

Writing Research Across Borders II Session A
Friday, February 18 10:30am-12:00pm

A1

Writing Research on the Federal Landscape: Funding Opportunities at Federal Agencies

Chris Coro, The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Dept. of Education

Emily Doolittle, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education

Michael Gorman, National Science Foundation, U.S.

*Brett Miller, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child and Human Development
NICHD, U.S.*

Tanya Shuy, The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Dept. of Education

Wilsonia Cherry, National Endowment of the Humanities, U.S.

The Panel will first present and provide an overview of the each agencies interests in the area of writing and/or writing research with opportunities for discussion with program staff.

This symposium will present funding opportunities from various federal agencies that support opportunities focused on writing and more broadly on education and learning. the session will provide information on funding opportunities that are available for writing researchers. Participants will include representatives from the Institute of Education Sciences and The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education; the National Science Foundation; the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; and the National Endowment for the Humanities. There is a growing recognition of the importance and need for an increased focus on writing and writing research. In this session the program officers will provide current information on programmatic and research support, current programs and priorities, as well as tips on preparing and submitting proposals for grant, contract, and/or fellowship support. This session is structured to permit opportunity for questions and to raise issues related to navigating the landscape of federal support. This panel symposium is appropriate for new investigators launching research programs and for more experienced researchers interested in funding priorities and opportunities for involvement at the subject matter expert level.

A2

Authoring across borders: The Mouton-de Gruyter Handbook of Writing and Text Production

Daniel Perrin, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Eva Marie Jakobs, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Roundtable

The shift from an industrial to an information society has increased the importance of writing and text production in education, in everyday life and in more and more professions in the fields of economics and politics, science and technology, culture and media. Through writing, we build up social networks, develop projects, inform colleagues and customers, and generate the basis for decisions. We send e-mail messages with text attachments, publish those texts, and store them in knowledge data bases. The quality of the products of all these processes is often decisive for social resonance and professional success.

Nevertheless, many people experience writing and text production as a painful and later as a tedious routine. Beginners as well as experienced writing professionals have to fight to find the right words and sentences, the most convincing form and content, and they complain of writing problems or even blocks. Obviously text production places demands on semiotic, linguistic and intellectual capacities in quite a different way from speaking, which usually seems to be manageable without significant problems. This gap between the relevance of writing and competence in writing raises the questions of how text production can be conceptualized, taught and learned and, first of all, what writing and text production are in terms of human activities.

The Handbook of Writing and Text Production will provide a state-of-the-art description of writing and text production, their theoretical and empirical investigation, their relevance as real world problems in which language and communication are central issues. Seven sections will focus on the theory and methodology of writing and text production research and on approaches related to author, mode, genre, media, and domain. The sections will have their own section editors and each of the chapters will be co-authored by two internationally-recognized researchers, each from different geographic areas and academic traditions (e.g. US-Asia, Australia-Africa, or Europe-Latin America). This authorship policy will guarantee comparative and comprehensive coverage of research into writing and text production.

In the roundtable discussion at the WRAB conference, the volume editors and designated section editors will present the emerging “Handbook of Writing and Text Production” and discuss the project with the scientific community. Colleagues interested in the project, such as section editors, authors, or future readers, are invited to participate in the discussion.

A3

Writing math and science

Word Problems as Genre in Mathematics Education: Exploring the Hidden Written Ground of Mathematics Teaching and Learning

Susan Gerofsky, University of British Columbia, Canada

Word problems (or story problems) are part of mathematics instruction world-wide, appearing in textbooks, standardized examinations and classroom interactions from the earliest years of schooling to post secondary mathematics classes. The word problem is a culturally-recognizable form, the subject of jokes, cartoons and advertisements. It has an extraordinarily long 4000-year history, having been used in mathematics education continuously since the education of scribes in ancient Babylon.

Word problems invoke strong emotional reactions; people either love them, or, more commonly, hate them bitterly. When asked why they include word problems in their mathematics curricula, most writers and teachers say that word problems are applications of mathematics to real-life situations, yet the most cursory examination shows that the genre is, by its very nature, nothing of the sort. A great deal of effort has gone into teaching students to be successful in solving word problems (often through translational “tricks”), and into attempts to make word problems more true-to-life, but there has been little ontological research into the nature of word problems in themselves.

Without knowledge of word problems as a written genre, efforts to improve the writing or solving of word problems may be misplaced, working against what the genre is constitutionally capable of doing. With this in mind, the research question here is an ontological one: **“What are word problems as a genre within mathematics education?”**, with the aim of using an awareness of the intrinsic nature of the genre to design more effective pedagogy.

Using concepts of genre drawn from rhetoric (Jamieson 1975; Miller 1984; Campbell & Jamieson 1978; Bazerman 2000; Artemeva 2008), linguistics (Grice 1975; Levinson 1983; Swales 1990), film studies (Tudor 1986; Sobchack 1986; Neale 2000) and literary criticism (Bakhtin 1986; Frye 1957; Todorov 1976), this two-year study aims to give a comprehensive account of mathematical word problems as a rhetorical genre. The methodology draws from Miller and Shepherd (2004) in considering this genre in its temporal and social setting (its *kairos*), its formal features (particularly in terms of linguistic pragmatics), its ancestral or antecedent genres, including an investigation of historical purposes and intentions, and its social action, including the ways that contemporary teachers, students and curriculum writers take up embedded generic intentions and forms.

More concretely, the author has used the following mixed linguistic and qualitative methods as part of a multifaceted analysis of the word problem genre:

- textual analysis of contemporary and historical word problems;
- an exploration of the history of word problems from ancient Babylonian and Egyptian texts through medieval, Renaissance and early modern examples, through a range of cultural contexts; and
- interviews with curriculum writers, teachers and students at the elementary, secondary and tertiary levels of mathematics education.

The author draws conclusions and makes suggestions about the nature of effective disciplinary teaching and learning in mathematics based on an understanding of word problems and, eventually, other genres that form the invisible written and spoken grounds for mathematics education.

References

- Artemeva, N. (2008). Toward a unified theory of genre learning. *Journal of business and technical communication* 22 (2), 160-185.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2000). Letters and the Social Grounding of Differentiated Genres. In *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, edited by D. Barton and N. Hall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 15–29.
- Campbell, K. K. & Jamieson, K. H. (Eds.) (1978). *Form and genre: Shaping rhetorical action*. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of criticism: Four essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.
- Jamieson, K. M. (1975). Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61: 406–415.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70: 151–176.
- Miller, C. R., & Shepherd, D. (2004). Blogging as Social Action: A Genre Analysis of the Weblog. In *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community, and the Culture of Weblogs*, ed. L. Gurak, et al. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Libraries, http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/blogging_as_social_action.html.
- Neale, S. (2000). *Genre and Hollywood*. London: Routledge.
- Sobchack, T. (1986). Genre films: A classical experience. In Grant, B. K. (Ed.), *Film genre reader*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Todorov, T. (1976). The origin of genres. *New literary history* 8(1), 102.
- Tudor, A. (1986). Genre. In Grant, B. K. (Ed.), *Film genre reader*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Susan Gerofsky

Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

University of British Columbia

2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, Canada. V6T 1Z4

cell: (604)842-7500 office: (604)822-5204 fax: (604) 822-4714

susan.gerofsky@ubc.ca

<<http://www.edcp.educ.ubc.ca/faculty/susan-gerofsky>>

A3 (continued)

Writing math and science

Students' Use of Learning Resources When Writing in Physics and the Mother Tongue:
The Implications of "Quotations Without Quotations Marks"

Bente Aamotsbakken, Vestfold University College, Norway

In a project financed by the Norwegian Research Council, *Learning Resources and Writing in Educational Textual Cultures* (2010 – 2013), we are conducting a research in highschools in order to find out how students are using learning resources, i.e. textbooks, websites, encyclopedias etc. in their efforts to write educational texts. In the concept "learning resources" we include teachers' guidance, students' cooperation and response, along with the resources accounted for above (Bazerman & Prior 2004).

The access to digital media in the classroom provides an easy way to collect several pieces of information, but simultaneously students run the risk of becoming tempted to plagiarise (Aamotsbakken 1997). Plagiarism indicates that they operate too close to the source; in other words we could talk about "quotations without quotation marks" (Barthes 1993 [1990]) or refer to it as an intertextual practice (Aamotsbakken 2007). By the term "plagiarism", we mean that students cut and paste texts into their own work without listing sources correctly and without integrating the texts critically. When students not only cite sources correctly, but also make critical and thorough use of already published texts by reflecting and commenting on them in their own writing, we refer to it as optimal intertextual practice.

In the above-mentioned project we investigate two subjects: physics and the mother tongue. In this presentation I want to present some results from observations and interviews connected to the teaching and writing in the two subjects. I will shed light on how the teacher has prepared the lessons by giving tasks to be fulfilled (Dysthe 2002). The students' writing in general and their choice of ways of coping with the tasks will be commented on (Halliday & Martin 1993; Tedick 1990).

Methodologically we have cooperated closely with teachers who are interested in contributing to the project by inviting us into their classrooms. The same teachers have also given us free access to the digital platform used by the school. As researchers we are allowed to read students' essays and logs continually. Additionally, we have agreed to carry out focus group interviews with students who are considered to be well-functioning writers and students who could be described as "risk writers", i.e. students who take risks by breaking with subject-oriented norms and conventions (Hertzberg 2006).

Our institution, Vestfold University College, has over the years developed research competence regarding the study of textbooks and educational media such as digital platforms, portfolios, digital texts in general and also tools used in didactic contexts, i.e. games, toys etc. (Aamotsbakken 2008). In this respect, we consider our previous research to fit well into our ongoing project on writing. In Norway the Department of Education has stressed the importance of the so-called basic skills: reading, writing, digitality, numeracy and orality. The new curriculum from 2006 (Kunnskapsløftet) has implemented these skills for every school subject from the Kindergarten through all levels in the educational system up to university level. Consequently, writing in any subject should be of interest for the teachers involved. For the mother tongue reading and writing are axiomatic; for physics writing probably becomes less space (Halliday 2004, Snow 1993). However, the new implications for all school subjects constitute a matter worth research and investigation.

