, and political critiques embedded within students' oral and written words. The effects on students' attitudes, learning, political sensibilities, and writing under this type of pedagogy have been documented mostly through narrative re-creations from instructors. Practitioners hoping to enact some of these critical methods have difficulty gleaning information from this form of scholarship due to the tendency of the instructor to elide mistakes and complications, a practice that has been critiqued by Tassoni and Thelin (2000).

The panelists felt that the most beneficial methodology would respond to Richard Haswell's (2005) call for RAD scholarship—research that is replicable, aggregable, and data-supported. The panelists designed a study to reflect data gathering techniques consistent with the tradition of participant-observation. They will have observed and participated in every class session, taking copious notes about the classroom dynamic and the students' behaviors; surveyed the students' academic, social, and political backgrounds; conducted interviews with students both mid-term and post hoc; reviewed with instructor post hoc his impressions of the classroom; and analyzed the students' writing. They will compare the results of the study with the criticisms of it found in our field's literature—competing agendas of students and instructors (Durst 1999); focus on rationality to the exclusion of emotion (Ellsworth 1989; Worsham 1998); unequal division of power

in the classroom (Ruszkiewicz 2000); and sacrifice of writing instruction to political correctness (Hairston 1992).

In this presentation, the panelists will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the methodology and report on the preliminary analysis of the data.

M8. Overviews of K-12 writing instruction
Writing in the Secondary School: 25 Years of Progress, or déjà vu all over again?

Arthur N. Applebee
University of Albany, SUNY
AApplebee@uamail.albany.edu

In the early 1980s, a series of studies investigated the nature of writing instruction in American schools, using a combination of in-depth case studies of classroom instruction with national surveys of instruction to provide a detailed portrait of strengths and weaknesses across the major academic subject areas (Applebee, 1981, 1984). This presentation will examine changes in instruction since this early work, drawing on data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress as well as early findings from a new National Study of Writing Instruction.

The portrait of curriculum and instruction that emerged from the earlier studies was quite bleak: The typical writing assignment was a page or less, begun in class and completed for homework. Most writing involved filling in blanks and providing short answers, with little attention to analysis and interpretation, and with an average of just over 3 minutes of instruction before students were expected to begin to write. At the same time, the studies highlighted the importance of writing across the curriculum: Although writing was most likely to be *taught* in English classes, students *did more* writing, in total, for their other subjects than they did for English. And while the overall picture was bleak, later studies, particularly Langer & Applebee (1987) and Langer (2001), highlighted schools and classrooms in which students were engaged in rich and challenging writing activities. During this same time period, the National Writing Project was beginning to expand the number of local writing project sites across the country providing professional development to teachers in the teaching of writing, K-12. (Lieberman and Wood, 2003; MacDonald, Buchanan, & Sterling, 2004).

These decades have also been marked by a number of trends whose impact on writing instruction is unclear. First among these is the new emphasis on high stakes testing. When writing is included in these assessments, as Hillocks (2002) has noted, the nature of the assessment can have a powerful and sometimes narrowing influence on what is considered good writing. Further, as the emphasis on high stakes tests increases, there is a chance that writing will be squeezed out of the curriculum.

Another trend whose impact on the teaching and learning is unclear is the spread of new technologies. Advances in technology have made word processing tools and Internet resources widely available, and students report making extensive use of them in their writing (Applebee & Langer, 2006; National Writing Project, 2006). At the same time, new genres and forms of publication have emerged that integrate a variety of media and capitalize on the flexibility of hypertext. From instant messages to web pages to blogs to embedded graphics and videos, these changes are certainly having an impact on students' writing experiences, though we do not know the extent to which students have opportunities to engage with these technologies to carry out school tasks.

While students' reading performance has been high on the national agenda in recent years, students' writing ability has been remarkably absent from public concern. Although studies over

the past twenty years have identified strong relationships between reading and writing as well as the role writing plays in content learning, there has been little national attention to how writing progresses across the school years and across subject areas.

In a series of analyses of National Assessment data, we found that although changes in writing achievement have taken place since the early 1970s, the gap between more and less advantaged students continues to be large, and overall performance has not risen very much. Students still do not seem to be writing enough nor receiving enough writing instruction, in any subject (Applebee & Langer, 2006).

