Writing Research Across Borders II Session I
Saturday, February 19 4:30-6:00pm

I1
Writing centres/centers and English language learners: Research on institutional pressures, programmatic challenges, student expectations, and culturally sensitive strategies (Part II) (See Session H10 for complete abstracts)

Lawrence Cleary, University of Limerick, Ireland
Wu Dan, Xi'an International Studies University, China
Ann-Marie Ericksson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
Magnus Gustafsson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
Joan Turner, Goldsmiths, University of London, U.K.
Carol Peterson Haviland, University of California, San Bernardino, U.S.
Amy Zenger, American University, Beirut, Lebanon
Paula Gillespie, Florida International, U.S.
Michelle Eodice, University of Oklahoma, U.S.
Terry Myers Zawacki George Mason University, U.S.

I2
Genre processes for advanced writers

Genre and Generic Labor

Clay Spinuzzi, University of Texas at Austin, U.S.

In North American Genre Theory (NAGT), genre is understood as a stabilized-for-now understanding of how to produce and understand texts (Schryer 1993; see Russell 1997, 2009 for overviews of NAGT). NAGT-based studies of work demonstrate that genres tend to be applied in clusters (variously theorized as sets, systems, repertoires, ecologies, etc.; see Spinuzzi 2004) to collectively mediate a relatively stable activity over time. Such workplace genres change over time as their activity changes, hybridizing, adapting, and sometimes disappearing (e.g., Bazerman 1988; Myers 1990; Spinuzzi 2003).

Yet genres sometimes change far more rapidly, particularly in activities that themselves change rapidly, that require constant innovation, that involve high turnover in autonomously functioning participants, and/or that heavily interpenetrate other activities (e.g., Slattery 2007; Spinuzzi 2008; Swarts 2007). In such cases, the genre is still "stabilized-for-now," but "now" becomes much shorter and "stabilized" becomes a much more relative term. And such cases seem to be more frequent in knowledge work (cf. Castells 2003; Drucker 1993; Engestrom 2008.).

In this paper, I propose further theorizing genre for such work activities by drawing from Manuel Castells' distinction between self-programmable labor, which is labor that can "reprogram itself, in skills, knowledge, and thinking to change tasks in an evolving business environment" (2003, pp.90-91), and generic labor, which can be generalized, automated, or codified (p.94). I compare this distinction to the traditional Bakhtinian distinction between official (centripetal) and unofficial (centrifugal) genres, proposing a matrix to help classify rapidly changing genres, and I illustrate by drawing from recent studies of rapid genre change in knowledge work.

I2 (continued)
Genre processes for advanced writers

Academic Genres, Argument Conventions, and Multilingual Writers
Iswari Pandey, Syracuse University, U.S.

While interest in globalization and internationalization of higher education has led to a burgeoning of research on the production of academic work by international writers in Anglo-American educational settings, many questions involving the writing practices of these academics within their immediate academic and professional worlds remain unanswered. For example, a number of studies (Bhatia; Canagarajah) have looked into the problems that scholars from non-Anglo-American regions face to publish in refereed international journals. But little research exists dealing with how they write for local professional audiences. How do multilingual academics conceptualize and write for their local professional audiences? What genre and argument conventions do they prioritize in their compositions? How do these practices converge and conflict with the prized practices in the Anglo-US settings?

Drawing on a large-scale qualitative study in India and specially focusing on the conference proposals that were published with the program of a national conference of university educators and again published—post-presentation—in the proceedings, my talk addresses these and related questions. The conference, called a national seminar on quality education, was organized by a central university and National Council for Teacher Education of India in which graduate students as well as published authors presented. Their papers were screened based on whether they contributed to the seminar topic of bridging theory-practice divide in English teaching at the school and college levels. My talk, centered on those presentations and proceedings as well as interviews with some of the presenters, contributes to the work in international writing studies by highlighting the complexities of rhetorical conventions and composing practices that expert and graduate-student writers negotiate in a multilingual society when they write in English. While these writers navigate local cultural and linguistic norms, they also reconstruct the genre and argument conventions that academic writers and presenters elsewhere follow. This presentation also demonstrates how academic writing today only selectively conforms to established genre conventions (Bazerman; Swales, for example). Understanding these strategies and their rhetorical effects is crucial to appreciating the creative negotiation of multilingual writers of English in academic settings.

Works Cited

Bazerman, Charles. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. Print.
Bhatia, V. K. *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman, 1993. Print.
Canagarajah, Suresh A. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 2003. Print.
Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Print.

I2 (continued)
Genre processes for advanced writers

Rethinking Collaborative Writing: The Effects of Social Media on Nonprofit Writers

Robert McEachern, Southern Connecticut State University, U.S.

In their 2004 *Journal of Business Communication* article, Lowry, Curtis, and Lowry review 20 years of research on group writing in the workplace, concluding that the discipline needs an agreed-upon definition of collaborative writing. Their resulting definition posits that collaborative writing involves a group of employees from the same organization, with shared goals, creating a document together, and that once the document is published or otherwise finished, the group may meet to self-assess, but the task is otherwise over.

At about the same time (2004), internet-based applications began to change. Web 2.0 applications, with their inherent interactivity between producer and consumer, replaced static web 1.0 applications. Eventually, applications such as social networks, wikis, blogs, and video-sharing sites produced what is known as "wikinomics" (Tapscott and Williams 2006), an attitude of expectation of interactivity from consumers. In the field of professional writing, this interactivity has changed collaborative practices. While Web 2.0 applications are often used internally for collaboration between co-workers (Krause 2009; Zhang, Zhu, and Hildebrandt 2009), much writing-based activity involves the creation of texts with those who are not employees of the writer's organization (Chappell and Church 2008; Mehrotra 2008). This collaboration, through applications as wikis, social networks, and blogs, juxtaposes the "official" versions of an organization's text with comments, revisions, and parallel versions written by outsiders. As a result, a different kind of "collaboration" is created, one that does not fit the definition accepted by the discipline.

This paper will describe ongoing research that examines the effects of Web 2.0 applications on the collaborative practices of writers in several nonprofit organizations. Using data from interviews with the writers and analyses of the texts they created singly and in collaboration with external audiences, it will ultimately argue that, based on the research completed, the definition of collaborative writing offered by Lowry, Curtis, and Lowry will need to be revised and expanded. Given the interactivity inherent in social media and other web 2.0 applications, the collaborative creation of a text is no longer a strictly internal process, but also involves readers/co-writers who are external to the organization. Furthermore, text creation is no longer a defined process, one with an easily demarcated beginning and end, but one that involves ongoing, publicly visible revision. Finally, for writers such as those in the study, whose primary writing takes place in social networks, the discipline's assumptions about the ubiquity of internal collaboration does not hold, as writers find that readers demand immediate responses which do not allow time for collaboration.

Zhang, Allee M., Yunxia Zhu, and Herbert Hildebrandt. "Enterprise Networking Web Sites and Organizational Communication in Australia." *Business Communication Quarterly* 72 1 (2009): 114-19. Print.

Enterprise 2.0 software: wikis are used for collaboration and knowledge sharing. Blogs are replacing newsletters, creates branding for indivs and depts. Podcasts allow new technology to be shared.

Krause, Tim. "Facilitating Teamwork with Lean Six Sigma and Web-Based Technology." *Business Communication Quarterly* 72 1 (2009): 84-90. Print.

Mehrotra, Rahul. "Printed Books and Online Help Using a Wiki." Presented at Society for technical Communication Annual Conference, Philadelphia, June 2008. Available at http://www.writersua.com/articles/WIKI/index.html

Chappell, Gail and Cindy Church. "Engaging Diverse Audiences Using Screencasts, Wikis, and Blogs." Presented at Society for technical Communication Annual Conference, Philadelphia, June 2008.