References

- Aamotsbakken, B. (1997). *Tekst og intertekst. En studie i intertekstualitetens betydning for tre åttitallsromaner av Edvard Hoem*. (Text and intertext. A study in the significance of intertextuality related to three novels from the 1908s by Edvard Hoem). Oslo: Acta Humaniora, Universitetet i Oslo, Avhandling for dr.philos.-graden
- Aamotsbakken, B. (2007). Pedagogiske intertekster. Intertekstualitet som praktisk, teoretisk og analytisk redskap (Intertextuality as theoretical and practical concept). In: Knudsen, S., Skjelbred, D. & Aamotsbakken, B. (eds.): *Tekst i vekst. Teoretiske, historiske og analytiske perspektiver på pedagogiske tekster*. Oslo: Novus forlag
- Aamotsbakken, Bente (2008): "The Pedagogical Text - an important element in the textual world? Reflections on the concepts of 'text', 'context' and 'literacy culture'". In: *Designs for Learning*, nr. 1/2008, Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
- Barthes, R. (1993 [1990]): *S/Z*. London: Basil Blackwell
- Bazerman, Charles & Paul Prior (eds) (2004): *What Writing Does and How It Does It. An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*, New Jersey and London
- Dysthe, O. (2002): Professors as Mediators of Academic Text Cultures. An Interview Study with Advisors and Master's Degree Students in Three Disciplines in a Norwegian University. *Written Communication*, Vol. 19, No. 4, 493-544
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Martin, J.R. (1993): *Writing science: literacy and discursive power*. London
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2004): *The Language of Science*. London: Continuum
- Hertzberg, F. (2006): Risikoskriverne i KAL-materialet – noen teksteksempler [The risktaking writers in the KAL-project – some cases]. In S. Matre (ed.): *Utfordringer for skriveopplæring og skriveforskning i dag* [Challenges for teaching and researching writing]. Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag
- Snow, C.P. (1993): *The two cultures*: with introduction by Stefan Collini. Cambridge
- Tedick, D.J. (1990): ESL writing assessment: Subject-matter knowledge and its impact on performance. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 9, Issue 2, 123-143

Bente Aamotsbakken, Vestfold University College, P.O. Box 2243, N-3103 Toensberg, Norway
bente.aamotsbakken@hive.no, +47 97143642 / +47 33031429

A3 (continued)

Writing math and science

Writing to Learn as Distributed Cognition

Perry Klein, The University of Western Ontario, Canada

An important function of writing in elementary and secondary subjects such as science and history is to support content learning. However, the process of writing to learn is not well understood. To date, most theories focused on cognitive processes internal to the individual learner (see Klein, 1999 for a review). For example, Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1987) knowledge transforming model proposes that expert writers carry out a dialectic between rhetorical problem solving and content problem solving. However, internal, individual theories of writing to learn have encountered problems. First, the knowledge transforming model implies that learning should be limited to expert writers, but empirical research shows that it is not (Bangert-Drowns et al., 2004). Second, although internal, individual theories of writing may present an ecologically valid model of sequestered writing activities, they do not represent writing practices in elementary and secondary classrooms, where writers routinely interact with teachers and fellow students, and use a variety of external supports such as source texts and writing templates.

Recently, several authors have called for distributed cognitive theories of writing or writing to learn (Glaswell & Kamberelis, 2007; Newell, 2006). Distributed cognition is the theory that in real activities, representations include both internal and external components, and operations are distributed across individuals. Distribution can support problem solving in several ways: augmenting knowledge in long term memory; reducing cognitive load on working memory; supporting perceptually-based inferencing; and prompting efficient sequences of operations (Zhang & Patel, 2006).

My talk will provide a distributed cognitive analysis of writing to learn. This will include several dimensions: The writing operation that is being distributed; the external and internal representations that support it; and the practices through which it is distributed. I will illustrate this using an activity in which eighteen Grade 5 students, working in partners, wrote explanations of the disappearance of young fish from a river. Students used six diverse sources (e.g., diagram, graph, table), which did not explain the disappearance, but provided data from which students could construct explanations. In a previous paper, I have described the ways in which partners distributed writing operations to create a text (Klein, April, 2009). In this paper, I will expand the analysis to consider the role that external representations play in the knowledge construction process.

The analysis will show how information from the source texts is transformed through the collaborative activities of the writers to construct new knowledge. Distributed aspects of this process include: the representation of knowledge construction as a writing goal; the representation of premises that support inferences; and the sharing of reasoning and writing operations between partners. This analysis will allow us to understand why learning through sequestered writing requires sophisticated strategies, but learning from rich content area writing activities can be accomplished using more elementary strategies.

A4

Evaluation and Quality at All Levels

Assessing Struggling Writers: A Comparison of Writing Performance and Behavior Across Four Genres

Michael Hebert, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Steve Graham, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Karen Harris, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Despite the importance of writing, many children continue to struggle with writing skills. According to the most recent National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), a score of *Proficient* or above on this national writing assessment was achieved by only one out of three eighth graders, and only one out of four twelfth graders (Salahu-Din, Persky, & Miller, 2008). The most common method for identifying students with writing difficulties is to assess performance in a single genre. Calfee and Wilson (2004) noted that most standardized writing assessments requiring an extended writing sample often do so in the narrative genre. The underlying assumption behind this practice is that the same writing skills are needed for all writing assignments, regardless of context or purpose (Camp, 1983, as cited in Murphy & Yancy, 2008). However, Espin, Weissenburger, and Benson (2004) noted that low correlations for holistic quality scores from different writing samples may indicate measurement of different constructs. The purposes of this study were to examine whether the writing performance and behaviors exhibited by students identified as struggling writers was significantly and meaningfully correlated across four genres, as well as to evaluate the predictive value of three aspects of students' composing behavior for writing quality (based on the Simple View of Writing (Berninger, 2000)). Specifically, the four research questions asked were: a) are measures of writing performance (e.g. writing quality) highly correlated across genres?, b) which variables predict writing quality above and beyond control variables and each other?, c) do the same variables predict writing quality in each of four genres?, and d) is it appropriate to identify struggling writers through assessment in a single genre? A sample of 137 struggling writers in second and third grade wrote responses to writing prompts in four genres (i.e. story, personal narrative, persuasive, and informative) in a counterbalanced order. Performances on measures taken from the samples were correlated across genres to determine if writing in one genre predicted writing in another. Small to moderate correlations (ranging from .246 to .597) were observed for each of the writing measures, with the exception of handwriting (ranging from .726 to .775). Additionally, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted for the measure of writing quality taken in each genre to determine the predictive value of measures of self-regulation strategies, language skills, and transcription skills. Language skills and self-regulation (i.e. time spent composing) were found to be consistently significant predictors ($p < .05$) of writing quality in separate regression analyses of all four genres. Finally, analysis of individual student performance across genres indicated four general patterns of scoring. Results indicate it may not be appropriate to identify struggling writers by assessing students in a single genre.

A4

Evaluation and Quality at All Levels

The Good Writers – Who Are They?

Eva Maagerø, Vestfold University College, Norway

Dagrun Skjelbred, Vestfold University College, Norway

Writing research in school has often focused on students with problems in creating texts of good quality. Both the lack of linguistic knowledge, genre competence and failing insight in the interaction between language and context has been discussed in several projects. In our ongoing research project: *Learning Resources and Writing in Educational Textual Cultures* (2010-12) we concentrate on students who are evaluated as good writers. We want to use these students as “critical cases” (Flyvbjerg, 1991) to find out who such students are, how they work with writing, their interest for writing, their relation to reading, and last but not least, their use of learning resources in order to develop knowledge about successful writing. This kind of research may increase our understanding of the writing process and also be helpful in the teaching of writing.

Our data is collected in an upper secondary school in Southern Norway where the students are between 16 and 19 years old. We concentrate on the students’ writing in their main vocational subjects and in the subject Norwegian. We follow two groups of students (25 all together) through one year in school through text studies, interviews, video filming and observations.

In this paper we will present, through case studies, four students, two girls and two boys, all 17 years old, who are seen as good and successful writers by their teachers. The four students attend vocational courses, the girls a program in design, the boys a program in technical production. We will discuss some preliminary findings from our interviews with these four students, and from analysis of their texts. We will especially focus on their subject oriented writing and their use and evaluation of the teaching material and other learning resources used in their class. Attention will also be paid to their motivation for writing, and their reading habits. In addition their teachers’ argumentation for evaluating these students’ texts as good, will briefly be presented. The theoretical foundation of the project is a sociocultural view on learning (Bakhtin m.fl., 1986, Vygotsky og Cole, 1978, Säljö, 2001), theories of textual cultures (Snow, 1993) and subject-oriented language (Halliday og Martin, 1993, Martin, 1993) as well as theories of multimodality (Baldry og Thibault, 2006).

References

- Bakhtin, M., Holquist, M. & Emerson, C. (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX, University of Texas Press.
- Baldry, A. & Thibault, P. J. (2006) *Multimodal transcription and text analysis: a multimedia toolkit and coursebook*. London, Equinox.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1991) *Rationalitet og magt*. København, Akademisk Forlag.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Martin, J. R. (1993) *Writing science: literacy and discursive power*. London, Falmer Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1993) Life as a noun: Arresting the Universe in Science and Humanities. I: Halliday, M. A. K. & J.R., M. (red.) *Writing science. Literacy and Discursive Power*, s. 221 - 267. London, The Falmer Press.
- Snow, C. P. (1993) *The two cultures*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Säljö, R. (2001) *Läring i praksis: et sosiokulturelt perspektiv*. Oslo, Cappelen akademisk.
Vygotsky, L. S. & Cole, M. (1978) *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

A4 (continued)

Evaluation and Quality at All Levels

Revealing Our Values: Reading Student Texts with Colleagues in High School and College

Nicole B. Wallack, Columbia University, U.S.

Among many teacher educators in English Education and Composition, it is axiomatic that reading students' writing with colleagues teaches us a lot about our pedagogy. In sharing these texts, we can consider how our classroom practices correspond to our learning goals, revise or refine our assignments, and explore how our responses affect student work. At the same time, we can examine the principles that informed our pedagogical choices, and assess their implications. However, once teachers have completed their degree requirements, or initial professional development obligations, we may rarely encounter student writing besides our own. As we move from training to full-time positions in secondary and higher education, teachers are expected to work more independently. While it is important for teachers to develop this autonomy, it also has significant costs. Rapidly—within a year or two of full-time teaching—teachers can fall into unproductive and potentially problematic habits of mind when assigning, reading, and responding to student work. More important, teachers who do not read writing from colleagues' students may lose the capacity to understand or value work that does not resemble what they ask of their own students. This problem, which can simply lead to backroom gossip and disagreements within a department or school, has much profounder implications across education levels.

This presentation will examine how reading student work across education levels in professional development contexts reveals tenacious—and sometimes negative—myths about how writing is taught in high school and college. These myths shape teachers' expectations and writing curricula in both secondary and higher education. More specifically, I explore how teachers articulate their values about essay writing when they share student work with colleagues, and what options teachers have when those values are tested or resisted by others. I draw on materials from my fieldwork in high schools and colleges through Bard College's Institute for Writing and Thinking. Supplementing these student papers and written reactions, I report on surveys of 100 past workshop participants from high schools and colleges to test whether it is true that reading student writing across education levels fosters pedagogical revision. I offer a sample plan for structuring such workshops at high schools and colleges. Finally, I locate this study within the growing literature on knowledge transfer in writing studies, which has not yet closely examined the role of transfer for teachers' performance in high schools and colleges.

A5

Toward new models of collaboration in literacy research: Lessons from the Stanford Study of Writing and the LiteracyCorps Michigan Project

Lessons from the LiteracyCorps Michigan Project

Julie Lindquist, Michigan State University, U.S.

Bump Halbritter, Michigan State University, U.S.