In this presentation, these analyses will be augmented by case studies of writing activities in an initial sample of 3 middle and 3 high schools. These studies involve interviews with students, teachers, and administrators, observations of classroom instruction, and analyses of the cumulative body of students' work across an academic year.

Writing as critical and creative thought

Judith A. Langer
University at Albany, SUNY
JLanger@uamail.albany.edu

Recently I have been asked by educational colleagues in several developed as well as developing countries to address the topic of critical and creative thinking. It is their concern that even when their students are learning quite well the content they are being taught, they graduate and move into the workplace with limited ability to be change agents, to create new ways to solve existing problems and to create new questions at the horizons of newer knowledge that will move their fields and countries ahead in world markets. Both my work on literary and discursive thinking (1990;1995), my later work on schools that beat the odds (2004; 2002; 2001) and the still later Partnership for Literacy (2005;2003) have moved me to confront these concerns head on. Although all my projects have focused on ways in which writing, reading and discussion can be used to further students' abilities to think about and learn both content and literacy, it has become increasingly apparent that what is meant by literacy and what is meant by thinking are extremely nontrivial questions that lie at the heart of the types of educational reform these (and probably all) countries are seeking.

To address these issues, my talk will have three parts, drawing on my past and present research. It will begin with a discussion of "literate thinking," (in press; 2005) a concept I developed some time ago (1987) but have been refining over the course of the last few years. This will be followed by a discussion of critical and creative thought, including their distinctions, their overlaps and how they occur and interact in life. Last will be an elaboration of these ideas as they occur in the writing students can be asked to do in secondary school disciplinary coursework, with particular examples of the ways in which writing can successfully support both critical and creative thought as well as higher literacy. The critical issue of the ways in which teachers can be helped to conceptualize the role of writing in their students' creative and critical thinking about their subject matter will be interwoven.

Since the in-progress National Study of Writing Instruction (Applebee & Langer, 2006), makes clear the paucity of writing that secondary students are asked to do across the subject areas in the United States as well as the ways in which the No Child Left Behind legislation may have unwittingly reduced the kinds as well as amounts of writing students are asked to do, the talk will end with a discussion of ways in which secondary classrooms as they are typically conceived leave little room for uses of writing as critical and creative thought and limit the development of the abilities so valued in the workplace.

M9. Assessing the writing proficiency of future elementary school teachers: Results from year one of the Teachers for a New Era Literacy Research Project at California State University, Northridge

Chair:
Kathleen Dudden Rowlands
California State University, Northridge

Panelists:
Tina Bertacchi-Love
California State University, Northridge
Tina.M.Bertacchi-Love@csun.edu

Pamela Bourgeois
California State University, Northridge

Sandra Chong
California State University, Northridge

Irene Clark
California State University, Northridge

Renee Ziolkowska
California State University, Northridge

Respondent:
Theresa Montaño
California State University, Northridge

This panel will analyze results from the first year of a long-term major literacy research project undertaken at California State University, Northridge, under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation's innovative Teachers for a New Era initiative. Precipitated by local elementary school principals' complaints that teachers prepared at CSUN "can't write," CSUN composition instructors' rejoinder that their students were writing quite well, and an interrogation of the phrase "can't write," researchers developed two rubrics to address the writing proficiency expectations of the two constituencies. They used both rubrics to assess over 200 samples of timed and revised writing produced by over 100 CSUN students across academic ranks, self-identified as future elementary school teachers. Representing multiple disciplines at CSUN, the panelists will describe the project's rationale, design, and implementation. Panelists will then discuss the project's initial findings and what they might suggest about 1) the teaching and practice of writing across the university, and about the writing instruction that English Language Learners, in particular, do or do not receive; 2) expectations of student writing, and writing in general, from university composition instructors compared to those of education faculty and professionals; 3) how these expectations impact the assessment of student writing, and the writing of English Language Learners, in particular; 4) how timed writing assignments compare with at-home revised work, and the significance of this distinction for English Language Learners, in particular, and for students increasingly subjected to standardized writing tests; and 5) what changes, if any, could and/or should be made in the preparation of elementary (and other) teachers in order to develop their proficiency as writers and future teachers of writing.