I3
Writing poetry in school at all ages
Teaching Primary School Students to Play with Poetry: An Intervention Study
Pietro Boscolo, University of Padova, Italy
Nicoletta Galvan, University of Padova, Italy
Carmen Gelati, University of Padova, Italy

Italian primary school children usually approach poetry through reading. They read and analyse the meaning of easy poems, and are asked to write personal comments. In pre-school and early grades, children are also invited to invent short poems and nonsense rhymes. In this case, only superficial aspects of poetry are considered (rhyme, in particular). Instead, even for young students, poetry writing requires the use of flexible operations in activities which offer both freedom and constraint (Wilson, 2009). In a previous study (Boscolo, Gelati, & Galvan, in press), primary school students were taught to re-write texts by respecting the constraints of narrative genre. The study to be presented reports an instructional intervention with 72 fifth-graders (M = 29, F = 43), who were taught to "play" with poetry. A control group comprised the same number of students (M = 31, F = 41). The study aimed to verify whether an approach to poetry, in which students are presented with a poem and asked to write a new version respecting structure and rhythm, has positive effects on their ability to modify poetic texts creatively and their attitude to poetry.

Before the intervention all students were submitted the following measures:

- Reading Comprehension Test
- WISC-R Vocabulary and Similarities sub-tests
- Beginning a new line: students were given a short poem without line breaks, and were asked to modify it by putting in the correct breaks
- Re-writing: students were given a short poem and asked to write another with a different but related title (the poem "Autumn" had to be re-written in keeping with the title "Spring")
- 7-item questionnaire regarding their like of poetry
- Self-efficacy of writing questionnaire, including 10 items on general writing skills (e.g., "Do you feel able to write a text without any spelling mistakes?"), and 7 items specifically regarding poetry writing.

The intervention, which lasted about 6 months (90 minutes a week), had two main objectives. The first was to help students realize that a poem can have different functions: to describe, narrate, recall, produce new meanings. The second objective was to help students discover "other" meanings of words, that is the metaphorical use of common words. At the beginning of the intervention, the teacher asked children for their beliefs about the features of a poetic text (e.g., "How can you understand whether what you are reading is a poem or a story?"). During the intervention, children were involved in several activities. Through poetry-reading, they were led to appreciate the music and rhythm of a poem, and understand the linguistic resources (alternate rhyme, couplet rhyme, assonance, etc.) which produce these effects. Regarding writing, they were taught

to re-write a poem by changing the subject but keeping the original rhythm, or the same number and length of verses and alliterations. The teacher had a scaffold function, in that she facilitated children's discovery by presenting examples of poems, underlining good results, and stimulating children's search for original solutions. The control group students were presented with poems in a traditional way.

After the intervention, all students were given the two motivational questionnaires and different versions of the "Beginning a new line" and "Re-writing" tasks. Moreover, the experimental group children participated in a re-elaboration task. They were given a poem, from which they had to select the finest words or lines and compose a new poem. In the presentation, differences between the intervention and control group students in poetry writing and attitude to poetry writing will be analysed as well as examples of children's poetic productions.

I3 (continued)
Writing poetry in school at all ages

Genre Knowledge and Development: Preadolescents Writing and Performing Poetry

Janine L. Certo, Michigan State University, U.S.

This study explored preadolescents' poetry knowledge and development. Forty fourth and fifth grade students across two classrooms in one U.S. school composed poems across one month before performing them. Afterwards, they were interviewed to explain: 1) why their text is a poem, 2) why they revised their poetry, and 3) their source (s) of learning how to write and perform poems. Questions included: 1) What is the working knowledge of poetry as demonstrated by preadolescents in poetic text production? and 2) What do preadolescents' original poems, discourse about their poems and performances, and discourse about their sources of learning reveal about poetry genre knowledge and development?

Drawing on ethnographic and textual analysis methods, this work is situated within the genre development studies (e.g. Dyson, 2003; Elster & Hanauer, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Schnoor, 2004). The researcher, two urban elementary school teachers, and community poets implemented writing sessions three times per week with preadolescents (n=42). Community poets performed poems, discussed their approach to writing and performing poems, and guided students in their own writing and performances. Instructional contexts were documented, including the writing process. The researcher kept conceptual memos each week in the field (Heath & Street, 2008). Students selected one poem to perform at a school -based reading, and their performances were videotaped.

Students composed between a range of 5-15 poems (over 300 poems). A poetry coding scheme was adapted from features generally-accepted by poetic language theorists (Friedrich, 1979; Jakobson, 1987) and from Kamberelis (1998; 1999) who has done analyses of a variety of children's writings. Children's poems and interview transcripts were coded in Hyperresearch[©] for actual and reported textural, structural and register features. Each poem was analyzed in relation to other data sources (child interviews, drafts of poems, audiotapes of instruction, poetry readings/performances, field notes, emails, demographic data) for a functional-rhetorical analysis.

This investigation is informed by genre theory, particularly genre conceptions inspired by Bakhtin (1986), where text (spoken, written, multimodal) is constructed relative to social practices and personal histories (Bazerman, 1997; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; Freedman & Medway, 1994; Russell, 1997). Findings here focus on student vignettes that represent major trends in the findings. Similarities included: 1) students' use of intertextual practices, such as literary borrowing from visiting poets, peers, and model poems, 2) increased revision activity closer to performance, 3) use of memorization and movement in performance and 4) children expressing a poet identity. There were differences in features used, including more use of multi-stanza and free verse poems in fifth grade. Fourth graders made more use of rhyme.

Knowledge of genres is front and center in becoming a competent writer across contexts, yet poetry is under represented in the curriculum. Poetry develops children's perceptions, draws their attention to language, and helps them make meaning of the world. This study informs what preadolescents, as legitimate peripheral participants, know and can do with poetry and the instructional contexts and social variables that are linked to children's knowledge and growth.

Writing poetry in school at all ages

Ways with Words: Teachers' Beliefs and Pedagogical Practices in the Use of Metalanguage to Teach Poetry

Anthony Wilson, University of Exeter, U.K.
Debra Myhill, University of Exeter, U.K.

Introduction

Research into poetry writing processes remains scant. A recent review of this literature (Wilson, 2009) argues that poetry writing is not accounted for in the well-established theories on the subject: Flower and Hayes (1980, 1981), Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), Kellogg (1994) and Sharples (1999). Many teachers avoid teaching the writing of poetry and in secondary (high-school) classrooms, poetry is more likely to be taught as part of the reading curriculum than the writing curriculum. At the same time, teachers in England have been encouraged to develop students' metalinguistic understanding through explicit teaching of grammar. Explicit knowledge is defined as '*knowledge that can identify and account for connections and distinctions between different examples of usage, enhance reading and improve writing*' (QCA 1998:20). The goal of acquiring such metalinguistic knowledge is to develop a repertoire of tools for writing: the ability '*to control and manipulate the material at hand*' is more significant than the ability '*to describe a linguistic feature using grammatical terminology*' (Van Lier 1998:136). With the teaching of poetry in particular, however, the metalanguage includes both linguistic metalanguage (eg verbs, clauses, subjects) and literary metalanguage (eg metaphors, caesura, enjambement). This paper demonstrates how teachers' pedagogical beliefs and practices about the value of metalanguage in the teaching of poetry is ambivalent and at times contradictory.

Methodology

The data for this paper is drawn from a nationally-funded (Economic and Social Research Council) study investigating the impact of contextualised teaching of metalanguage on students' writing and on students' metalinguistic understanding. The research design comprised a randomised controlled trial and a complementary qualitative data set. The qualitative study involved lesson observations of 32 classes being taught three units of work on writing narrative fiction, argument and poetry. One observation was conducted for each unit of work, giving a total of three observations per class, and 96 observations in total. After each observation the class teacher was interviewed to investigate his/her beliefs about teaching writing and to probe the pedagogical decisions made in the lesson. A student from each class was also interviewed to elicit their metalinguistic understanding and the linguistic choices made in their writing. It is the latter interview set which informs this paper.