Lessons from the Stanford Study of Writing

Jenn Fishman, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Session overview: This session asks, "How can new forms of collaboration enrich literacy research?" Specifically, participants in this session discuss some of the motives, goals, and challenges of collaboration across conventional research boundaries, including discrete roles (e.g., researcher/subject), discrete methodologies, and discrete projects.

This panel describes the collaboration between researchers involved in two long-term projects: the Stanford Study of Writing (SSW) and LiteracyCorps Michigan (LCM). Motivated by the shared goal of improving educators' understanding of twenty-first-century college writers, these projects represent two distinctive inquiries into college writing and literacy. Notably, however, both projects treat the classroom and the campus as starting points for research that encompass students' out-of-class writing, home literacies, experiences over time, and ongoing self-reflections. Both projects also integrate collaboration into every phase of research from study design and data collection to data analysis and production.

In their remarks, panelists discuss their recent grant-supported opportunity to share not only data but also data analysis. Reflecting on their 2010-11 collaboration and its outcomes, panelists will examine how research partnerships present uniquely generative opportunities for comparing data, sharing interpretive strategies, and producing new knowledge about writing and literacy. In addition, panelists will discuss whether and how their experience can offer others a model for transforming individual project archives into collective resources for the writing studies community, including not only writing researchers but also wider publics with compatible research practices and concerns.

Speakers and roles:

Speakers 1 and 2 ("Lessons from the LiteracyCorpsMichigan Project") will describe and show samples of video data from Literacy Corps Michigan, a multi-year qualitative inquiry into the reading, writing, and composing practices of the "digital generation" across Michigan communities. LCM is inspired by two related questions 1) What experiences and practices of mediation define the literacies of students who belong to cohort now widely known as the "digital generation?" and 2) How are these practices defined and supported by forms of access to social, cultural, and technological resources? LCM demonstrates a methodology for inquiry into literacy practices that includes 1) conducting videotaped interviews with students recruited from first-year writing classes at MSU; and 2) enlisting some of these students as collaborators in documenting community contexts that have emerged as significant in earlier interviews.

Speaker 3 ("Lessons from the Stanford Study of Writing") will describe and show examples of data from the Stanford Study of Writing, a five-year project that collected electronic survey and writing data from 189 participants and audio-recorded interviews from a sub-group of 36.

Overall, the SSW seeks 1) to provide an overview of student writing at Stanford; 2), to trace student development in writing across a five-year period; and 3) to make useful contributions to

the growing body of literature on longitudinal research. This presentation will focus on what we can learn about college writing from Study participants' experiences with collaboration, including 1) students in- or for-class collaborations; 2) their out-of-class and curricular collaborations; and 3) their collaborations with SSW researchers.

Following their project-specific remarks, speakers will describe how each study has engaged with data and findings from the other project. Together, this group will reflect on the benefits and challenges of their ongoing exchange before opening the floor to an extended discussion of future possibilities for similar work.

A6

Models of L2 Teaching of Writing in Higher Education

Reading Like Writers: Improving Writing in an Advanced-level Reading Course
Stephanie Lehrer, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel

Decades of ESL/EFL research have demonstrated that effective language teaching integrates reading and writing skills. Both are critical elements of an EAP curriculum, yet, paradoxically, EFL instructors often demand reading comprehension without directly addressing the essential avenue of writing. Clearly, this is where advanced students in particular need the most support. But what role should writing play in what technically is mandated a reading course?

A reading course curriculum cannot realistically tackle all that writing instruction entails. However, a project-based curriculum, in which text is annotated (Lehrer, 2009), summarized and then presented, provides opportunity for “the natural integration of language skills” (Stoller, 2006). Written article summaries comprise a crucial component of project work; by introducing and practicing some of the multitude of strategies involved in summarizing (Segev-Miller, 2009) reading comprehension is effectively linked to improved writing skills.

In addition, students can be encouraged to read more analytically, i.e., to be conscious of style and how information is being conveyed, in order to appreciate the deceptively minor decisions faced by writers (Prose, 2006). Explicit attention to certain grammatical structures increases the likelihood that learners will note them in text and subsequently emulate them in their own writing (Ellis, 2006).

Finally, writing errors are the key to solving problems of accuracy (Abdullah al-Buainain, 2006). Verb tense and connectors, in terms of conveying meaning, are as essential to reading comprehension as they are to writing. They are also structures with which students have particular difficulty, and therefore constitute the focus of the reviewing, self-editing, conferencing and revision techniques discussed here.

This presentation will outline an advanced-level project-based reading curriculum used in EFL reading comprehension courses for Israeli undergraduate engineering students at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. Usage of appropriate verb tense and cohesive devices is reinforced through a progressive series of writing activities that are grounded in authentic text. Learning to “read like writers” not only broadens students' purpose for reading, but also helps them to extend and polish their writing skills within the larger context of a reading course.

References

- Abdullah al-Buainain, H. (2006, March). Students' writing in EFL: Towards a teaching methodology. Paper presented at the Second AUC OXF Conference on Language & Linguistics, Cairo, Egypt. Retrieved on December 16, 2009 from www1.aucegypt.edu/conferences/aucoxf/presentations/Haifa_Al-Buainain.ppt.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Lehrer, S. (2009, March). A way of reading: Teaching annotation in an EAP course. Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, Denver, Colorado.
- Prose, F. (2006). *Reading like a writer: A guide for people who love books and for those who want to write them*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Segev-Miller, R. (2009, April). Language education graduates' self-study of summarizing

processes: an in-progress study. Paper presented at the Forum for Academic Writing, MOFET Institute, Tel Aviv.

Stoller, F. (2006). Establishing a theoretical foundation for project-based learning in second and foreign language contexts. In Beckett, G., H. & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Project-based second and foreign Language education: past, present, and future* (pp. 19-40). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

A6 (continued)

Models of L2 teaching of writing in higher education

Japanese EFL Learners' Development in L2 Writing

Masumi Narita, Tokyo International University, Japan

This study examined the relationship between linguistic features and second language (L2) writing quality based on frequency counts of the linguistic features extracted from EFL essay data. Two sets of linguistic features were employed in the present study: developmental indices (including those reviewed by Wolfe-Quintero *et al.*, 1998) and learner errors. The essay data were collected from sixty-one Japanese EFL college students, who were required, in an experimental writing session, to produce an essay within a 40-minute time limit without using any reference tools. All the essays were scored by two raters using the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs *et al.*, 1981) and the scores were used to divide the students into four learner groups.

Quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry were combined to identify the linguistic features that may have contributed to the writing quality represented as essay scores. Group differences were also analyzed to explore the question of how various components of L2 development progress. Learner errors were manually tagged and then error ratios of seven major word classes and misspellings were selected as variables that could possibly affect writing quality.

Among developmental indices examined in this study, correlation analyses revealed that text length, average sentence length, Guiraud index scores, and the percentage of error-free sentences were positive predictors of writing quality, whereas lexical density and the percentage of sentence fragments were negative ones. Learner errors showed that only the percentage of article errors was significantly correlated with writing quality, which means that article errors occurred more frequently as the learners' writing skill level became higher.

When group differences were examined, a complex picture of development in L2 use emerged. Beginning-level writers tended to make heavy use of the subordinator 'because' in the sentence-initial position, resulting in sentence fragments. High-intermediate level writers also produced a large number of sentence fragments; however, unlike the beginning-level writers, they were likely to produce incomplete sentences when attempting to present specific examples of the information given in the previous discourse. The other striking findings were (1) that more noun-related errors (errors with nouns and articles) were produced by more skilled writers, whereas more verb-related errors (errors with verbs and adverbs) were produced by less skilled writers, (2) that preposition errors were salient in more skilled writers, and (3) errors with adverbs or conjunctions were salient in less skilled writers, although the sentence-initial misuse of coordinating conjunctions was pervasive across the present learner groups.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis in the present study revealed non-linear aspects of second language development in writing, which suggests that further qualitative inquiry is necessary for fully exploring linguistic factors of 'good writing' in L2. In this line of research, elicitation tasks focused on a specific linguistic aspect, such as noun phrase complexity, may well be useful for complementing quantified results obtained from corpus-based studies. New methodologies are also necessary that do not assume a linear relationship between the target variables. Machine-learning techniques such as 'decision trees' are one possibility (Pendar and Chapelle, 2008).

References

- Jacobs, H., Zingraf, S., Wormuth, D., Hartfiel, V., and Hughey, J. (1981) *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pendar, N. and Chapelle, C. A. (2008) Investigating the Promise of Learner Corpora: Methodological Issues. *CALICO Journal*, 25 (2), pp.189-206.
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., and Kim, Hae-Young. (1998) *Second Language Development in Writing: Measures of Fluency, Accuracy & Complexity*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

A6 (continued)

Models of L2 teaching of writing in higher education

A Postmethod Framework of an EFL Bilingual Writing Course in a University of China

Qisi Zhang, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Not many EFL/ESL students can afford to come to the United States to further their studies. In that case, how can English teachers and educators accommodate the students' needs in their home country contexts? Based on the theory of postmethod this study proposed a framework of an EFL writing course in a university bilingual program in the northeastern part of China. The bilingual program aims to help its preservice teachers to be able to teach their majors bilingually in both Chinese and English after graduation in K-12 local schools. A major part of the program is the bilingual writing course, where the researcher works as the director.

The study mainly employed methods of literature analysis in combination with text data analysis of the EFL context. This paper is to present how the researcher analyzed the teaching context and population, incorporated her in-depth knowledge that she brought to her classroom, and came up with a postmethod theoretical framework of the curriculum design and the pedagogical instruction about the bilingual writing course.

Positioning herself as an autonomous teacher in the particular context, the researcher addressed five aspects in designing the framework of the course: (1) empowerment of the students, (2) critical thinking, (3) writing across curriculum, (4) design of course texts, and (5) multiple assessments. It is argued that the preceding five topics should be addressed throughout the teaching performance. In accordance with the postmethod theory and the characteristics of the Chinese EFL learners, the researcher suggested using an eight-part portfolio in the course assessment rather than utilizing a traditional single paper test in the final exam. This theoretical framework is not only conducive to the bilingual education in China's EFL context but also helpful to North American educators of Chinese students as well as students from other outer-circle countries.

rzhm@iup.edu

A7

Alternative Methods of Looking at Writing and Writers

Tim Dewar, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Mary Sawyer, State University of New York at New Paltz, U.S.

Tom Meyer, State University of New York at New Paltz, U.S.

Tanisha Smith, Tupelo Schools, U.S.

Karen Hamelin, Willamette University, U.S.

With the emergence of knowledge-driven societies based on textual exchanges of information, writing and its instruction has become a central focus of schools (National Commission on Writing, 2003, 2004, 2006). In the United States, the response has been typified by establishment of standards (e.g. Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994 & Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010) and the use of on-demand writing tests to judge students writing achievement. These writing samples are commonly evaluated by well-established processes that use scales or rubrics to judge the writing and the writers (Hillocks, 2002). This method of assessment comes from a tradition of ranking students (Cooper & Odell, 1977, 1999). While ranking certainly has its place, there are other reasons to assess. The Education Department's Race to the Top Assessment Program indicates that this need is seen even at the federal level. At the classroom and school level there is a need for diagnostic tests that allow for more accurately targeting instruction to student needs and assessments that capture the growth or improvement in student performance (Stiggins, 2002). This panel will offer three alternative methods of looking at student writers and their achievement that speak to these other needs.