M10. Examining cross-cultural interactions with "home" discourses in WAC/WID work

As Anson's (2002) casebook makes clear, working across and in various disciplines poses many challenges. The following panel addresses these challenges from the perspective of

"ingroup/outgroup" conflicts in "home" discourses, which often occur—sometimes unknowingly-- when participants of various disciplines engage in WAC/WID work. The three papers employ ethnographic and discourse analytic methodologies to tease out some of the points of conflict for examination. Individually, each paper adds a different understanding of potential conflicts. Collectively, they

provide a means by which multi-disciplinary participants' views can be better understood and acknowledged, while working in disciplines outside their own.

Interdisciplinary (writing) collaboration, interdisciplinary (cross-cultural) communication

Maureen Mathison
University of Utah
maureen.mathison@hum.utah.edu

Collaborative work is commonly accepted as challenging, even when the participants are from the same culture (Hall, 2002). When, as in the case of interdisciplinary work, the collaboration requires attention to "Discourses" (Gee, 1996), the project becomes even more difficult as participants have to identify and then adapt to different ways of knowing and communicating. Interdisciplinary groups need first to recognize that the challenges they are experiencing have more to do with cultural differences among norms, values, and worldviews, than the specific issues about which they are discussing. Often interdisciplinary participants enter into collaborative relationships unaware of their cultural differences, as they perceive themselves more alike, self-identifying as professionals as they work together on a common project. Considering themselves all as ingroup members, then, they erroneously assume that they think and communicate similarly.

Although this assumption creates common ground for collaborative efforts, it also forestalls a necessary focus on the cultural, intercultural and cross-cultural communication that is necessary for effective disciplinary collaboration. If not addressed, the likelihood of frustration may increase as participants' ways of knowing, professional values and goals, and communication patterns come into conflict. It behooves individuals involved in interdisciplinary work to be aware of the expectations and potential challenges that can impede effective intercultural communication, and its subdomains (Kim, 2001) of cultural and cross-cultural communication. Combined, these three domains help to elaborate some of the more prominent contingencies of teaching and learning as an ingroup or outgroup member WAC/WID programs. In this paper we extrapolate from the literature on intercultural communication and report on an ethnographic experience in mechanical engineering to make recommendations on how to design and implement pedagogical collaborations among disciplines as cross-cultural interactions.

Not at home at home: Rich feature/context sensitive analysis of English Department discourse on disciplinary writing

Doug Downs
Utah Valley State College
downsdo@uvsc.edu

English Departments are rarely studied as sites of disciplinary writing instruction because of English's long association with and responsibility for literacy instruction campus-wide. English is often the department that writing faculty come *from* to go *to* other departments as outgroup members. English often assumes the writing it teaches is *the* writing, yet as MacDonald (1994) has argued, its "universal" writing is humanities-based and disciplinary, though rarely recognized as such by English faculty. Writing faculty are often outgroup members in their own departmental home, in ways that impact disciplinary writing instruction in English.

Compared with WID instruction in other disciplines, English's "ownership" of literacy creates warped versions of typical outgroup/ingroup communication problems. Geisler (1994) and Norgaard (1999), for example, show how in philosophy and engineering, respectively, the tendency to split disciplinary expert knowledge from "basic" literacy creates difficulties because literacy practices are themselves a form of disciplinary expertise. Yet when writing faculty work with English faculty, English's assumption of its expertise in general literacy practices means that writing faculty are not seen as experts at all.

In this paper, I explore how context-sensitive text analysis (Huckin, 2002) and rich feature discourse analysis (Barton, 2004) of English department discourse on disciplinary writing instruction reveals underlying cultural values, assumptions, and worldviews which complicate the implementation of WID in English. Using a corpus developed from conversations on disciplinary writing instruction in a mid-size English department at a state teaching university, as well as drawing on historical documentation of English departments' relationships with disciplinary writing instruction (e.g., Scholes, 1985; Russell, 2002), I develop a case study that speaks to two main points: the value of discourse analysis in discovering ingroup/outgroup cultural conflicts in WID instruction, and strategies for implementing disciplinary writing instruction in the English department based on resulting cultural understanding.

The WID research interview as a rhetorical frame for generating collaborative interdisciplinary conversation

Sarah Reed
University of Washington
reads@washington.edu

In the last-minute, over-committed context of academic life there is rarely time for inter-disciplinary WID faculty, writing consultants and staff to establish and nurture trust-based, professional collaborative relationships that can work positively to negotiate and creatively explore disciplinary assumptions, boundaries and prerogatives around integrating writing into disciplinary curriculum. This lack of space and time for collaborative conversation raises the questions of how time might be generated and
rhetorically framed as productive for both disciplinary faculty and WID program staff and faculty.