Preliminary Findings

Preliminary findings indicate that teachers:

1. are less confident teaching the writing of poetry than narrative fiction and argument;

2. hold paradoxical beliefs about the role of literary and linguistic metalanguage in teaching poetry writing;
3. often use literary language formulaically or 'uncreatively', rather than as a guide to aid learners playing with language;
4. are confident with literary terminology but fearful of linguistic terminology;
5. articulate and reveal a lack of confidence in subject knowledge which shapes their view of the value of metalanguage.

Conclusion

The paper contributes to theoretical understanding of the significant role of subject knowledge in shaping teacher beliefs and indicates how writing instruction in poetry is less secure than the teaching of other genres. The implications for theory, policy and practice will be discussed. Potential recommendations for improving the quality of teaching the writing of poetry will be considered.

I4
Writing development in primary and secondary education
> The Visualization of Self: Multimodal Composition in Youth Media and the
> Realization of Adolescent Identity
> *Deborah Romero, University of Northern Colorado, U.S.*

This paper bridges work in New Literacy Studies with work from Multimodality to analyze literacies in an after-school setting. Specifically, it examines the impact of youth media technologies on both multimodal composition processes and products and explores how these impact identity development and agency. Analyses of qualitative data, collected during two years at an afterschool program with Latino youth, reveal how the collaborative experiences and resulting multimodal compositions empowered adolescents to reposition themselves as producers, not consumers, of media messages. Furthermore, students' multimodal texts were subsequently taken up as symbolic resources that impacted on-going identity formation and social agency as evidenced during public screenings of their work.

I4 (continued)
Writing development in primary and secondary education
> Talking about Writing: Language Socialization and Academic Writing in High School
>
> *Betsy Gilliland, University of California, Davis, U.S.*

Because it is rarely used in interactions outside of school, academic language is unfamiliar to all students, but especially to those from the culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds that make up the majority in California schools. As students progress through high school and into college, they must become more academically literate, taking on new ways of working with texts and expressing their perspectives on the information contained therein. The genres they produce become more abstract and require stronger control over linguistic structures to demonstrate more analytic thinking (Christie & Derewianka, 2009; Schleppegrell, 2004).

Later language socialization extends the concepts developed by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) to adolescents and adults learning to communicate within specific roles in institutions and communities (Ochs, 2002). Advanced literacy is of the many areas of language use to which adolescents must be socialized (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). Depending on their cultural backgrounds, students will have differing degrees of similarity between their home literacy socialization and that of the school (Heath, 1986).

Research Questions, Methods, Data

Taking a language socialization perspective, this year-long cross-case study documents the language used in discussing students' writing and identifies feedback practices that lead to development. This study of three high school English and English Language Development (ELD) classrooms seeks to understand what conceptions of academic writing underlie students' and teachers' talk about writing, how novice writers are socialized into an academic discourse community through talk about writing, and how expectations for student writing vary across grade levels.

Research methods include ethnographic participant observation in high school English language arts and English language development classrooms, audio recording of talk between teachers and focal students during writing instruction, interviews with teachers and students, and document analysis of student writing. In addition, the researcher is following graduating seniors into their community college composition classes the subsequent year, observing them in their classes and interviewing them.

Findings

Findings document a high degree of written and oral scaffolding in both the Ninth Grade English and Advanced ELD classes, with students completing entire essays during class time. In contrast, assignments in the mainstream Senior English course are minimally scaffolded, and students write the bulk of their texts as homework. Analysis of audio data from the high school classes reveals that students mostly ask procedural questions rather than conceptual questions, and that teachers mainly respond to students who bid for help rather than checking in with students who do not request assistance. Students in the ELD and ninth grade classes do incorporate language structures from their interactions with teachers into their writing, particularly in the form of sentence starters

provided by the teachers. In the community college classroom environment, preliminary findings suggest that the structure is somewhere between the two high school models: more scaffolding of assignments themselves, but with the expectation that students will be able to complete the work on their own time.

References

Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2009). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum International.

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*, 339-361.

Heath, S. B. (1986). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. In B. Schiefflin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (1st ed., pp. 97-124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99-120). London: Continuum.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language Socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163-191.

Schleppegrell, M. (2004). *The language of schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

I4 (continued)
Writing development in primary and secondary education

Noise or Music? Early Writing Development (8- to 11 Year Olds) in the
Perspective of Dynamic Systems Theory
Lieve Verheyden, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
with the cooperation of Kris Van den Branden, Gert Rijlaarsdam, Huub
van den Bergh, Sven De Maeyer

From a *developmental ladder*-perspective on language learning, variability is considered 'noise' rather than 'music'. The most important results of cross-sectional research on language development are the *mean* scores of large groups of performers of different ages, leading to the determination of "milestones" or "benchmarks". Between participants variance is mentioned but not often *used*. In longitudinal language studies the number of observations is often limited to two (e.g. pretest-posttest design), which necessarily implies that growth curves are linear (straight) and within participant fluctuations are blurred. *Dynamic Systems Theory* (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008), however, argues in favour of the fundamental recognition of (between and within participants) variance as an important source of information on the development of complex and dynamic systems, such as written language (development), which is impacted by a very individual interaction of learner factors and environmental factors.

In our presentation we will elaborate on one part of the results of our PhD-study, in which we modelled 30 second-language learning third-graders' development of narrative text quality, operationalised by means of one holistic variable, observed at six occasions spread over one school year. We compared three different multilevel growth models: (1) a model that imposed a linear growth curve on the data, (2) a model that imposed a polynominal growth curve on the data, and (3) a model in which no growth curve was imposed at all. The analyses revealed the third (multivariate) model to be significantly better than the two models that imposed a growth curve (linear or polynominal) on the data. This implies that these young (second language) writers follow their own changeable developmental path, as is hypothesized by Dynamic Systems Theory.

By way of illustration we will also go into one case study (two to four students form two different classrooms) to show potential links between context related factors such as writing instructions (in interaction with certain types of learners) and the intra-/inter-individual variance observed in the texts produced during the writing sessions (Polkinghorne, 1995; Chinn, 2006). Teacher support was observed during the introductory phase of the writing sessions, the coaching-while-writing phase and the feedback phase. In addition, data on teachers' cognitions were gathered through post-lesson semi-structured interviews in which teachers gave feedback on the writing development of some of their pupils, and on the factors that - according to them - prohibit or stimulate a smooth but steady growth in DSL writing skills. Children's narratives were collected and analysed (seven indices of text quality), together with their answers on written questionnaires investigating their appreciation of the writing sessions. Analyses of the written narratives of the eight participating pupils revealed potential links between

the individual growth curves for different text measures and the writing instructions plus teacher support that the learners received.

I5
The "Things They Carried": Transfer, composition, and cultures of writing

Liane Robertson, Florida State University, U.S.
Kathleen Blake Yancey, Florida State University, U.S.
Kara Taczak, Florida State University, U.S.

Overview:

Successful transfer—applying knowledge and practice gained in one context to challenges posed in new contexts—is a foundational goal of all educational endeavors. Within the last decade, research by several scholars—including Smit (2004), Beaufort (2007), Downs and Wardle (2007), Bergmann and Zepernick (2007), and Jarrett, et al. (2008)—suggests first, that first-year composition (FYC) courses are inadequate for the transfer of knowledge, and second, that if a more intentional, rhetorically aware, conceptual model of writing informed the FYC curriculum, transfer would be more likely.

Responding to these findings and others, this panel considers the major themes in the research on transfer as a context for considering two previously overlooked but significant factors in students' ability to transfer knowledge and practice from FYC to other writing situations: (1) the content of composition and (2) systematic reflection. On the basis of this research, this panel thus points first, to revisions in our understandings of knowledge transfer and second, to revisions in the design of FYC curricula that enhance the possibility of transfer and better prepare students to write across the curriculum and into their major disciplines.