Presentation 1: "What's your best?": Writers Judging Their Work

This presentation introduces the focus of the session, alternate methods of looking at writing and writers, by sharing an informal "person on the street" video survey of a seven adults from diverse backgrounds. These adults were enjoying a sunny spring day on the waterfront of a small city in the western United States when they were approached by the presenter and voluntarily responded to the question, "What is the best thing you've ever written?" Their responses raise questions regarding what counts as "writing" and "best." In addition, their responses perhaps underscore for viewers that the ultimate meaning and power of writing lies in the life (or death) it takes beyond classroom walls.

Presentation 2: Drawing on Experience: How Young Learners Perceive and Experience Writing

This study queried young writers' perceptions of writing through the use of drawing. Drawings were collected from various students, first through eighth grade, including students identified as ELLs. Students were enrolled in summer and regular school classrooms. Each student drew a picture of him- or herself as a writer in school. To triangulate, we also collected students' writing samples in which students described their drawings. In roughly a quarter of the cases, we also interviewed students about their drawings. All data were de-identified prior to analysis.

Data was analyzed using a constant comparative approach that involved examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998). In six separate sessions involving more than 50 participants, the authors shared representative drawings with a variety of local and national teachers and researchers with expertise in the field of writing. The drawings were also shared with teachers with less expertise. These sessions permitted us to gather

educators' descriptions of the portrayal of writers and writing and to generate descriptive codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Eventually, we searched literature within the area of reading and/or writing that reported analytic approaches used to categorize drawings (i.e., Kendrick & McKay, 2004). Our analytic process, thus, reflects "a steady dialogue between theories and evidence" (Ragin cited in Miles & Huberman, 1985, p. 144) inasmuch as we studied both the data and the literature to develop a final set of categories and descriptors for the analytic framework which we now call the Drawing Protocol. The Drawing Protocol was further refined in an iterative process which involved several trial applications on drawings not used in this study.

We believe students' drawings coupled with either short interviews or writing can help us learn about student writers and could help educators in making instructional decisions, establishing what students know and can do, and in determining the effectiveness of the learning environment (Keogh, 1998) – critical outcomes of what good assessment for ELLs should be able to do (Hurley & Blake, 2000). The information could also support teachers in creating classroom environments that are sensitive to the needs of all learners (Au, 2001; Escamilla, 2000; Street, 2001). Researchers will find the drawing protocol a valuable tool for tapping into the mind of the learner in order to better understand what they know about writing. And, finally, we believe that drawing and either talking or writing can be a powerful process from which the writers can better understand themselves as learners in general and, more specifically, what it means to be a writer (Anning, 1997; Bradley, 2001). In this session, we will share sample, representative data sets, and discuss the drawing protocol.

Presentation 3: Forced-Choice Scoring: Determining Change, Seeing Developmental Patterns.

Examining a corpus of 400 pre- and post-writing samples from 200 upper elementary and middle school writers, this study applied two assessment methods to determine change in the writing achievement of the students. The first assessment method used traditional scaled-scoring procedures. Every paper was scored holistically and on six analytic traits by trained scorers. The results of these scaled scorings were used to calculate changes in the writing achievement. The second protocol, called Forced-Choice Scoring, builds on the Haswell (1988) and requires the readers to choose which paper is better both holistically and for the same six analytical categories. The degree of superiority could be ranked as slightly, moderately, or significantly better.

The study seeks to determine if such a direct comparison of two writing samples would reveal changes in the pre- and post- achievement that the grossly scaled metric of a six-point rubric fails to capture. Further, the study hopes to contribute to a picture of the typical development pattern of writers in the age range of 12-15.

Comparison of the data generated by these two scoring protocols reveals equivalent numbers of writers demonstrating improvement between the pre- and post- writing samples. However, a closer examination of the numbers shows a more complicated picture. Only 40% of the writers were similarly assessed by both protocols. For the other 60% of the writers, the choice of protocol would lead to different determinations of improvement in writing ability. Where scaled scoring had shown no improvement or even regression, a direct comparison of the two writing samples provided clear evidence of improved writing achievement. In other cases the direct comparison revealed the deterioration of writing skills. The difference in results dependent upon protocol emphasizes the need in this time of increased assessment to develop an array of

writing assessment protocols and employing them in ways that support the goals of the evaluation.

The direct comparison of writing samples generated six months apart provides a rich picture of typical and anomalous development of writing skills. Most typically, students show gains in organizational structure as they show losses in ratings of voice or stance, as they attempt to write in academic genres. The use of formal transitional markers replaces intuitive turns in structure. Student writers' knowledge and use of conventional spelling and mechanics appears to follow very idiosyncratic paths. This study indicates a striking need to develop a map of writing development across the lifespan.

References

- Anning, A. (1997). Drawing Out Ideas: Graphicacy and Young Children. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 7 (3), 219-239.
- Au, K.H., Carroll, J.H., & Scheu, J.A. (2001). *Balanced literacy instruction: A teacher's resource book* (2nd edition). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Bradley, H. D. (2001). How Beginning Writers Articulate and Demonstrate Their Understanding of the Act of Writing. *Reading Research and Instruction*. Vol. 40(4), 273-96.
- Escamilla, K. (2000). Teaching literacy in Spanish. In R. DeVillar & J. Tinajero (Eds.), *The power of two languages* (pp. 126-141). New York: MacMillan.
- Cooper, C. R. & Odell, L. (Eds.). (1977). *Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cooper, C. R. & Odell, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Evaluating writing: The role of teachers' knowledge about text, learning and culture*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Haswell, R. (1988). *Contrasting ways to appraise improvement in a writing course: Paired comparison and holistic*. Paper presented at the 39th annual meeting of the conference on College Composition and Communication St. Louis, MO, March 17-19, 1988. (ERIC Document ED 294215).
- Hillocks, G. (2002). *The testing trap: How state writing assessments control learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hurley, S.R. & Blake, S. (2000). *Assessment in the content areas for students acquiring English*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Keogh, B. (1998). Concept cartoons: A new Perspective on physics education, *Physics Education* 33(4), 219-231.
- Kendrick, M. & McKay, R. (2004). Drawings as an alternative way of understanding young children's construction of literacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 4(1), 109-128.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: toward a shared craft*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- National Commission on Writing. (2003). *The neglected "R"*. Washington, DC: author.
- National commission on Writing. (2006). *Writing and school reform*. Washington, DC: author.
- Stiggins, R. (2002). Assessment Crisis: The Absence of Assessment FOR Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83 (10), 758-765.
- Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J. (1990, 1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Street, B.V. (2001). *Literacy and development: Ethnographic perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Voice and the Other

Creative Writing as a Vehicle for Intercultural Awareness

Marianna Oyanedell, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

The EFL Writing Classroom, in which the discussion of global issues has already become part of our “daily bread”, can take a leading role in the colossal task of raising intercultural awareness. The need for peaceful communication, mutual respect and tolerance is becoming very obvious in a society that is increasingly being marked by the interaction with people from other cultures and nationalities, whether they speak English as a first language or not.

In this study, we focused on the influence of intercultural awareness and consciousness on our Chilean students’ creative writing and our main objective was to determine in which ways these pieces of writing reflected any of the following:

- i. The existence of prejudices and stereotypes
- ii. Cultural dimensions (communication styles, perception of time, personal space, etc.) that influence our thinking and behavior patterns
- iii. “Critical incidents”: misunderstandings or “when something went wrong in an intercultural encounter”

To do so, we analyzed a number of writing pieces from fourth-year students attending a Writing Workshop at the English Teaching Program at Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile. Results showed that even though our students declare they are not prejudiced against any ethnic or specific nationality, they are not prepared to interact with people from other countries, such as The United States, Canada, England, Colombia, Venezuela or Perú, due to their lack of knowledge of the different ways people think and live. Moreover, they criticize and don’t seem to grasp the whole meaning of ‘intercultural communication’.

In order to improve this, our next step is to answer the following questions:

1. Which strategies can our students develop in their writing process which can lead to intercultural awareness and consciousness using creative writing as a vehicle for communication?
2. How can these goals be transferred into adequate and more effective writing tasks?

We believe that these findings and the development of adequate and effective writing tasks can be beneficial for Chilean teachers in various educational contexts who feel the need to make their students sensitive for intercultural encounters, e.g. to ensure ethnic harmony in the schoolyard, to prepare secondary and university students for exchange programs, or to boost adult students’ confidence for intercultural experiences at work.

References

- Bennett, M.J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 179-195.
- Hammer, M.R., & Bennett, M.J. (1998, 2001). *The Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: The Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Vilá, R. (2005). *Competencia Comunicativa Intercultural. Un estudio en el primer ciclo de la ESO*. Doctoral thesis. Barcelona University, Spain.

A8 (continued)

Voice and the Other

Vulgar Eloquence: Enlisting the Resources of Speech for Writing

Peter Elbow, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, U.S.

Most people assume a large gulf between the processes of speaking and writing--and also between spoken and written language. Teachers, in particular, often warn students: *Remember you're writing now, you're not speaking*. I will contest these assumptions—at both the theoretical and practical level.

At the theoretical level, I will explore the many linguistic and cognitive virtues in speaking and spoken language. Even the language of spontaneous, uncaredful, unplanned, unselfmonitored speech is full things needed for careful, serious, edited written English.

Central to this argument is an exploration of the intonation units (or tone groups) that are found in virtually all human speech. It might seem that these are useless for writing since they audible features that cannot be transferred to the silent page. But in fact, when speakers chunk their spoken language into intonation units, they build in syntactic and rhetorical features that are interesting to explore and are badly needed in even careful “correct” writing. These features—which tend to increase clarity and energy in writing—are very often missing when people write in the careful self-monitored fashion that is so common.

At the practical level, I will describe two basic ways to use the linguistic process that most people find easiest, speaking, for the process most people find hardest, writing.

- The first way is by “speaking onto the page”—that is, to generate written language in the unplanned, unselfmonitored fashion that many people are familiar with from nonstop freewriting.
- The second way is to use careful reading aloud for late revising—adjusting our prose till it feels right in the mouth and sounds right in the ear. This is an interestingly body-based process (though of course it calls on the mind) that helps us harness the benefits of spontaneous intonation for careful writing. That is, it helps us produce intonation units that are well formed and well integrated with the grammar and meaning of the sentences—instead of the more random intonation units that are found in spontaneous speech.

For sources, I will be calling in particular on linguistic work by Douglas Biber, Wallace Chafe, and M.A.K. Halliday.

A8

Developing Writing Teachers at All Levels

Continued Variation Amid Standardization

Suzie Null, Fort Lewis College, U.S.