To this end, the speaker conducted a series of ethnographic interviews with engineering faculty participating in a WID program for the dual purposes of 1. Continuing to gather and generate knowledge about the experiences of and attitudes towards writing of engineering faculty and 2. Using the research interview as an opportunity to generate trust-building conversation around topics that exceed the term-by-term necessities of producing course materials, such as syllabi, course schedules, lecture topics and assignment sheets. A frame for generative collaboration is especially important within a disciplinary environment where the "home" discourse, in this case engineering, situates writing and writing instruction, functionally if not intentionally, at the periphery. This paper draws on the precedence set by an assessment study of a pilot engineering WAC program at Texas A&M (Johnson, 2001) that used linguistic analysis to assess attempts to create solidarity and cohesion among participants, including discourse markers, hedging and politeness (Tannen 1993, 1994). This paper aims to establish and to better understand the success of the research interview as a frame to generate inter-disciplinary collaborative conversation around writing and writing instruction in a WID program.

M11. Writing instructional practices in UK and European schools

Policy and practice in teaching writing in UK schools

Roger Beard
University of London, UK
r.beard@ioe.ac.uk

Debra Myhill
University of Exeter, UK

The last decade has seen a concerted effort by the UK government to raise standards of literacy attainment in elementary and secondary schools. Building on the existing statutory provisions for national curriculum content, national testing arrangements and inspections of schools, the policies of the last ten years have focused on professional development, guidance on teaching approaches and a target-setting agenda for student attainment.

The two presenters have each undertaken research studies that have investigated student attainment and progress in writing during this time, in the elementary and secondary age-range respectively. Their data indicate some key issues that are raised by centralised policies and their implementation (Beard et al, 2004; Myhill 2005 and in press). Both presenters have also been commissioned by centralised agencies to undertake reviews of research during this time (Beard, 1999; Myhill and Fisher, 2005) that have helped contextualise national policies within a broader evidence base.

After briefly outlining the main centralising trends of the UK education system, Roger Beard will discuss findings on an intervention programme to raise the attainment of under-achieving children, using specially written materials and specially trained teaching assistants.   Debra Myhill will discuss how curriculum policy which has promoted the re-introduction of grammar teaching contextualised within a pedagogy of writing is being realised in practice. She will illustrate how, on the one hand, some writers were able to describe explicit linguistic choices, such as deliberate syntactical alterations, based on purposeful teaching of linguistic constructions; but that, on the other hand, teaching linguistic terminology also led to some children using explicit terminology without corresponding understanding

These findings will be used to illustrate some of the recurrent issues in the relationships between policy and practice in the teaching of writing, including sustainability, unintended consequences and the role of subject knowledge.

The role of writing in European national curricula (year 1 - 13)

Sigmund Ongstad,
Oslo University College, Norway
URL: http://home.hio.no/~sigmund/
IMEN: http://www.lu.hio.no/imen
http://www.lu.hio.no/nordisk-fagdidaktikk/

The Council of Europe (COE) has developed a framework for teaching, learning and assessing foreign language education. Inspired by its success in Europe, COE has even initiated a new framework for standard language education (French in France, Danish in Denmark etc.). One influential source is the Norwegian 2006 curriculum, which has two important patterns - it is a coherent curriculum for *all* years from 1 to 13 (age 6-19) and it has made interdisciplinary basic competencies (of which one is writing) obligatory for all school subjects.
(http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/schoollang_EN.asp?)

COE's new framework has been influenced by the Language across the curriculum project (LAC). A main idea now is to describe the role of 'language' in all school subjects, at least in compulsory education and to produce a resource book (framework), used voluntary in all 47 European countries! If this intention becomes just partly true, the ideas might be influential to an extent hardly seen in international educational contexts.

Taking a step back it could be claimed that the quite 'language oriented national curricula in Norway is (implicitly) influenced by American inspired process writing (POW) over the last 20 years. This points to a quite under-communicated role of cultural contexts for national curricula. The Norwegian development is closely related to writing, but is this the case in other countries? The paper will analyse critically how writing is perceived and positioned in different countries and problematize how LAC-ideas relate to 'writing'. Two (related) aspects will be focused especially, if/how development of writing is thought of and in which genres/discourses students are supposed to write.