Panelist 1: Context and Cultures of Writing

The first presentation begins with a three-part context keyed to (1) definitions of writing; (2) a synthesis of what the research shows; and (3) a discussion of what the research means. Any discussion of transfer in writing needs to begin with our definition of writing. Here that definition is located in three significant shifts keyed to changing definitions of composing: writing process approaches; genre- and discourse-community approaches; system or framework-based approaches. Among these, the most common is the writing process approach (Fulkerson). The research on transfer—synthesized from research studies, from assessment studies, and from the literature of higher education— paints a fairly consistent picture of what and how students transfer writing knowledge and practice. When students enter college, for example, many of them are able to evaluate their own writing relative to a collegiate schema (Blakesley). Once in college, they develop both an understanding of the value of writing processes and their own writing process(es), and they carry these forward with them, although they tend to truncate and adapt processes for other situations (Hageman; Jarratt; Hilgers et al). In college, students begin to understand genre as a schema, but they have not developed a language for talking about it nor have they developed a framework or theory that could relate a family of genres to each other or across genres (Hilgers et al). Likewise, students don't seem to develop an epistemological understanding of how knowledge is made generally nor in their own fields through genres (Russell and Yanez; Marra and Palmer; Wineberg). Students who seem to develop more fully as writers understand the need to adopt a novice stance (Hansen; Dennis; Sommers and Saltz); they see the connection

between their own writing development and their future as writers (Beaufort; Tollivar Burton); and they value the disciplinary knowledge of their instructors (Bergman) and see that as key to their own development as writers. A review of this research thus shows both that we can succeed in fostering transfer and that there are two new areas in particular that merit inquiry. The fact that so many students at so many institutions understand and practice process suggests that even when our teaching is not designed for transfer, it leads to transfer. However, without a robust vocabulary to describe the new learning, students struggle to describe what they have learned. In addition, there are new questions about the utility of two new approaches to collegiate composition. The first question not addressed in the research is the role of content in transfer. Beaufort's conceptual model includes content knowledge, of course, but seems to suggest that content resides only in curricular sites *outside* first-year composition. This raises a question about how transfer in FYC might be affected relative to the content taught in this course. Second, while several scholars recommend reflection as a mechanism for transfer, thus far no study has invited students to develop their own theory of writing and inquired into the efficacy of doing so.

Panelist 2: Context and Content: Sites of Transfer

This ten-month research study seeks to identify the role that content plays in the transfer of knowledge and practice from the first-year composition classroom to other writing contexts in college. More specifically, the study begins with what is transferred in two sites: first, within the course, from assignment to assignment over one semester; and second, from first-year composition into other writing situations, in a range of disciplines, the following semester. The study includes nine students, three students from each of three differently themed sections of first-year composition at a Research–1 institution. One section focuses on culture and media and asks students to analyze the impact of social forces on writing; a second section takes an expressivist approach to composition, encouraging students to explore their role as writers existing in and influenced by society's and their own expectations; and a third was designed to "teach for transfer" using content designed deliberately to encourage knowledge about writing that can be applied to other writing contexts beyond the first-year composition classroom. The other writing contexts students engage in are academic situations, including courses in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts. Through a multi-modal methodology that includes discourse analysis of student writing and course assignments, interviews with students, and questionnaires about writing perceptions and approaches to assignments, this study explores three foci: evidence of the occurrence of transfer between assignments in each course, evidence that transfer is connected to specific content, and evidence of transfer between first-year composition and subsequent contexts of writing inside the academy. Preliminary findings indicate that the students in the "teaching for transfer" course are better prepared for writing in other contexts than students in the other two sections studied, and that deliberate content design has enhanced their ability to transfer. By comparing the three varieties of content in each of the first-year composition course designs, this study evaluates the content that is transferred best, suggests what makes this transfer occur effectively, and recommends specific FYC content designed to assure transfer to other writing contexts in college.

Panelist 3: Context and Reflection: The Enhancement of Transfer

This panelist's study looks at the role of reflection as a vehicle to enhance transfer and the efficacy of incorporating into the first-year composition classroom. While scholars have addressed the role that transfer may or may not play in the composition classroom, none has addressed the role of reflection as a deliberate, systematic strategy to assist students in transferring writing knowledge and practice to other contexts. Anne Beaufort, for example, identifies five knowledge domains and concepts—rhetorical knowledge, discourse community, genre knowledge, process knowledge, and content knowledge—that she believes are key to the transfer of knowledge from first year composition to other sites of writing, and she points out that reflection is needed as well. She does not, however, explore how reflection specifically works to foster transfer or the means by which it is used. This study thus takes up where Beaufort's "leaves off" beginning with Donald Schon's and Kathleen Yancey's contention that reflection allows people to "theorize [their] own practices" so that they can improve their work—both within the workplace and the academy—and focusing on case studies of six students in a first-year composition course designed to teach for Drawing specifically from Schon and Yancey's three nested types of reflection—reflection-in-action; constructive reflection; and reflection-in-presentation—this qualitative study uses interviews, visual representations, and student writing as data sources to map how reflection does or does not assist students in transferring knowledge and practice. Through an analysis of these data sources, preliminary findings show that systematic reflection becomes a reiterative practice encouraging the students to identify themselves as reflective practitioners and that reflection becomes a key term for the students—one that they will call on and use in later writing courses. Further analysis will examine in what ways reflection does or does not foster the transfer of knowledge from first year composition class to other academic writing sites and recommendations for including reflection in first-year composition course design.

I6
Studying college student writers engaged in sites of politics, policy and business

Writing about Culture: What Counts as Research in an American Undergraduate Ethnography Course?

Elizabeth G. Allan, Oakland University, U.S.

In the context of the International Writing Research Conference, assumptions about what counts as research and how issues of informed consent and institutional oversight are negotiated cannot remain unexamined. Discussions of research practices at the Santa Barbara conference revealed, for example, that in many non-American contexts, there is no requirement to obtain assent from minors and consent from parents in order to conduct qualitative research in the equivalent of American K-12 classrooms; the consent of the principal is sufficient. In the U.S., however, minors are considered a "vulnerable population," and faculty research proposals involving such populations are subject to stringent review by an Institutional Review Board [IRB]. However, it is not unusual for American college-level instructors to assign primary research projects to their undergraduate students without any IRB exemptions or approvals, despite a growing trend toward publishing undergraduate work in journals and at conferences.

In American colleges and universities, the policies regulating *undergraduate* research are inconsistently enforced or perhaps widely misunderstood. At one American university, for example, institutional guidelines for conducting undergraduate research state: "Projects intended to demonstrate research or assessment techniques and that are not designed to provide generalizable knowledge, need not be submitted to the IRB as long as risks to subjects are no more than minimal." While there is an expectation that the instructors will "cover" ethical principles of research in class, most of this undergraduate research—including interviews, surveys, observations of minors, and video data collection— is conducted without consulting the IRB. The distinction between *demonstrating* research and *doing* it seems to hang on that gray generalizability clause, which has often been interpreted as something akin to "what gets researched in the classroom, stays in the classroom" or, perhaps less charitably, "don't analyze, don't tell."

At the time of this writing, I am in the early design phase of a qualitative study which investigates the gap between policy and practice in American undergraduate research pedagogy. I will be conducting teacher-research in my own undergraduate courses in the 2010-2011 academic year, focusing on a course that explicitly takes ethnographic inquiry as its subject. Writing About Culture: Ethnography challenges the boundary between what most American universities consider "real" research—that is, human participants research subject to IRB approval under United States Federal regulations—and "classroom project" research. At the time of the Writing Research Across Borders II conference, I will be in the data-collection phase. This individual presentation will analyze data collected in the first half of the data collection cycle, using a grounded theory approach to formulate and refine research questions during the second round of data collection. I invite my international writing research colleagues to join me in a dialogue about the teaching of undergraduate research and my own research-in-progress, anticipating that their perspectives will enrich—and perhaps challenge—my own interpretations of the data.