Recent school reforms such as NCLB have focused on standardizing learning outcomes, and in the process have stimulated many districts to standardize curricular content (Hillocks 2002). But these attempts at standardization have ignored the fact that schools are organized around variation. The students who attend public schools vary, and the local, social, and political expectations schools face vary as well. In order to operate reliably amid such varying needs and goals, schools are organized as loosely coupled systems (Weick 1976; 1982), which allow teachers to employ a variety of approaches and adaptations in order to meet the students' and organizations' varying needs. This study explored how attempts to standardize a system designed for flexibility and variability affected writing instruction: did it lead to a decrease in standardization, a decrease in flexibility and variability, or perhaps other, unanticipated outcomes? In addition, it explored the extent to which teachers' experiences and training in writing instruction affected their uses of varied curricula even amid district pressure to follow standardized writing curricula.

To explore these questions, this study employed a double comparison between 4 schools that were designated for Program Improvement (PI) by the state of California and one that was not; and between teachers in each school who were NWP fellows and those who were not. Qualitative coding was used to analyze fieldnotes from classroom observations and recorded interviews from 9 Language Arts teachers at 5 middle schools.

Testing mandates didn't seem to reduce instructional variability; in fact it added an additional variable into the already dynamic school environments, which seemed to create further opportunities for variation. Moreover, the NWP fellows exhibited the greatest ranges of curricular variation. They generally used a greater variety of curricular sources, used more techniques to teach writing, created more opportunities for students to learn interactively, and had classrooms characterized by more types of teacher-student interactions. Their students also spent more class time planning, composing, and sharing their writing. These results indicate that instructional variation may be an integral aspect of writing instruction in U.S. schools, and that standardization efforts could be unlikely to change this "deep structure" (Geertz 1973) of school organizations.

It may be impossible to standardize a system that is designed to accommodate variation among its constituents by encouraging variation among its practitioners. But if the goal is to improve the quality of students' writing, then standardization may not need to be the primary focus. Instead, the focus would logically be the dissemination of effective strategies for teaching writing, even if those include a variety of approaches rather than one "proven" method or narrowly-defined set of criteria. The NWP, with its emphasis on diffusing strategies selected and proven by teachers, seems particularly well equipped to help teachers find writing instructional strategies that would be compatible with the variations they encounter in their local contexts. Although this study's NWP teachers often perceived the state mandates and the NWP to be at odds, the NWP might be in the best position to help California meet its goal of improving writing skills among all its students.

References

Geertz, C. (1973). Deep play: Notes on the Balinese cockfight. In *The interpretation of cultures*, New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hillocks, G. (2002). *The testing trap*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative science quarterly*. vol. 21, March 1976, 1-19.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *Phi delta kappan*. 63:10, 673-676.

Suzie Y. Null
Teacher Education Department
Fort Lewis College
Durango, CO 81301
970-403-1189
null_s@fortlewis.edu

A9

Adult Writers

Adult New Writers: What Does the Research Say?

Heidi Silver-Pacuilla, American Institutes for Research, U.S.

Mary Ann Corley, American Institutes for Research, U.S.

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is in the first year of a three-year technical assistance project funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, to produce professional development materials related to research-based writing instruction for adult basic education (ABE) programs. Research conducted with adults with low-literacy levels is sparse. What has been conducted in writing development is, for the most part, descriptive, anecdotal, or consisting of case studies of one-time interventions. We have broadened our review to seek guideposts from literatures in related fields and settings, such as secondary education and community college remedial education. In addition, the literatures on critical and new literacies contribute a useful perspective related to the role of developing voice and power for disenfranchised adults.

The focus of this presentation will be threefold. First, we will introduce conference participants to the realities and characteristics of the adult education setting and population that make writing instruction challenging but important. We will then share findings from our literature review, which spans related fields and populations. Finally, we will share what we have learned thus far in our study of selected adult education programs and instructors about how they are incorporating technical assistance into practice. These are detailed below.

We will provide an environmental scan or overview of adult basic education as a site of re-engagement for adult learners. From our project, we will share the characteristics of the programs in which our participants teach, how they currently teach writing, and what they identify as major barriers in their programs, learner attitudes, or their own practice. The literature review is a survey of more than 100 articles that pertain to writing development and instruction for adult new learners. This literature is coded to methodological characteristics, population, and settings, as well as to various sub-topics. Sub-topics include cultural diversity, out-of-class literacies, technology integration, strategy instruction, self-directed learning, differentiated instruction, and adult learning theory.

By the conference in February 2011, we will have recruited and oriented up to twelve state teams of five or more adult education instructors and professional developers and initiated a virtual professional learning community. We will have facilitated team members through three (of eight total planned) online courses introducing the concepts of universal design for learning, looking at student work, and planning for differentiation. Through these courses with discussion and reflection assignments, we will capture a picture of how adult education instructors approach the teaching of writing. We also will share writing samples from adult learners being taught by our participants.

We hope that, by introducing the adult education population and setting to researchers attending the Writing Research Across Borders conference, we will interest more researchers in contributing to the knowledge base on developing writing skills in adult new writers.

mcorley@air.org:

Hsilver-pacuilla@air.org

A9

Adult Writers

Undocumented in a Documentary Society: How Immigrants' Religious Writing Mediates Legal Status

Kate Vieira, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

We are living in what Dorothy Smith and Catherine Schryer have called a documentary society, in which textuality organizes our social relations, especially in regards to legality. Perhaps no group appreciates the power of such textual systems more than undocumented immigrants in the U.S., whose lack of papers excludes them from official state belonging, often with dire consequences. Scholars of immigrant literacies have examined the rhetoric of this “thick” relationship between state order and paperwork (Cintron), as well as how immigrants’ biliteracy practices might upend the power relations enforced by immigration law (Kalmar). Yet researchers have not investigated how immigration law, as a textual system, mediates (and is mediated by) the texts immigrants themselves author. This talk seeks to fill this gap. In particular, I explore how the undocumented status of one group of immigrants permeates their religious writing. I find that such writing, in turn, allows them access to the alternate textual system of the church, which can provide the legitimization stripped from them by the state.

This individual presentation reports on an ethnographic study, completed in summer 2008, on the writing of Portuguese-speaking immigrants in a former mill town in Massachusetts. As part of this study, I conducted literacy history interviews with 22 Brazilian immigrants, the majority undocumented, took ethnographic notes at community literacy institutions, and collected participants’ writing. Using grounded theory to analyze this data, I found a striking relationship between participants’ lack of papers and their use of religious writing to address their undocumented status. I coded for how participants constructed an authorized subject position from which to preach; how their religious writing implicitly or explicitly addressed issues of immigrant rights; and how discursive traces of the Brazilian homeland, often expressed in generic choices, functioned to provide solace to undocumented writers and their audiences.

This talk will focus on just two participants, whose literacy experiences best represent the larger findings of the study. My results show that within the area’s Brazilian churches (both evangelical and Catholic), participants used religious writing for legitimization in three ways: by calling on God or the Holy Spirit to authorize their writing; by interpreting the Bible to challenge U.S. immigration laws; and by writing sermons and religious songs that gesture to their homeland. Taken together, these rhetorical strategies provide participants with a moral and transnational alternative to the hostile textual system of the U.S.

Documentary society, then, can inhere in individual writing lives, as immigrants use writing to jockey for legitimacy. Moreover, just as textual systems can shape immigrant writing, such writing itself can work to alternately undermine or support competing textual systems, such as those of the church and the state.

A9

Adult Writers

Writing as Distributed Cognition: The Case of Computer Mediated Conferencing

Tracey L. Leacock, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada

Writing theorists have tended to focus on writing as primarily an individual activity (e.g., Bereiter & Scardemalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Hayes, 1996). Yet, in practice, a writing process that is primarily in the head of one individual is the exception rather than the norm. Student and professional writers alike interact with a range of content-based source documents (e.g., course texts, academic journals), writing-process guides (e.g., assignment specifications, professional style guides), and audiences (e.g., teachers, editors, peer-reviewers), and these interactions are central to the writing process itself. In other words, the cognitive processes of writing are distributed across people and artifacts, even in the case of a “single-authored” product. This is becoming particularly evident in online writing (Kittle & Hicks, 2009; Miller, 2005; Rose, 2007; Witte, 2007).

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is becoming an increasingly common mode of communication in both the workplace and formal learning settings. When students use CMC to discuss course concepts and work on individual papers, the cognitive processes involved in learning and writing are distributed across group members. This has the potential to help students learn how to identify gaps and clarify their ideas more effectively than they would if working alone, each trying to learn the material entirely within their own heads. Extant research on CMC has focused primarily on issues of social presence, social interaction, and negotiation of meaning, rather than the process of creating text or the quality of the set of “individual” texts that may result from group discussions during the writing process (see Spatariu, Quinn, & Hartley, 2007 and Spatariu, Hartley, & Bendixen, 2004 for reviews).

This paper proposes a new way of thinking about writing in the (online) post-secondary classroom. Rather than starting from the individual, I will look at writing as an example of distributed cognition, i.e., as a complex cognitive activity that, from the outset, is “distributed across internal human minds, external cognitive artifacts...groups of people...and space and time” (Zhang & Patel, p. 333; see also Hutchins, 1995; Zhang & Norman, 1994).

By approaching writing from the perspective of distributed cognition, I hope to help researchers and teachers to show students that writing not just as a summative activity to be engaged in a few days before that final paper is due, rather it is an ongoing process that gives each student access to a range of sources (peers) for checking one’s knowledge throughout a course, for gaining new insights and new ways of approaching an issue, and for testing whether the text a student settles on for that final paper is likely to convey what the student intends it to convey.

I will draw on data from CMC discussions about individual term papers in a third year undergraduate course to show what a distributed cognition model of writing might look like in the CMC context, taking into account the individual cognitive resources that are augmented in a CMC context and the ways in which external artifacts and peers provide this augmentation.

A10

Becoming Academic Writers

Learning to take an Effective Authorial Stance in Second Language Academic Writing: The Affordances of a Stance Corpus

Mary Schleppegrell, University of Michigan, U.S.

Peichin Chang, University of Michigan, U.S.

This paper provides evidence of the ways in which a semantic corpus can support second language (L2) writers' development of stance. Taking an effective stance in academic research writing calls for the ability to claim solidarity with readers, evaluate and critique the work of others, acknowledge alternative views, and argue for a position (Hyland, 1998). Novice L2 writers are often found to lack control of the linguistic resources needed to project an authoritative persona with appropriate voice (Hyland, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2004; Wu, 2007). The paper reports on the affordances of a technological tool developed to provide explicit support to L2 writers in projecting an authoritative voice.

The tool is a web-based database of published research that was analyzed and presented to learners with stance resources rendered explicit, using the framework of systemic functional linguistics; specifically, the Engagement resources (Martin & White, 2005). The explicitly rendered resources were made available for exploration by learners in a variety of formats—by clause, move (Swales, 1990; 2004) and textual context. An investigation was carried out to test the hypothesis that rendering explicit the complex stance-related linguistic resources in this way would enable students who engaged with the database tool to argue with a more persuasive authorial voice (Pho, 2008; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001). Seven Mandarin-speaking graduate students at a U.S. university were recruited to engage in five sessions of training and interaction with the tool as they wrote introductions to their research. Multiple methods of analysis were employed to track their development of and accuracy in stance understanding as well as improvement over time in their writing performance.