I will use data collected as COE-coordinator for a group studying the role of language in mathematics education in addition to results from comparative studies of European national curricula done by an IMEN research group.

M12. Languages of book reviews

The impact of contextual configuration on genre: A comparative study of academic vs. "mass-market" book reviews

Llüsia Gea Valor
Universitat Jaume I Castelló, Spain
gea@ang.uji.es

The study of genre has attracted a great deal of attention in the last two decades. Among the many definitions of this complex notion, a key feature seems to be shared: the fact that genre encompasses a close relation between textual and contextual features (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993, 2004). In this scenario, the book review (BR), which was initially disregarded in favor of other more prominent research-process genres, has recently been the focus of some insightful studies, especially in the academic field (Belcher, 1995; Motta-Roth, 1996, 1998; Gea Valor, 2000; Moreno & Suárez, 2006; Salager-Meyer et al., 2006).

One of the most attractive features of the BR is how interpersonal dynamics influences the array of linguistic and rhetorical features chosen. Although any review certainly entails description, it is widely agreed that the BR is essentially an evaluative genre involving a high degree of social interaction between three basic participants: writer, author reviewed, and audience. In short, contextual factors strongly influence the rhetoric of the genre.

Taking these aspects into consideration, the present study examines two distinct corpora: the first one consists of academic book reviews (henceforth, ABR) and the second one of BR published in newspapers and magazines or non-academic book reviews (henceforth, NABR). While both serve the general communicative purpose of describing and assessing a book, they clearly differ in terms of target audience, audience expectations and participant relationship. In general terms, the NABR appeals to the general public, a non-specialist audience, whereas the ABR is aimed at a relatively small, well-defined, homogeneous group composed of researchers and scholars working in the same field or in related disciplines; in other words, a specialised audience which constitutes the relevant discourse community. Drawing on a corpus of 20 reviews from specialised linguistic journals and 20 reviews from the widely-known magazines *Time, Newsweek* and *The New York Review of Books*, this paper analyses and compares the rhetorical structure of ABRs and NABRs in an attempt to determine whether a different contextual configuration may give rise to significant differences in the rhetorical organisation of the BR as a genre. The results

suggest that, while ABRs tend to follow highly conventionalised structural patterns which respond to the epistemological needs of the discipline, NABRs are more influenced by the reviewer's personal style, and generally favour cyclic patterns of summary-critique-discussion.

The language of evaluation in literary academic journal book reviews: Matching theoretical descriptions of evaluation and practical applications to teaching

Ana I. Moreno
Centro Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain
anaimore@telefonica.net
ana.moreno@unileon.es

Lorena Suarez
Universidad de León, Spain
dfmlst@unileon.es

As the number of studies on evaluation in English increases and different categorisations and models are offered to describe this construct (Thompson & Hunston, 2000; Hyland, 2000), it becomes more difficult to decide how to use all this knowledge in applied fields like teaching English as an L2. The present paper proposes a framework of description of evaluation strategies that enables to usefully apply results in this area. The framework arises from a need to compare evaluation strategies across English and Spanish in a meaningful way. To achieve the necessary comparability requirements, our approach draws on the new agenda for large-scale contrastive rhetoric studies proposed by Connor and Moreno (2005). This agenda involves two crucial phases: a) using well-designed comparable corpora; and b) identifying comparable textual concepts that can be further operationalised into linguistic features. In relation to a), two comparable corpora of 40 recent literary BRs, 20 in English and 20 in Spanish were compiled for the present study. In relation to b) the comparison was restricted to the text material used in expressing two particular types of propositions in the particular rhetorical context created by the BR genre within one particular disciplinary culture. The propositions compared were those pragmatically functioning as praise or criticism of the book under review or an aspect of it. Then the study analysed how evaluative acts of praise and criticism were shared with the readers through evaluative (interpersonal) devices both on the propositional and metadiscourse planes (epistemic modality, attribution markers, attitude markers, impersonalisation strategies, praise-criticism sequences, evaluative retrospective labels…). Comparable qualitative categories were juxtaposed and quantitative data under each comparable category were contrasted. The contrastive results were analysed by means of the Chi-square test. The results show that a) although contemporary Spanish writers of literary BRs seem to make fewer negative remarks than their Anglo-American counterparts, they are not so frequently hedged as in English; b) the Spanish reviewers in this corpus have a greater tendency to hide their responsibility for their evaluations by using first person plural pronouns and verb forms; c) they also tend to use fewer attitude markers towards their own evaluative remarks, d) by contrast, English writers of literary BRs resort more to praise-criticism (or vice-versa) sequences, while their Spanish counterparts seem to prefer praise-praise sequences; and f) the English BR writers tend to use evaluative endophoric labels more frequently. To supplement this quantitative contrastive study of evaluation strategies, qualitative methods (interviews and e-mail questionnaires) were used in order to explain some of the results obtained. Implications for teaching critical writing in English or Spanish as an L2 are discussed.