I6 (continued)
Studying college student writers engaged in sites of politics, policy and business

Professional Writing in a Digital Writing Center: The Effect of Learning Styles on the Learning and Writing Process
Mariëlle Leijten, University of Antwerp, Belgium
Luuk van Waes, University of Antwerp, Belgium

One of the main advantages of online learning materials should be that they are suitable for students with different learning styles. This paper presents a study and a methodology to investigate whether students with different learning styles make use of the potential flexibility of online learning materials, i.c. in the context of Calliope – an online writing center (www.calliope.be; Opdenacker & Van Waes 2007).

Research questions
The present study was carried out to determine whether one of the modules developed for Calliope, related to writing Bad news letters, is really suitable for students with different learning styles and whether students with different learning styles make use of its' potential flexibility.
Therefore, the main research questions are:
   Is the Calliope module on bad news letters suitable for students with different learning styles?
   a. Do students with different learning styles carry out the task in different ways?
   b. What is the relation between learning styles and the quality of the letters produced?

Task
Twenty students each completed the Kolb's Learning Style Inventory questionnaire (Kolb, 1984), which distinguishes between four different learning styles: the accommodator, the assimilator, the converger and the diverger. Next they completed a module on writing bad news letters designed in the context of Business Communication courses. The assignment was to practice writing a bad news letter, in Dutch, on the basis of a case description. Theory and small exercises were provided in the online module. The letter had to be written in MS Word, and participants were given four hours to complete the task.

Method
Each participant was observed as he/she worked in Word or consulted the Calliope module with *Inputlog*, a keystroke logging program (www.inputlog.net; Leijten & Van Waes, 2006), and with Statcounter (www.statcounter.com), a program which records details of page views in web browsers such as MS Internet Explorer. By combining the data collected by these two applications, we were able to observe participants' writing processes and determine how they interacted with the Calliope module during the writing process. Finally their letters were graded to determine their quality .

Results
An effect of learning style was found, which suggests that writers with different learning

styles tackle the learning materials in different ways, often in line with the preferences that characterize their learning styles. For instance, participants who were characterized as so called C*onvergers* are most likely to focus on the case in the beginning, while *Assimilators* are most likely to do so in the middle of the writing process, which is largely in line with our hypotheses. In other words, it seems as if writers with different learning styles do benefit from the flexible way in which the sections in the Bad news letter module can be accessed.

With regards to text quality, there were no significant differences in text quality between writers with different learning styles. This suggests that there are perhaps other mediating factors which influence text quality more than a writer's learning style. In addition, we believe this also suggests that Calliope appears to cater to writers with different learning styles.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experimental learning. Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey.

Leijten, M. & Van Waes, L. (2006). Inputlog: New Perspectives on the Logging of On-Line Writing. In K.P.H. Sullivan & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Computer Key Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications* (pp.73-94). Oxford: Elsevier.

Opdenacker, L., & Van Waes, L. (2007). Implementing an open process approach to a multilingual online writing center; The case of Calliope. *Computers and Composition*, 24(3), 247 - 265.

I6 (continued)
Studying college student writers engaged in sites of politics, policy and business

Sponsoring "Green" Subjects: The World Bank's 2009 Youth Essay Contest
Anne Porter, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, U.S.

In 2009, the World Bank held a Youth Essay Contest, inviting submissions on the topic of "The Next Generation of Green Entrepreneurs." 18-25 year-olds from all over the world were invited to submit essays over the web in English, French, or Spanish in response to the following questions: "How does climate change affect you?" and "How can you tackle climate change through youth-led solutions?" Nearly 2500 college age youth from over 150 countries participated in the contest, and 90% of them hailed from the Global South.   The three winning essays and the five finalist essays, which are available online, provide moving testimony and ideas for addressing global warming. The essays nonetheless differ in the degree to which they endorse the Bank's philosophy of "green neoliberalism" (Goldman 2005).

The World Bank is for many a symbol of neoliberal globalization, and it is also one of world's most influential sponsors of literacy. (Jones) Therefore, "it is useful"--as Brandt (2001) suggests-- "to think about who or what underwrites occasions of literacy learning and use" (19).   Many schools, newspapers, civic organizations, and corporations regularly offer essay contests, but few studies focus on the rhetoric of such contests. In this presentation, I consider how contest materials, and the essay task in particular, appealed to certain audiences and promoted certain lines of (environmentalist) inquiry. I read the essays for the degree to which writers adhered to, or departed from, the task's implied narrative structure and interpretation of "solutions."

This study builds on work in "constitutive rhetoric" (Charland, Burke), new literacy studies (Street, Scribner and Cole), critical cultural studies (Althusser) and rhetorical genre (Miller, Bawarshi).   I interpret these essays in relation to the priorities, directions and incentives that were built into the task.   Methods of narrative and rhetorical analysis were used to examine the online call for essays, guidelines, and the two-part structure of the prompt. The essays were then coded and assigned point values based on the degree to which they begin with climate change testimony and end with youth-led, "green economy,"and/ or "entrepreneurial" solutions. They were additionally scored for how clearly their solutions aligned with representations of the World Bank agenda appearing on the webpage to which essayists were referred.

Though the losing essays were not available for analysis, all of the winning and finalist essayists wrote compellingly about their experiences with climate change in their communities, and all followed the basic narrative structure that had been provided by the prompt. Where the winners appeared to differ from the finalists was in their level of agreement with the Bank's own "green economy" solutions. Several essayists whose interpretations differed starkly were nonetheless able to become finalists and have their work made available online. These findings suggest some of the limitations and possibilities that accompany the sponsorship of green literacy practices. In the age of the internet and transnational communications, the ambiguity of these findings suggest some of the ways by which sponsors of environmental literacy simultaneously enable and constrain writing subjects.

Works Cited

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)." *Ideology and the State. Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* NY: Monthly Review Press, 1971. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer*: *Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2003. Print.

Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy in American Lives.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. Print

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Quebecois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (2), 1987, 133-50.

Goldman, Michael. *Imperial Nature: The World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalization.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005. Print.

Jones, Phillip W. *World Bank Financing of Education: Lending, Learning, and Development, Second Ed.* NY: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 70, 1984, 151-167.

Scribner, Sylvia and Michael Cole. "Unpackaging Literacy." Reprinted in *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Cushman et al, Eds. Boston: Bedford/ St. Martins, 2001. Print.

Street, Brian. "Introduction." Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy. Brian Street, Ed. NY: Cambridge UP, 1993, 1-21.

I7
Linguistic approaches to middle school writing
Effects of Morphological Instruction in Children's Writing
Deborah McCutchen, University of Washington, U.S.

Although morphological skill has been studied in the context of oral language development and reading, comparable research on the contribution of morphological knowledge to children's writing is less extensive (e.g., Largy, Cousin, Bryant & Fayol, 2007). As is the case with phonological knowledge, children demonstrate evidence of tacit morphological knowledge relatively early in the development of their oral language skills, as they learn to generate verb tenses, plurals, and other syntactic markers -- often by age three (Berko, 1958). Nunes and Bryant (2006) argued, however, that children need more explicit morphological knowledge, in addition to explicit phonological knowledge, to become fluent readers and writers.

In the theoretical models of writing proposed by Hayes and Flower (1980; Hayes, 1996) morphological skill might routinely facilitate both text generation (i.e., retrieving appropriate lexical items) and transcription processes, particularly spelling. especially helpful in spelling, demystifying many peculiarities in English (see also Moats, 1983; Nagy & Scott, 2000). For example, morphological knowledge can help a child understand why the same sound is spelled differently across words with different morphological structures (*fox, locks*). In addition, children might use morphological knowledge to bootstrap their vocabulary development, and broader vocabulary knowledge can help writers retrieve appropriate lexical representations for their semantic intent during text generation, especially for the decontextualized language so common in academic written language (Nagy & Scott, 2000). Indeed, McCutchen, Covill, Hoyne, & Mildes (1994) found that young skilled writers accessed words from memory more quickly than less skilled writers. In addition, knowledge of morphological transformations (e.g., <u>nation</u>, <u>national</u>) could assist writers as they try to construct the syntax of transitions across sentences (McCutchen, 1987), or as they attempt to honor given-new constraints (Clark & Haviland, 1977) in their texts.