Results show that the writers developed understanding of stance as a concept. In drawing on stance resources in their writing, they more readily learned about and adopted monogloss resources (used to present factual information), and proclaiming resources (used to project a strong argumentative voice) than the intermediate stances that make a tentative claim. The successful deployment of stance resources in their writing was challenging, but even in this short intervention many of the writers were able to recognize the prosodic nature of stance and begin to transfer their new knowledge about stances into productive use in their research writing. Analysis of their pre- and post-tool use drafts indicates a positive relationship between stance learning and writing performance. The study also points to ways that the technology could be further developed to support this potential, and suggests that discipline-specific texts and different writing styles be included in such semantic corpora, so that linguistic patterns representative of the writers' own fields and preferred forms of argumentation can motivate users of the tool.

While L2 writing pedagogy often focuses on the lexical and grammatical structures that writers need to develop, just learning words and grammar does not support writers in the challenges of presenting an authoritative stance. The results of this study indicate that

making explicit the linguistic resources used for stance meanings offers the potential to better support L2 academic writers.

References

- Hyland, K. (1998). Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text* 18 (3), 349–382.
- Kennedy, C. and Miceli, T. (2001). An evaluation of intermediate students' approaches to corpus investigation. *Language Learning & Technology*. 5(3), 77-90.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Pho, P (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: a study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*.10. 231-250.
- Schleppegrell, M. (2004). Technical writing in a second language: the role of grammatical metaphor. In Ravelli and Ellis (eds.), *Analysing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks*. NY: Continuum. 173-189.
- Swales, John M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, John M. (2004). *Research genres: explorations and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, S. (2007) The use of engagement resources in high- and low-rated undergraduate geography essays. *Journal of English for academic purposes*. 6 (3), 254-271.

Contact information: Peichin Chang (peichin@umich.edu)
Mary Schleppegrell (mjschlep@umich.edu)

A10 (continued)

Becoming Academic Writers

An Approach to Developing Writing Skills for Research Publication in English

Tatyana Yakhontova, Ivan Franko National University of L'viv, Ukraine

Publishing research in English is currently one of the major concerns of many academics throughout the world. Not surprisingly, language teachers and applied linguists have started to emphasize the importance of English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) as a relatively new pedagogical branch aimed to address the needs of those who wish to present their findings in peer review international journals. In Ukraine, for example, mature researchers with an adequate level of general English competence appear to be the most active and interested group of potential ERPP consumers as many of them are willing to publish in English and to become active members of international research communities.

In an attempt to respond to these urgent needs, a special English academic writing training for mature researchers has been elaborated by the author of the presentation and conducted at a number of Ukrainian research institutions within the period of 2004-2010. The participants were Ukrainian researchers in hard sciences and economics within the age range from 28 to 55 years. The training lasted for two workdays and included various types of writing activities elaborated with due regard for East European cultural and educational context.

This paper describes the structure and activities of the training and analyzes the challenges it provides for both trainer and trainees. It will be shown how the application of two theoretical frameworks – a genre-based approach to writing (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Paltridge, 2001) and the notion of intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1986; Kristeva, 1980; Fairclough, 1995) – contributed to the rapid development of research texts construction skills of this specific group of learners. This effect has been enhanced by the use of various templates – stereotypical phrases and certain textual models – offered to participants of the training during almost all types of activities.

Despite highly positive anonymous evaluation of the training by its attendees, there happened to be a number of problems caused by insufficient awareness of these learners of culture-specific aspects of English academic written discourse. These inevitable challenges and the ways of their overcoming are highlighted and discussed in the presentation.

A10 (continued)

Professional education for the language professions

The Critical Reflective Essay and Overseas Students - Linguistic Repertoire
Genre Selection and Rhetorical Tradition

Sharon Norris, Roehampton University, U.K.

The critical reflective essay (CRE) has become an increasingly popular mode of assessment in higher education institutions across Europe and North America, and throughout the world. However, this paper argues, within the Anglophone world, CREs present particular difficulties for non-native speakers of English, especially among those students whose cultures' rhetorical traditions differ significantly from those of North America and the UK. Thus, despite their popularity, the paper argues that CREs have the potential *de facto*, to disadvantage foreign students.

Focusing on Masters-level Creative Writing students, the paper notes that not only do overseas students have to negotiate writing creatively in another language and familiarising themselves with writing traditions that may be unfamiliar, even within the higher education context, but in the CRE, they also have to grapple with a hybrid form: i.e. a non-traditional academic essay that requires self-reflection. The paper asks: if native English-speaking students find it difficult to negotiate the combination of self-reflection and critical analysis, how much more difficult is it for students from outside the European/North American Anglophone academic tradition?

The paper will draw on original research comparing sample CREs from students on Creative Writing Masters programmes in Norway and England (i.e. where the language of instruction in Norway is Norwegian). It will examine the nature of the difficulties encountered by students in the two countries and whether they are comparable. If so, are any strategies to address these equally applicable in both countries, or are both errors and potential remedies culturally-specific? While initial examination suggests similarities in the mistakes students make in both countries (e.g. conflation of styles; self-absorption at the expense of self-reflection), a number of factors militates against a straight comparison. For one thing, the understanding of the term 'essay' and the role the academic essay is accorded within the HE system has traditionally been very different from the one country to the other.

From this, the paper goes on to consider whether errors in the CREs by non-native English speaking students on the English MA course tend to mirror those by the native speakers, or if there is evidence that any weaknesses are culturally-determined. The paper, which draws on the work of Halliday, Swales, Yamana Kachru and Pierre Bourdieu, concludes i. that, in an increasingly globalised higher education market, cultural context (both national/linguistic and academic 'culture') must be taken into account when both teaching and marking the CRE, and ii. that these different layers of cultural context should also be taken into account also in relation to native speakers from minority ethnic and 'non-traditional' backgrounds.

This research originates in a project entitled "Writing The Critical Reflective Essay in Different Text Cultures in Education", which began earlier this year, for which I am guest researcher. It is funded by the Norwegian Research Council, under its *Educational Media And Writing in Different Text Cultures in Education* research programme, and will run until 2013.

A11

Authoring by and for the Deaf

Authoring With Video (AWV)

Barbara K. Strassman, The College of New Jersey, U.S.

Research documents that deaf students do not write as well or as effectively as their hearing peers, have not mastered Standard English grammar and use a limited vocabulary (Albertini & Schley, 2003; Musselman & Szanto, 1998). Research also shows that 1)the nature of the writing task and the familiarity of writers with the topic and audience significantly improves their level of writing (Albertini, 1990; Albertini, Meath-Lang & Harris, 1994; Musselman & Szanto, 1998); 2)writing is a productive means of active cognitive engagement that leads to content learning (Langer & Applebee, 1986; Lang, & Albertini, 2001) and 3)writing instruction is most effective when used to help the writer think through ideas as in the learning of a content area (Emig, 1997; Langer & Applebee, 1986; Yore, 2000).

Research also demonstrates that deaf viewers' comprehension of captioned programs is better than their comprehension of text alone indicating that the visual component of captioned media plays an important part in conveying to the deaf viewer the meaning of the program. (Berman & Jorgensen, 1980; Boyd & Vader, 1972; Lewis & Jackson, 2001; Nugent, 1983). The current generation of school-aged children has easy and regular exposure to captioned programs. Lewis and Jackson (2001) cite research evidence that "children who are deaf or hard of hearing watch as much, or more, television than their hearing peers".

In the AWV study, as students were completing a content area unit, they were shown a silent video clip with images related to the ideas and concepts studied. Students were also given a writing prompt. Students were not expected to caption the clips but rather to write in response to what had been learned in the content area classroom and was seen in the video clip; the video became a backdrop to the student's text, much like documentary footage is to a TV reporter's narrative.

During this 3 year project, middle school deaf students were asked to alternately word process traditional texts and AWV texts within their science or social studies classes. Each subject wrote 4 texts, two in the AWV approach and two in a traditional method. Each text was scored by 3 raters along 9 measurements for the traditional texts and 11 measurements for the AWV texts. Raters used a project-created writing rubric to score each text. All students and teachers were individually interviewed at the end of their participation in the project. The interviews, which were videotaped and later transcribed, followed a pre-set protocol of questions aligned with the research questions.

The research questions were:

Does the integration of Authoring With Video into content area instruction

1. increase the amount of writing done by students?
2. motivate students to engage in writing more than traditional content area writing assignments?
3. motivate students to use more content vocabulary?

Results indicate that AWV does motivate students to write more and to use more specific content vocabulary. The data also suggests that the subjects may not understand the role of captions in televised media.

A11

Authoring by and for the Deaf

Multimodality in SDH's Education in Brazil

Célia Maria Magalhães, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil

Vera Lúcia Santiago Araújo, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Brazil

Since the pioneer work of the 90s, research on multimodality has been developing so as to include analysis of the web page and film texts and genres along with the printed page and static images. Multimodal transcription is one of the methodologies devised for the examination of film texts and genres and applied successfully in much of this kind of research. In audiovisual translation (AVT) In spite of the obvious interface between multimodality and AVT, very little has been done in terms of methodology to join the two approaches. To the best of our knowledge only one investigation uses multimodal transcription of films to find a better way through novice subtitlers' training. The present work-in-progress aims at replicating this investigation with novice subtitlers for the deaf and hard-of-hearing in Brazil. Our hypothesis is that multimodal transcription could also be a tool to teach future expert translators to handle text analysis and multi-media technology for successful subtitling for the deaf and the hard-of-hearing. This paper analyzes an extract of a Brazilian feature film (*Fronteira - Frontier*) subtitled for the deaf and hard-of-hearing in two steps. The first focuses on describing characteristics of Subtitling for the Deaf and the Hard-of-Hearing (SDH) following the parameters proposed by the research on the topic carried out at UECE (Universidade Estadual do Ceará) and the patterns aimed at a hearing audience. The second provides a multimodal transcription of an excerpt of the film in order to analyse its SDH as an element of a multimodal text. The final purpose is devising a model to be used in SDH education that combines multimodality and audiovisual translation.

A12

Writing in the Health and Care Professions

Culture, Translation, and Genre: The Emergence of Health Literacy Interventions
Philip Girvan, National Collaborating Centres for Public Health, Canada

Health literacy is a function of overall literacy, encompassing knowledge, understanding, and access to and control of resources that promote and maintain satisfactory health and wellbeing. Crucial in the areas of health promotion, health protection, disease prevention, healthcare maintenance and system navigation, health literacy is the outcome of such diverse abilities as reading, writing, numeracy, the ability to access information, and critical thinking. Health literacy is an important means of maintaining health and a strong predictor of health status.