M13. The research exchange: Redefining writing research and scholarship

Joan Mullin
University of Texas
jmullin@mail.utexas.edu

Glenn Blalock

Baylor University
glennblalock.phd@gmail.com

Jenn Fishman
University of Tennessee
jfishman@utk.edu

Doug Hesse
University of Denver
dhesse@du.edu

Mike Palmquist
Colorado State University
Mike.Palmquist@ColoState.edu

Stephen Wilhoit
University of Dayton
wilhoit@notes.udayton.edu

What counts as "research"? What defines "scholarship"? And who is involved? These questions arose during a session on writing research at CCCC 2006, when we realized how many of us regularly conduct teacher research, longitudinal projects, or RAD scholarship. Unfortunately, the same Cs session taught us how often our field's projects and data remain largely unknown and inaccessible. If, however, researchers could easily share their work, our field would gain valuable insights into how research is being constructed: what problems are emerging across institutions and within particular local contexts; how are questions being framed; what methodologies are being used; and what results are being generated. If less-visible research projects were more widely available alongside nuts-and-bolts information about well-publicized studies, the composition community would be better able to replicate, compare, and aggregate information, and researchers would be better able to work together to increase what is known about writing and to improve both writing instruction and writing research.

To promote these goals, the contributors to this roundtable came together to create the Research Exchange <http://wac.colostate.edu/research/>, an interactive database-driven web resource designed to make widely available the research and scholarship in composition studies. Providing our community with a place to post research studies, information and ideas, the Research Exchange aims to archive current work and has already raised questions for further consideration: What counts as "scholarship" and "research"? What questions about writing need to be asked, and how best can we answer them? How should we display and exchange the results of our studies? How can online environments foster collaboration and exchange? What ethical questions does this research raise, and what else should we be asking? Offering an overview of the Exchange site, this roundtable will engage the audience in discussing how it might serve, expand and redefine research in our field.

M14. Literacy in a diverse world

Approaching literate practices on the basis of the continuum restricted-full literacy

Maria Sílvia Cintra
Federal University of São Carlos
msilviam@power.ufscar.br
http://www.letramento.iel.unicamp.br

I intend to propose an approach based on Goody's concept of restricted literacy (1968). Goody referred to West Africa and to India as cases of restricted literacy. On the other hand, Gumperz (1986) referred to minority groups situated in the urban outskirts or in rural areas in the United

States, and pointed out the apparent difficulty for learning in such communities. I intend to discuss the fact that in either case we are before the same reality that may be envisaged by means of the continuum restricted-full literacy. In Brazil, as I understand it, we are before a case of restricted literacy similar to the one present in India. It is possible to recognize the intersection of three continua: the continuum oral-written, the continuum rural-urban and the continuum restricted-full literacy, which we can say intersect. Restricted-full literacy deals with questions related to power, to secrecy, to cipher and to initiation. I intend to bring evidence of the fact that in Brazil there exist characteristics proper to restricted literacy: appeal to magic-religious conceptions; resource to formulaic style; tendency to secrecy; persistence of oral modes of instruction; emphasis on rote learning (even at the university); oral residues in a literate culture; tendency towards preciosity. There seems not to exist, however, a strong association between writing and religion. Without defending the autonomous consequences of literacy but, rather, understanding literacy in an ideological way (Gee, 1989; Street, 1993; Barton&Hamilton, 1998), I intend to raise some questions related to the socio-economic structure of Brazilian society that may serve as a first attempt to explain why, in a XXIst century global society, in an emergent country, there may still subsist traits characteristic of restricted literacy, even when the widespread code is an alphabetical one.