This study examined children's use and spelling of morphological markers in their writing. We examined morphological forms used within text written by 175 fifth grade students in U.S. schools. We assessed the extent to which children's morphological awareness was related to their attempts to include more complex morphological forms in their writing and their ability to spell those attempts more accurately. Using a sentence-combining task that invited morphological manipulation of words, we documented that children with higher morphological awareness used more morphologically complex words in their written sentences and were more accurate in their spelling of those words. Following an intervention, in which children in half of the participating classrooms received morphologically focused vocabulary instruction, children completed the sentence-combining task a second time. Lower performing children in intervention classrooms used more morphologically complex forms at posttest, and spelled them more accurately, than their peers in control classrooms. The study adds to our understanding of the basic linguistic knowledge and subskills that contribute to writing ability.

Prominent Feature Analysis: New Promise for Growth in Student Writing
Sherry S. Swain, National Writing Project, U.S.
Richard L. Graves, Auburn University, U.S.
David T. Morse, Mississippi State University, U.S.

Our study sought to identify the features present in students' writing at various achievement levels with the ultimate goal of improving writing instruction. In studying effects of state assessments on writing instruction, Huot argues for assessment that will "recognize the importance of context, rhetoric, teaching, and learning" and be based on clear features of language use. Hillocks suggests that while teachers find fault with their state assessments, they do not know how to conduct detailed analyses of those assessments. We hypothesized that if teachers understood the specific features of writing at various levels, they would be better prepared for teaching and curriculum development.

The research questions that guided our study included the following:
1. What are the prominent features of the writing of seventh-graders at various assessment score points?
2. What correlations, if any, exist between the prominent features and assessment scores?
3. What correlations, if any, exist among the prominent features themselves?

To answer these questions, we examined the assessment writing of 464 seventh grade students. The methodology included protocols for examining exemplar papers, a process for determining a list of features and what constitutes "prominent" for each of the features, a method for recording features observed in each paper, a process for determining the level of agreement among readers, and criteria for a research team of teachers to serve as readers. No external guidelines or rubrics were used in the analysis; the methodology relied on the expertise of the research team and on frequent professional discussions required by the protocols.

Statistical analyses yielded results with both instructional and assessment implications, including some 32 prominent features, 22 positive and 10 negative, with a classification consistency of 97%. Of the 22 positive features, 14 correlated positively with the assessment scores (i.e., elaborated details, cumulative sentences). Of the ten negative features, 8 correlated negatively with the assessment scores (i.e., usage problems, redundancy). There were 108 statistically significant ($p < .001$) interrcorrelations among the features, with potential for instructional implications. (i.e., elaborated details and cumulative sentences were negatively correlated with redundancy, suggesting that a focus on these positive features could reduce redundancy.) A formula was devised to yield prominent feature scores, the scores ranging from 3 to 21, a more useful range than the 4-point assessment scale. Prominent feature scores were also significantly correlated with assessment scores ($r = .54$). Prominent feature analysis may be useful for teachers studying student writing for instructional purposes, for professionals leading professional development programs, and for researchers in the field of writing assessment.

Swain, Sherry S., Richard L. Graves, and David T. Morse, "A Prominent Feature Analysis of Seventh Grade Writing." Journal of Writing Assessment. In Press. Print.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (2002). *The testing trap: How state writing assessments control learning.*
New York: Teachers College Press.

Huot, B. (1996). Toward a new theory of writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, *47*, 549–566

Swain, Sherry S., Richard L. Graves, and David T. Morse, "Prominent Feature Analysis: What It Means for the Classroom." English Journal. 99.4 (2010): 84-89. Print.

Linguistic approaches to middle and secondary school writing
Hypertext writing and observational learning: Effects on writing skills

Martine Braaksma, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Gert Rijlaarsdam, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands*
Huub van den Bergh, Utrecht University, Netherlands*

With the introduction of a new examination program in the Netherlands, writing education in the upper forms of secondary education has changed considerably. It has led to more frequent writing tasks and more variation in writing tasks for the school subject Dutch and to an increased use of writing and presentations in the other subjects. Furthermore, information and communication technology (ICT) plays an important role in information retrieval and in text composition and revision.

Until now, practice and research are mostly restricted to the traditional paper format and focused on the deconstruction of the phases of the writing process. Underneath, two assumptions about learning guide this restricted view on learning to write: (1) the adage 'practice makes perfect': when students have to learn to *write,* than they have to *write* a paper, and (2) the idea of similarity of tasks: when students have to learn to write a *paper*, then they have to write a *paper*. In our research project, these two assumptions about learning are *refuted* to improve practice and to extend and refine theory on writing processes. We study whether two innovative learning arrangements could improve the quality of writing. Two learning arrangements are studied: learning by writing *hypertexts* (instead of 'linear' texts), and *observational learning* (instead of performing).

To test these assumptions, we set up an experiment in which 78 students (eleventh grade, pre-university level) followed at school a lesson series in argumentative writing in three different conditions: two experimental conditions and a control condition. The three versions of the lesson series were similar in many aspects: same text type (argumentative text), theme, documentation materials, instruction time, etc. Only the writing format differed between the conditions. In the experimental condition HYP students (n=26) wrote an essay in hypertext form; in the experimental condition OBS students (n=30) did not write themselves, but instead observed (on video) peer writers writing their essay; in the control group LIN students (n= 22) wrote an essay in linear form. Furthermore, we added an extra control group (CON). In this condition, students (n=26) followed the regular writing lessons provided by their own teacher. Before and after the lesson series, the writing skills (text quality) of all students were assessed; students wrote argumentative essays in linear form. The argumentative text quality of these essays were coded by three independent coders and proved to be reliable.

Regression analysis showed no differences between conditions on argumentative text quality for students with a medium writing skill (i.e., medium scores at text quality at the pre-test). However, aptitude-treatment-interactions were found; the regression slopes differed significantly between the conditions showing that students with a higher writing skill wrote an argumentative text of a higher quality in the post-test when they were in the hypertext-condition or observational learning condition during the intervention than students in both control conditions. It might be that these students could cope with the

unusual learning formats of hypertext writing and observational learning and transfer their 'new' writing approach to linear writing.

I8
Initiating discourse: Writing research on the workplace through empirical and historical lenses

Lindsay Steiner, Kent State University, U.S.
Diana Awad Scrocco, Kent State University, U.S.
Courtney Werner, Kent State University, U.S.

This panel discusses various ways that people engage in literate practices as part of their initiation into specific discourse communities. We draw on empirical and historical research that locates various literate practices within each research site and situate our arguments within the larger field of writing studies. The first speaker discusses the implications of a grounded observational study of novice graphic design students and how these students articulate argument through document design as a way of initiation into the field of professional visual communication. The second speaker explains how resident physicians training in a resident-run outpatient clinic describe and understand the role of literate practices in their initiation into the discourse community of medicine. Drawing from a historical analysis study, the third speaker focuses on how the field of rhetoric and composition has taken up new media studies and how that genre of writing impacts the field of rhetoric and composition as a workplace. We make both local and global connections between these empirical and historical projects as part of a larger argument for the theoretical and practical importance of workplace literacy research in the field of writing studies.