Health literacy interventions generally focus on health promotion, health protection, disease prevention, health-care maintenance, and system navigation. Framing these activities as social practice, this research catalogues the diverse spoken, written, and digital genres relevant to health literacy and examines the rhetorical strategies utilized by stakeholders to alter, hybridize, and modify these genres to accord with various social contexts where the interventions occur.

Research Literatures:

Bakhtin, M. M. *The problem of speech genres. Speech genres and other late essays.* McGee, V. W. (trans). Eds. Emerson, C. & Holquist, M. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1986. 62-102.

Canadian Council on Learning. *Health Literacy in Canada: Initial Results From the International Adult Literacy and Skills Survey.* Ottawa, ON. 2007.

Nutbeam, D. "The Evolving Concept of Health Literacy". *Social Science & Medicine* 67. 2008. 2072-2078.

Miller, C. R. "Genre as social action". *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70. 1984. 151-67.

Spinuzzi, C. "Toward Integrating Our Research Scope: A Sociocultural Field Methodology". *Journal of Business and Technical Communication.* 16 (3). 2002. 3-32.

Research Questions:

What (and whose) translations of culture inform the design and practice of health literacy interventions?

What rhetorical strategies guide the planning, implementation and execution of health literacy interventions?

What genres emerge from these strategies?

Methods: Specific methods of information gathering will include questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and critical document, discourse and genre analyses.

Data:

Genres of health literacy interventions to be analysed include, but are not limited to: education booklets and brochures, health information on the internet

news alerts: TV, radio, newspapers

postings for inoculations and screening

articles in newspapers and magazines
postings for health and safety warnings
air and water quality reports
food and product labels
statements of rights and responsibilities, informed consent
health-benefit packages
fitness programs
health product purchase and sales
diagnostic screening

Questionnaires will be circulated to individuals involved in the planning, design, implementation and uptake of various health literacy interventions. 10 to 12 semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key individuals involved in the planning, implementation and execution of various health literacy interventions and approximately another 6 with members of populations targeted by particular health literacy interventions.

Findings: This abstract describes research currently underway.

A12 (continued)

Writing in the Health and Care Professions

Everyday Matters: Reception and Use as Productive Design of Health-Related Texts

Hannah Bellwoar, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

The field of technical communication has tended to define its object of inquiry around the production and usability of particular technical texts in workplaces and school. However, the literate activities of technical practices, or what people do with texts, involves more than that, included the self-directed trajectories of reading, writing, and talk people engage in as they grapple with technical questions. In this presentation, I explore such trajectories in the context of healthcare. What happens to technical healthcare texts after their distribution to patients? What other kinds of texts do people encounter and seek out? How are these texts received and used by people, including interactive uptakes that involve talk, writing, and other semiotics?

Drawing on a wider study of healthcare literate practices (collection of technical/official and non-technical/unofficial texts, observations, semi-structured and discourse based interviews, mainly with laypeople, conducted over the last 2 years), I explore the case study of Meagan, a young woman dealing with ulcerative colitis and pregnancy complications. Using three theoretical ideas for frameworks of activity: trails of associations (Latour, 2005); knotworking (Engestrom, 1999); and chronotopic lamination (Prior and Shipka, 2003), I follow Meagan's chains of reception to health-related texts that demonstrate her designs of her lifeworld and her production of knowledge and texts about her body and her health. Through this case study, I argue that patients use technical healthcare texts outside of workplaces (hospitals, doctors' offices, etc.) to produce knowledge and design their understandings and choices relating to their bodies and health; thus, reception and use should also be considered by the field as multi-semiotic productive strategic acts of repurposing, inscription and reproduction.

A12 (continued)

Writing in the Health and Care Professions

Documenting Work Practices: The Role of Second Language Literacy in the Swedish Elderly Care Sector

Zoe Nikolaidou, Södertörn University, Sweden

In this paper, I will present results from the first phase of the three year-long project “Care work as language work: Affordances and restrictions for speakers of Swedish as a second language”, which focuses on the role of communication and literacy in the elderly care sector in Sweden. The project seeks to examine the increasing demands on the use of language by carers working in elderly residences and more specifically the increasingly important role of documentation. A special focus is given on those carers whose first language is not Swedish, as a majority group in the elderly care sector in Sweden, and on the resources they use when dealing with written and oral language. An overall question is whether their multilingualism is considered to be a restriction or an affordance for their participation in central communicative practices at the workplace. Initial analysis of the findings has shown that written and oral interaction is a big part of the carers’ daily tasks and that documentation has become a standardized activity within the elderly care sector. Communication with other colleagues and with the residents’ relatives is the most frequent reason for writing. Other literacy-related activities involve writing for keeping archives, writing as a mnemonic device (in the form of ‘to do lists’) and writing for providing services (as in the case when they do shopping lists or order the residents’ food). Reading also plays a crucial role in the carers’ daily activities, as it serves work-organization purposes (following specific work schedules), information purposes (being updated on the ongoing needs of a resident) and service providing purposes (shorting out lunch boxes according to residents’ eating habits). Carers whose first language is not Swedish report continuous difficulties when documenting their everyday work activities. However, the study has shown that working with other colleagues on literacy problems is a well-developed strategy. Workplace-based literacy courses are an additional resource, but writing for the course seems to be different from writing for work. The theoretical background of the project lies within the field of New Literacy Studies (e.g. Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Street, 1994) and the use of literacy is examined as a contextualized behavior. Additional input to the study is given by workplace ethnographies that argue for the increased role of textualisation in the workplace (e.g. Karlsson, 2005; Searle, 2001). The methodological approach used in this project draws from ethnographic methods of data collection, such as participant observation, informal interviews and audio/video recordings. The data presented in this paper draws from fieldnotes and interview extracts.

References

- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local Literacies: reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Karlsson, A.-M. (2005). Variation as text politics. Five store texts and their roles in the new work order". In K. Berge & E. Maagerø (Eds.), *Semiotics from the North: Nordic approaches to systemic functional linguistics*. Oslo: Novus.

- Searle, J. (2001). Constructing literacies in the New Work Order. *Literacy and Numeracy Studies*, 11(1), 21-40.
- Street, B. (1994). Cross-cultural perspectives on literacy. In J. Maybin (Ed.), *Language and literacy in social practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

A13

Power and Positioning in Learning to Write: Children's Perceptions of Mediational Tools for Writing

Cheri Williams, University of Cincinnati

Diane Hungler, Norwood City Schools

Nicole Robinson, Talawanda City Schools

*Tammy Sherry, Northern Kentucky University**

Roundtable

Overview: This presentation will report the findings of a year-long qualitative investigation of Interactive Writing instruction in a first grade classroom. The researchers first will describe the instructional approach and then discuss how the children interpreted and appropriated their teacher's instruction in ways that positioned them among their peers as more capable or less capable writers. These subject positions afforded the children more or less power during paired writing events. Implications for teaching, learning, and future research will be discussed.

Presentations:

The Research Project: Investigating Interactive Writing as an Approach to Early Writing Instruction

Interactive writing is a particular approach to beginning writing instruction that reflects an apprentice model of learning (McCarrier, Pinnell, & Fountas, 2000). Empirical research on interactive writing suggests its effectiveness (Button, Johnson, & Furgerson, 1996; Craig, 2006; Williams & Lundstrom, 2007), but the body of work is very limited. The purpose of our investigation was to add to the evidence base on this instructional approach and to the research on early writing instruction more generally. Across one academic year we investigated interactive writing instruction in a first grade classroom. Two questions guided data collection and analysis:

What does Diane, the classroom teacher, teach the children about the writing process—about what it means “to write” and how they can go about it?

How do the children respond to Diane's instruction and in what ways do they use it to support their independent writing endeavors?

Theoretical Framework: We grounded this study in Rogoff's (1990) theory of cognitive development as an apprenticeship. Rogoff suggests that mastery and appropriation of specific cultural tools occurs through *guided participation* in socially-situated activities with adults and peers who scaffold the learner's understanding of and skill in using these mediational means. She argues that both guidance and participation are essential, because the processes involved create links between what children already know and the new information to be learned. Guided participation also structures and supports children's attempts, and through it, adults gradually transfer to children the responsibility for carrying out the task using the available cultural tools. Social interaction is critical to the learning, particularly with regard to the shared thinking involved in collaborative

problem-solving. Rogoff contends that guided participation creates an “apprenticeship in thinking” (p. 8) and that children appropriate this shared thinking for their own purposes. *Interactive writing* (McCarrier, Pinnell, & Fountas, 2000) is an approach to beginning writing instruction that can provide the kinds of guided participation and apprenticeship in thinking Rogoff advocates.

Methods: We collected data twice weekly from October through May. We documented 36 lessons using field notes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982), and we videotaped and transcribed 8 lessons. Immediately after the interactive writing lesson, we observed the children as they participated in journal writing time. We captured these observations in field notes, and we photocopied the children’s written products.

We used a qualitative approach to analysis, borrowing procedures from constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). We analyzed the data separately, and each researcher wrote short memos to document her interpretations (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). We then met weekly to synthesize our analyses (Patton, 2002). In our weekly meetings, we generated larger categories into which we grouped the coded data. We added and/or collapsed codes and categories as necessary; our processes reflected Strauss & Corbin’s (1990) axial coding. Once we had categorized all of the data, we began selective coding whereby researchers integrate categories to form a grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process allowed us to conceptualize an analytic story about the use of interactive writing as an approach to early writing instruction.

Description of Interactive Writing Instruction: An interactive writing lesson begins with the teacher and children discussing their ideas for a group composition, most often based on a storybook read aloud or an experience they have shared. They collaboratively plan the text that will be written, and then the teacher begins to write the oral text on a large writing tablet. As she writes, she makes the writing process explicit by thinking aloud, as in “We have to make sure that what we say makes sense,” or “I need to leave space between the words, so that everyone can read our message.” Her instruction is explicit and appropriate to the text they are creating.

As the teacher guides the lesson, she incorporates an innovative technique specific to interactive writing: she “shares the pen” (McCarrier, et al., p. xvii) with her students. This technique distinguishes interactive writing from other approaches. At strategic points in the lesson, the teacher hands the pen to individual children and asks them to write specific letters or words or to add the appropriate capitalization or punctuation. The goal of sharing the pen is to focus students’ attention on specific aspects of the writing process that they are still coming to understand.

As the group encodes the message, the teacher discusses a host of concepts about print and conventions of written language appropriate to the text. She teaches specific letter-sound correspondences and orthographic patterns used to spell the words they are writing. She also explicitly demonstrates the use of cognitive strategies that will prove useful in composing and spelling. Then, she scaffolds the children’s ability to use these concepts and cognitive tools as they share the pen and participate in the writing event. At the end of the lesson, the teacher summarizes the key concepts that were explicitly taught and talks with children about the ways they can use independently what was demonstrated during the group lesson.