Trans-collaboration: Productively engaging difference in the 21st- century

Mara Holt
holt@ohio.edu

In the U.S., collaborative learning is institutionalized and is possibly losing its critical edge. Its practice is often abstracted from material conditions, blind to the intricacies of race and difference. Recent scholarship, however, reflects cultural movements towards awareness of race, ethnicity, national belonging, and globalization. As collaborative practices move beyond U.S. hegemonic white space, they require transnational and transcultural theories to provide a framework for understanding them.

Much current scholarship on collaborative practice is about teaching diverse students. Critical race theory emphasizes the importance of collaboration in teaching students of color (Vaughan), while ESL research demonstrates its success in second language learning (Ronesi). Scholars in Russia find collaboration successful in teaching students to understand a broader context for their learning (Zuckerman), and in the Israeli community of Acre it has energized the community and transformed the plight of Israeli Arabs (Hertz-Lazarowitz).

Why are collaborative practices so successful both interculturally and transculturally? How might this work change the way we theorize collaborative pedagogy? The work of Zygmunt Bauman, Trinh Minh-ha, Satya Mohanty, and others offers suggestive leads. It propels a perspectival shift in identity and its relation to difference, complicating the notion of difference as incommensurable ("apartheid difference") with difference as polyvalent, flexible, relational, and contextual ("affiliative difference").

U.S. collaborative learning's history of educational reform in support of democracy makes it important now, when democracy is not only an experiment across the globe, but in need of repair in the U.S. Schooling can play a productive role, however, only to the degree that we reconceive and engage difference. Our use of polycentric perspectives requires careful reflection to avoid the often patronizing and colonizing tendencies of U.S.-centric models. I submit the concept of trans-collaboration, collaboration that depends on productively engaging difference, as a provocation.

The rhetoric of global citizen action

Ljiljana Coklin
U.C. Santa Barbara
lcoklin@writing.ucsb.edu

This paper examines the challenges of an increasingly important link between the imperatives of globalization and the pedagogy of composition. If some of those challenges are a gradual redefinition of citizenship, from national to global, and a call for a global social action, then how does the teaching of writing contribute to these new directions?

This is one of the main questions that emerging college courses, like Writing for Global Studies, raise. Drawing on a personal experience of teaching Writing for Global Studies and using it as a starting point for this discussion, I want to examine the underpinnings of some of the assignments, in particular the final collaborative project—a grant proposal for an international non-governmental organization.

An assignment like this, which calls for an understanding of global issues as well as for a careful rhetorical construction of a socially active global citizen, brings to attention numerous questions, which this paper raises: What is the rhetoric of global citizenship, and what constitutes entitlement to global citizenship? If Global Studies as a discipline is oriented towards policy making and thus towards effective social action, how does the process of conceiving a global social action in college classrooms serve as a critical model for reflecting back on the existing forms of knowledge and power structures? How does the pedagogy of composition contribute to the education of the globally aware and socially active "citizen rhetors" (D.A. Hart)?, and ultimately, How effective is the pedagogy of composition in re-thinking and re-imagining social action across the existing national, economic, and social borders?

M15. Teaching writing through inquiry
Writing expository texts based on inquiry learning

Michel Couzijn
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
m.j.couzijn@uva.nl

Gert Rijlaarsdam
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
G.C.W.Rijlaarsdam@uva.nl

Although inquiry learning is very common in the science curriculum, it is rare in the pre-academic language curriculum. However, we think that inquiry learning, in combination with writing tasks, could be beneficial for the pre-academic language curriculum as well. A learning arrangement consisting of inquiry learning and writing may improve students' writing skill, information processing skills and subject matter knowledge. We base this hypotheses on Hillocks' meta-analysis (1986) and the work of researchers in the field of inquiry learning in the science curriculum (for example Keys, 1999).

In our experimental study, we aim to construct lesson series in which 11th grade students in the pre-academic language curriculum investigate authentic phenomena in various disciplines of the language science. Incorporated in the lesson series is a writing task to write an expository text, in which students report their data analysis and interpretation of the data. Our research question is: "What do the learning activities writing and inquiry, separately and in combination, contribute to the improvement of students' (a) inquiry skills, (b) subject matter knowledge, (c) writing skill, and (d) motivation for the language curriculum?"