Speaker 1: Designing Visual Rhetoric: Articulating Argument through Document Design

Drawing on the findings from a semester-long grounded observation study of a novice graphic design class at a public research university, I discuss how a group of novice document designers learn to articulate qualities of argument in design as part of their initiation into the field of professional visual communication. Specifically, I ask how document designers articulate qualities of argument in the work that they do, and I collect and analyze the data with that research question in mind. Researchers of document design and multimodality suggest that both the form and content of a text are key contributors to meaning (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996; Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003; Schriver, 1997). Despite these and other scholars' focus on design and form, there is an implicit privileging of the content (what is *said*) and of the print-linguistic elements of a text in the field of writing studies. The form, or design, is implicitly considered as *secondary* to the content in contributing to a text's meaning. Due to the oft-contested and vague understanding of "meaning," I substitute the term with "argument" in order to provide this study with a stronger connection to the field of rhetoric and composition. There is plenty of scholarship that addresses the semiotic and rhetorical functions of visual modes, but less scholarship that addresses the possible connections between document design and argument, and much of this scholarship focuses only on the *texts* and not the design *practices* and the designers *themselves*. My research is a step towards connecting the theoretical and empirical grounding of the elements of argumentation conveyed in both form (design) and content as articulated by practitioners in document design. By studying the practices of novice document designers, I gain

insight into connections between argument and document design as situated in an environment used for the initiation into a specific field of practice.

References

Kostelnick, C., & Hassett, M. (2003). *Shaping information: The rhetoric of visual conventions.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design.* New York: Routledge.
Schriver, K. (1997). *Dynamics in document design.* New York: Wiley Computer.

Speaker 2: The Literate Practices of Resident Physicians in a Resident-Run Internal Medicine Clinic

In this presentation, I discuss how resident physicians training in a resident-run outpatient clinic describe and understand the role of literate practices in their initiation into the discourse community of medicine. Analyzing the findings from a semester-long grounded interview study with five internal medicine resident physicians, I explain how they characterize the importance of their literate practices in the clinic while they are seeing patients and while they are conferring with attending physician preceptors. The main research question motivating the current study can be framed in the following way: How do resident physicians describe the writing and the reading that they do in a resident-run outpatient clinic while they are seeing patients and while they are conferring with preceptors? I analyze how resident physicians portray their sharing of texts in this clinic, drawing on theories of distributed cognition to understand how the literate practices in this clinic become dispersed among residents and preceptors (Hutchins, 1995). The findings from this study have interesting implications for studies of writing in professional settings. First, this study suggests the wide range of reference materials that residents use and value while learning to practice medicine. Also, this study examines the ways that residents conceptualize the material written in the patient chart and the identity roles of residents and preceptors. Finally, this study theorizes about the various ways that residents and preceptors collaborate during literate activities to accomplish medical work. Throughout my analysis of my findings, I draw on theories of literacy, including Heath's (1983) notions of literacy events, Street's (1984) concept of literacy as a situated social practice, and Gee's (2008) understanding of the relationship between literacy and identity. I argue that, in discussing their literate practices, these residents' convey clear notions of how to accommodate multiple audiences, compose several drafts for different purposes, use various textual and interpersonal resources, and employ other important rhetorical strategies. I conclude that these residents demonstrate an understanding of the dynamic nature of *in situ* literate practices in the workplace.

References

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. New York: Routledge.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Speaker 3: Old researcher, new researcher: Trajectories of indoctrination into rhetoric and composition through evolving subfields

      In this presentation, I offer an historical analysis of new media studies as a genre of writing within the field of rhetoric and composition. I ask: How is the concept of new media articulated and acted upon in rhetoric and composition? Because disciplines are ever evolving, newcomers to rhetoric and composition have a different understanding of the field than do more tenured researchers. These newcomers may also have a different vision of what it means to do work in the field and be an active member of the rhetoric and composition community. I draw upon the history of rhetoric and composition as a discipline (Bloom, Daiker & White, 2003; Connors, 1997; Berlin, 1987; Foucault, 1970) to discuss the foundational elements of the field and the professionalization of members into the field. I situate nuances of writing studies within the field as pertains to theories of writing and new media studies (Kress, 2003; Witte, 1992; Arnheim, 1969). By understanding the development of rhetoric and composition and its subfields, I construct theories pertinent to the development and professionalization of rhetoric and composition as a workplace. The primary data collected for this research includes a sampling of journal articles from the most prominent and influential journals in the field of rhetoric and composition. For this presentation I review only four decades of history, beginning with 1970 and leading up to 2010. I carefully selected each journal and journal articles for their influence within their respective decades. Calls for Proposals (CFPs) from the most prominent and influential professional conferences in rhetoric and compositions are also in my data sample and are used to identify trends, terminology, subfields, and indoctrination techniques. I focus primarily on new media studies particularly as a term, a theory of writing, and a subfield within which new scholars are acculturated. In creating an archeology of writing constructs and theories of writing, I shape an understanding of how the field of rhetoric and composition has evolved over time as well as what it means to be initiated into an ever-shifting workplace. Integral to my research is defining how new concepts become central to rhetoric and composition studies as well as how researchers satisfy requirements of fully acculturated professionals within a diversifying work place.

<div align="center">References</div>

Arnheim, R. (1969). *Visual thinking*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berlin, J. (1987*). Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bloom, L. Z, Daiker, D. A., & White, E. M. (2003). *Composition studies in the new millennium: Rereading the past, rewriting the future*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Connors, R. J. (1997). *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, theory, and pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Foucault, M. (1970). The archeology of knowledge. *Social Science Information*, *9*, 175-185.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. New York: Routledge.

Witte, S. P. (1992). Context, text, intertext: Toward a constructivist semiotic of writing. *Written Communication*, *9*(2), 237-308.

I9
Writing development across disciplines and national curricula: Dilemmas and challenges for research

Sigmund Ongstad, Oslo University College, Norway
Froydis Hertzberg, Oslo University, Norway
Synnøve Matre, National Centre of Writing Education and Research, Trondheim, Norway

In 2006 Norway, rather radically, introduced a new national curriculum in which five basic competencies must be integrated in all school subjects from year 1 to 13 (age 6 to 19). Http://www.udir.no/Tema/In-English/Curriculum-in-English/. One of these key competencies is writing, and for the compulsory school (1-10) the written curriculum describes sets of particular goals for years 2, 4, 7 and 10. In 2009 the Ministry of Education decided that *all* curricular goals in all educations and at all levels from year one up to doctoral courses should be formulated as testable descriptors. Hence curricular goals for writing have to be formulated so that they can be tested.

Internationally there is a strong political will to strengthen the role of language in school learning (CoE, 2009) http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Schoollang_EN.asp#P4_22 Around 40 European countries have for instance followed closely the project *Language(s) of Schooling* (2005-2009) in which writing and writing across disciplines have been important issues. Also, although the PISA-project decided not to compare writing internationally (for validity reasons caused by context differences), many nations are now developing national test for writing skills on different levels.

Such inter-/national ambitions raise in turn raise a series of questions, dilemmas and challenges for research on writing, of which our panel focuses the following: Which expectations are expressed in different national curricula and how research based are they? (Sigmund Ongstad's paper.) Are schools and teachers in the different school subjects ready to tackle these challenges? (Frøydis Hertzberg's paper.) How to design national tests so that they actually measure expected norms on different levels? (Synnøve Matre's paper.)

Positioning perceptions of 'writing' in North-Western European national curricula. A comparative study.
Sigmund Ongstad, Oslo University College   sigmund.ongstad@lui.hio.no

In studies of developments of research on writing both Nystrand et al (1993) and Ongstad (2001) found a common pattern: From the 1930s onwards dominating approaches to writing both in North-America and in Scandinavia (respectively) followed rather narrowly hegemonic language perceptions in linguistics (formalism, constructivism/semanticism, social constructionism/functionalism, dialogism/interactionism). Tendencies were traced till the 1990s. Further there is an increased governmental will the last decades to establish national/federal policies for literacy in general and for reading and writing in particular. Consequently concepts and

notions such as *basic skills*, *literacies* and *communicative competances* have become commonplace and crucial in national curricula and internationally. Finally one has seen a significant extension of the scope for schooling and learning in society. Pre-school years are more focused, years of compulsory schooling have increased and school and lifelong learning are moreoften connected in policy documents. This broader view of education has in turn contributed to new concerns among teachers, researchers and policy makers, not the least regarding writing: *how* can competencies be developed and accordingly, how can one know *to which degree* they actually have and *why*? Ministries have of course always had to *estimate* or *stipulate* a certain direction for students', classes' and cohorts' development when designing curricula, but often without any basis in empirical research.