The “Practice Page” as a Mediational Tool for Interactive Writing Instruction

Our year-long investigation clearly demonstrated that Diane’s interactive writing lessons reflected the format and procedures just described—with one notable addition. Diane incorporated a distinct mediational tool, “the practice page,” into her lessons to solve the spelling of “tricky” words she and the children were writing. Diane would move from the writing tablet to a large dry-erase board mounted on an easel. She would hand the marker to a child and say, “Let’s try that word on the practice page,” and then she would scaffold the child’s ability to solve the word’s spelling. Not every word was taken to the practice page—only those words that provided a meaningful context for teaching specific letter-sound correspondences (e.g., /z/ in *was*), larger spelling patterns (e.g., VCe), important orthographic principles (e.g., “Some letters are silent, like the *t* in *listen*. You can’t hear them.”), or particular word-solving strategies.

As Diane worked with children on the practice page, strategy instruction was foremost. She explicitly taught, demonstrated, and prompted a variety of word-solving strategies. For example, she taught the children to use a word or part of a word they knew (*an* → *landed*), to use a rhyming word (*rain* → *train*), and to use what they knew about each others’ names (*Sally* → *really*). Occasionally, Diane prompted the children to “use a resource” in the room (e.g., the word wall). The most frequent strategy Diane taught, demonstrated, or prompted was “say the word slowly and listen for the sounds you hear.” Once Diane had explicitly taught a concept or demonstrated a strategy, she prompted the children’s use of it as they “tried” words on the practice page.

Diane frequently used the practice page for word study mini-lessons that built on a particular concept she had addressed during the interactive writing lesson. For example, she helped the children see the ways in which the words *out*, *house*, *mouse*, *sound*, and *around* are related. We documented 29 such mini-lessons across the academic year. In most cases, Diane helped children to construct words from their parts by moving from the known to the unknown (Clay, 1993). In each mini-lesson on the practice page, Diane talked about “how English words work,” teaching the children important principles that govern the orthography.

Interestingly, Diane encouraged the children to use a practice page as a mediational means during their independent writing activities. Repeatedly across the academic year, she suggested that the children “use a practice page to figure out tricky words.” In fact, Diane positioned the practice page as the mediational means of choice. She recommended that the children “try a tricky word first on a practice page” before using other strategies she had taught—“before checking in a book or looking around the room.” She would often say, “Good writers try it first.”

(5-minute video-clip of Diane using the practice page during an interactive writing lesson)

Students’ Appropriation of the Practice Page during Independent and Paired Writing Events

Although limited, the previous research on interactive writing instruction has demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach for supporting young children’s early writing development (Button, Johnson, & Furgerson, 1996; Craig, 2006; Williams & Lundstrom, 2007). Importantly, the results of our study corroborated these findings. Diane repeatedly demonstrated the various ways in which authors compose text and

encode it in written language. She taught the children a variety of composing strategies and a host of fundamental concepts about print, conventions of written language, and spelling strategies. And, findings of the study demonstrated that the children appropriated many of these conceptual tools and subsequently used them to support their independent writing endeavors. We have documented a host of overt demonstrations of the children using Diane's instruction during journal writing time.

Interestingly, however, our observations of the children during journal writing time demonstrated that some of the children appropriated Diane's use of the practice page as a mediational tool for spelling. They would use a scrap piece of paper to solve a word's spelling before they wrote the word in their journal story. Other children overtly rejected the practice page as a mediational tool.

We have not yet completed our analysis of this section of the data, but our preliminary analyses suggest that a child's use of the practice page as a mediational means positioned her or him as a less capable writer amongst peers. Children who did not use the practice page to mediate spelling attempts were positioned as more capable writers. These subject positions also afforded the children more or less power during paired writing events.

In our presentation, we will report the final outcomes of this analysis, of the data set and discuss the implications of these findings for teaching, learning, and future research.

A14

An Empirical Study of First-Year Public Writing: Transitioning from High School to College

Public Writing and Shifting Perceptions of 'Audience' in FYW

Carol Hayes, The George Washington University, U.S.

Hearing One's Self Write: Identifying (with) Audiences for Research

Michael Svoboda, The George Washington University, U.S.

Generating Comparative Data for Examining the Ability of Different

Program Designs to Promote Positive Attitudinal Shifts in First-Year Writers

Steve Salchak, The George Washington University, U.S.

Overview: Advocates of public writing have successfully garnered broad support for the importance of engaging students as writers with audiences beyond the classroom and professor (Wells 1996; Isaacs and Jackson 2001; Weisser 2002; Welch 2005, among others), but their core claims are often grounded in theory and anecdotal accounts reminiscent of what educational researchers in other contexts have characterized as teacher "lore." This panel presents the findings of a study, conducted in spring and fall 2009, which used both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the impact of participation in a two-day student research conference on the ways that students conceptualize and approach academic writing and themselves as academic writers.

The study asked two primary research questions: 1) Does taking part in this two-day student conference (as either an audience member or presenter) impact student perception of their connection to paper topics, their motivations for writing, their attention to audience, or their perception of research-based writing as scholarly conversation? 2) Do the first-year writing courses at our university--which share a strong ethos of public writing--impact student perception in the above mentioned areas, even without the major event of the two-day student conference?

During the two semesters of data collection, 431 first-year students (total) took part in a pre- and post-semester surveys designed to measure shifts in student attitudes toward writing from high school to college. Twenty-eight (total) of those students--randomly selected across all of the participating sections--agreed to take part in small group interviews at the end of both semesters. The spring 2009 semester provided the "experimental" group: all students who took part in the study participated in the student conference in some way. The fall 2009 semester provided the "control" group: none of the students took part in a program-wide public writing event.

Paper #1--"Public Writing and Shifting Perceptions of 'Audience' in FYW"

This paper will explore one of the most puzzling results of the pre- and post-semester surveys: a question that, innocuously enough, asked students whether they had focused that semester on "analyzing audience needs." To our complete befuddlement, students who *presented* their research and writing at the spring 2009 conference ($N=48$) *lost* significant ground by the end of the semester, compared to their peers ($N=182$) who had attended the conference as audience members ($F(1,227) = 6.810, p = .010$). Indeed, the conference presenters ended up not only reporting lower means for this question on the post-semester survey ($M=2.92$) than students who attended as audience members ($M=3.27$), but from the pre-semester survey to the post-semester survey, students who

presented at the conference reported a mean *loss* (-.29, on a five-point scale), while students who took part in the conference as audience members reported a mean *gain* (.31). The results seem counterintuitive, since we had expected the conference presenters to demonstrate greater gains than audience members (as, in fact, they did in several areas). This paper--to be based on follow-up small-group interviews to be conducted early in fall 2010--will attempt to explore this puzzle. At this point, I believe the core issue to be one of how "audience" is interpreted. As we know from research conducted by Sommers and Saltz (2004), Carroll (2002), and others, students perceive their primary college writing audience to be their professors--the person who assigns their grade. I would hypothesize that the students who presented at the Symposium were primarily interpreting "audience" in the pre-semester surveys to refer to their teachers. After presenting at the conference, however, that interpretation of "audience" may have been disrupted--and they may have realized the degree to which most of their writing in college does *not* address outside audience needs. Data gathered in the fall will support, disprove, or complicate this hypothesis.

Paper #2 – Hearing One’s Self Write: Identifying (with) Audiences for Research

Drawing on studies of writing from inside rhetoric and composition (Harris 2006; Bizup 2008), as well as outside the field (Kruger & Dunning 1999; Colyar 2009), I offer an alternative explanation for the drop in scores for "analyzing audience needs" recorded by students who presented at the two day-conference, called the University Writing and Research Symposium. Meeting the needs of the actual but contrived audience of the Symposium, I argue, conflicted with the goal of addressing the specific disciplinary audience students had been led to imagine as they wrote their papers. In order to engage their student auditors, student presenters treated the symposium as an occasion for expressive performance rather than scholarly communication.

The argument for this alternative explanation will be assembled in three steps. First, through a reinterpretation of Kruger and Dunning’s 1999 article, "Unskilled and Unaware of It," I reconstruct the work of first-year-writing as an ongoing process of becoming aware of new forms and understandings of writing. This process, I argue, is not merely a matter of in-struction but also of ex- or de-struction. Students can perceive new forms of writing only when their current ways of seeing are disrupted.

Second, in support of the generalizations derived from Kruger and Dunning, I describe how this process has been managed in some classrooms in our writing program. Here the pedagogical roles of two recent texts will be highlighted: Joseph Bizup’s "BEAM" article (2008) and Joseph Harris’s *Rewriting* (2006). Both encourage students to imagine specific audiences as they engage different sources for diverse academic purposes.

Third, drawing on interviews with students conducted as part of the study and, less rigorously, on student comments gathered during individual consultations and draft workshops, I describe the emergence of what Julia Colyar, in "Becoming Writing, Becoming Writers," her 2009 article in *Qualitative Inquiry*, calls "the rhetorical self." In this construction of composition, rhetoric is the awareness of belonging to a particular discourse community. Here the student as researcher becomes the first audience for the student writer.

By this point in the process, I conclude, “analyzing audience needs” has been muddled by an emerging awareness of multiple audiences, including one’s own emerging disciplinary self—thus the drop in scores for presenters. The appropriate response to the findings of our study, then, is the one the University Writing Program has already taken: rethink the Symposium.

Paper #3--“Generating Comparative Data for Examining the Ability of Different Program Designs to Promote Positive Attitudinal Shifts in First-Year Writers”

A follow-up to the initial study, this paper presents findings of a second study undertaken in fall 2010 that seeks to establish baseline data for examining the question of what kinds of program design better promote positive attitudinal shifts among first-year writers.

In their longitudinal study of Harvard undergraduates Sommers and Saltz (2004) examine the question of why some students continue to develop as writers while others do not. Arguing that attitudinal shifts rather than textual achievement are better predictors of ongoing development, Sommers and Saltz “conclude that the story of the freshman year is not one of dramatic changes on paper; it is the story of changes within the writers themselves.” These conclusions are supported by studies at other universities (Carroll, 2002; Thaiss and Zawacki, 2006).

In the initial study, students in both the control and experimental group experienced statistically significant shifts in attitudes about writing, audiences, and themselves as writers, but there was little to no difference in levels of shift between the control and experimental groups. Disconfirming the original hypothesis that participation in a large scale public writing event would create measurable differences in attitude, these results raised the question of what *could* account for the very positive, across the board, and unambiguous attitudinal shifts documented in both semesters of the study.

At the university where the initial study took place, first-year writing is taught in three distinct venues: the general population of the First-Year Writing Program (the one measured by the initial study), the Women’s Leadership Program, and the Honors Program. The Women’s Leadership Program and the Honors Program are both highly selective but also quite different in culture and pedagogical orientation. The Women’s Leadership Program is a residential learning program that emphasizes community and engagement while the Honors Program follows more of a Great Books model that emphasizes coverage. This study will use instruments from the original study to gather comparable data from these other two additional venues (NOTE: I will be on sabbatical in 2010-11 and will thus have the time to do the data collection, entry, and analysis on these smaller groups before the February conference). By comparing data across venues, this study looks to create an empirical basis for identifying programmatic features that better promote positive attitudinal shifts among first-year writers.