In this presentation, we will demonstrate the lesson series, designed by teachers and experts in the academic discipline of Dutch language and literature. Furthermore, we will present the results of a pilot study (planned for fall 2007).

Writing in history: The need for secondary content-based writing instruction

Susan De La Paz
Santa Clara University
SDelapaz@scu.edu

Mark Felton
San Jose State University

As adolescents prepare for the demands of high school and college classrooms, they must learn to read and write increasingly complex and specialized forms of text. Moreover, adolescent writers must adapt to a variety of tasks, rhetorical structures and standards that vary from one discipline to the next. This need for discipline-based writing instruction is particularly evident in the history classroom. Over the past 15 years, the history curriculum has undergone significant reform. Today, the history curriculum, with its emphasis on reading and writing from primary source documents, places high demands on developing writers.

Using this as our rationale, we report the results of a quasi-experimental study that examined the effects of historical reasoning and writing instruction on culturally diverse eleventh grade students. Students learned historical inquiry strategies using 20th Century American History topics ranging from the Spanish American War to the Gulf of Tonkin Incident. In addition, students learned a prewriting strategy for composing argumentative essays related to each historical event. Results indicate that in comparison to a control group (N=79), essays written by students who received instruction (N=81) were longer, and were significantly more persuasive (effect size = .38 for length and = .35 for quality). Importantly, students in the comparison group (N= 79) read the same primary and secondary source documents, and received feedback on their written essays on the same topics, thus controlling for time on task, exposure to materials, and practice effects. These results compare favorably to results from a recently released meta-analysis on writing (c.f. Writing Next). This report shows that teaching adolescents strategies for planning, revising, and editing compositions routinely has a dramatic effect on the quality of their writing. (Graham & Perin, 2007). The results from our study offer a strong foundation from which to develop further interventions for developing writers.

Writing Instruction to Improve Students' Compare – Contrast Reports

Lori Kirkpatrick
University of Western Ontario, Canada
lori_kirkpatrick@hotmail.com
lkirkpa@uwo.ca

Current writing instruction focuses, in large part, on providing students with writing strategies which they can learn to use independently. Although much of strategy instruction is conducted in special education settings, it certainly has the potential to be of benefit in the regular classroom (Pressley, McGoldrick, Cariglia-Bull & Symons, 1995). One approach to strategy instruction is to teach students genre-specific strategies.
Interestingly, the compare-contrast genre has received very little attention.   This is a particularly difficult genre for three reasons. First, compare – contrast texts often require discourse synthesis: the reading of other texts in order to inform one's own related text. Second, in order to make comparisons explicit, compare – contrast texts require a complex interweaving of

information about different topics. Third, there is no single conventionalized structure for compare – contrast writing (Hammann & Stevens, 2000). Indeed, the three compare – contrast instructional studies found in my literature review differed in the structure taught to students (Englert, Raphael, Fear, & Anderson, 1988; Hammann & Stevens, 2000; Wong, Butler, Ficzere, & Kuperis, 1997). Some guidance regarding which structure should be taught to students can be found in Spivey's (1997) work, which evaluated the compare – contrast structure preferred by readers. Spivey found that the structure most closely associated with holistic grade was one in which aspect (e.g. colour) comparisons were grouped into paragraphs based on macro-aspect (e.g. physical appearance).

For my Masters thesis, I designed and implemented a writing strategy instruction unit to improve grade seven and eight students' writing of compare – contrast reports. The strategy taught in the unit was to use a compare – contrast table to record, organize and make connections between pieces of information and to plan the structure of the report prior to writing. The structure taught was the macro-aspect structure discussed above. Students' pre and post instruction reports were graded for holistic quality (1 – 10) by raters who were independent, blind to condition, and blind to the specific nature of the intervention. The unit had a large, positive effect on the holistic quality of students' writing (F= 44.83, p<0.01). The average gain in holistic writing quality made by students in the experimental condition was 1.27 / 10 (pre-test mean of 6.44 to post-test mean of 7.71) compared to a mean gain of -.18 (pre-test mean of 5.5 to post-test mean of 5.32) by students in the control condition. The results support the utility of structure planning as a writing strategy and also indicate that it is entirely possible to successfully implement writing strategy instruction in the regular classroom.

M16. Open session for international networking

All conference participants are invited to this open meeting to discuss international networking and organizational possibilities.