An important pre-investigation for a more extensive research on these issues could therefore be to describe the discursive/rhetoric perceptions of the stipulated development through the years of schooling as they symptomatically may come to surface in national and federal curricula. Looking at these questions internationally yet another pattern is of interest: some countries, such as Norway and UK, have recently rather based their written curricula more on specific chosen *stages* than on a *year-by-year-description*. Whether this 'simplification' is an educational means or a tool for testing is an open question.

Hence my study will trace further development(s) between 1990 and 2010 by analyzing perceptions of 'writing', especially in national curricula in Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK. Although a purpose is descriptive documentation, a general hypothesis is that a wide range of discursive theories on language and communication might occur differently in different national curricula. In the summing-up session at the 2008 Santa Barbara-conference increased complexity was underlined by commentators, a tendency even reflected in Bazerman et al (2010). The panel-presentation will highlight specific comparative aspects and will generally ask: Which roles can/should research on writing have/take vis-à-vis curricular 'prescriptions' of stages and development?

Writing as a basic skill in upper secondary school – a Norwegian case
Frøydis Hertzberg, University of Oslo
froydis.hertzberg@ils.uio.no

This presentation analyzes various success factors of teacher cooperation concerning student writing in upper secondary school.

Background
The Norwegian National Curriculum of 2006 (LK06) has made writing, reading, arithmetic, oral skills and digital skills a responsibility for all teachers from 1st through 13th grade. Although this particular part of the reform is met with great expectations from politicians and educators, a recent evaluation has identified considerable difficulties in the implementation process. By the majority of teachers and school principals the term *basic* is understood as *elementary*, which means that teachers in secondary schools find it less relevant to them. Moreover, as the need for cooperation across subject borders is not explicitly formulated in the curriculum, the motivation for such cooperation is not very high among the staff. This is particularly evident with *writing*. Since writing has been an integrated part of most school subjects for decades, teachers tend to say "we just do as we've always done".

The "Fagerbakken" case
As a counterpart to the picture described above, "Fagerbakken" upper secondary is an example of a school that has made writing in the disciplines one of its main concerns. During four years, a group of teachers from languages, social science, natural science, sport, history and religion have been sharing classroom experiences with student writing. The project, that is strongly supported by the head of the school, has deepened the teachers' understanding of writing and helped them broaden their own teaching repertoire. However, it has also made them more conscious of subject specific norms and cultures that sometimes cause disagreement in the group.
In my presentation I will discuss some conditions of success for this sort of project, both as a writing project and as a project aimed at professional learning.

Expectations of writing competences at grades 4 and 7 in Norwegian schools
Synnøve Matre, National Centre for Writing Education and Research, Norway
synnove@skrivesenteret.no

This presentation presents and discusses findings from a study which aims at exploring what levels of writing competence that reasonably can be expected at grades 4 and 7. The study represents the first step in a larger project examining the effects of defined norms of expectations on learning outcomes and assessment practice. (*Developing national standards for the teaching and assessment of writing*, funded by the Norwegian Research Council.)

Background
The Norwegian National Curriculum of 2006 includes writing as a key competence incorporated into all subjects. There is however a mismatch between this strategic role of writing in our educational system *and* our current knowledge about how this key competence develops and can be educationally improved and assessed. In addition evaluation of the first national test of writing competence in Norway (2005) concluded that the absence of a nationally shared set of specific standards for each of the grade levels involved was a major reason why inter-rater reliability in this test was generally low. Furthermore international studies indicate that use of specific standards correlate positively with results on tests, and that the educational improvement is especially high

for students from low income or minority homes (Doherty & Hilberg 2007). There is a need for studies relating to the development of writing competence.

Theoretical approach
Our study is founded in a social semiotic framework – including a writing construct which controls for the pitfall of assuming that writing competence is a uniform phenomenon (Halliday 1978; Berge et al 2005). Writing competence is understood as differentiated according to purpose, situations, educational cultures and types of writing (Purves 1992).

Focal case study
The study presented here is a focal case study. Data is collected in a small set of geographically distributed school classes where teachers from 4th and 7th grade are observed while assessing texts written by their own students *and* texts from the national writing tests of 2005. The teachers are working in groups; their conversations are recorded. The teachers are also interviewed about their expectations of the students writing and their grading of the texts related to a differentiated scale of assessment. The case classes are divided into two groups: one which has already worked with defining standards and one which has not.
The data will be analyzed looking for criteria that the teachers use in their process of assessing the texts. Results from the study will be presented and discussed at the conference.

I10
Cognition and context: Are there grounds for reconciliation? (Part II) (<u>See Session H1 for complete abstracts</u>)

Steve Graham, Vanderbilt University, U.S.
Anthony Paré, McGill University, Canada
David Galbraith, Staffordshire University, U.K.
Deborah Brandt, University of Wisconsin, U.S.
Charles Bazerman, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.
Karen Harris, Vanderbilt University, U.S.
Nancy Nelson, University of North Texas, U.S.
J.R. (Dick) Hayes, Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.

I11 Writing Research Across Borders II Poster Session
First-year Students' Construction of an Academic Persona in English as an
International Language (EIL): Bridging the Gap between Research and Practice
Àngels Oliva Girbau, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

Writing determines students' permanence in university and their professional options after their graduation. In the competitive current academic context, universities require students to use academic genres according to the specific features of their discipline, institution and linguistic community. The ESHE (European Space for Higher Education) promotes students' autonomy and geographical mobility. Therefore, students are increasingly more pressed to transfer their often vague unconscious knowledge on academic genres to field-specific academic genres in English, regardless of the different conventions that EIL (English as an international language) has in different institutional settings or purposes. European institutions are trying to tackle these problems applying different methodologies: writing centres, language courses, in-faculty courses, tutorships, writing labs, etc.

In order to successfully implement a durable system for the instruction of academic writing to first-year students, it is necessary to look back and learn from previous examples. US higher education has furnished us with a range of different models of implementations and theoretical/ideological frameworks to support them, and concern about students' writing at university has also been discussed and researched in Europe during more than fifty years. However, a lot of the previous research and public opinion on student writing in higher education had only assessed students' writing from a textual perspective which pathologised their writing. Writing instruction was regarded as remedial, and in charge of teaching assistants and other non-permanent teachers, when not altogether alien to higher education.

This paper studies the combined impact of current research trends on first-year students' development of their writing personas within the academic field of Humanities. We implement notions such as academic genres, systems of genres, academic literacies and activity systems in the seminar classes of the methodological subject *English for the Humanities*. By incorporating these ideas into the writing instruction of students with low English proficiency, we can shift the focus of the course away from students' language deficiencies and onto generic aspects such as the goals of their field, their role as academic writers or the cultural-specific features of academic genres, which they can acquire in spite of their problems in L2.

I11 Writing Research Across Borders II Poster Session (continued)
Genres across Borders: A Scholar-Networking Site in Progress

Carolyn R. Miller, North Carolina State University, U.S.
Dylan B. Dryer, University of Maine, U.S.
Chris Minnix, University of Arizona, U.S.
Matt Morain, North Carolina State University, U.S.

This poster will showcase the work-in-progress of researchers at three US universities as they develop a virtual center for interaction and cross-fertilization among genre researchers across disciplinary and geo-political boundaries.

In the last 20 years, research in literary criticism, film studies, media studies, composition studies, professional writing, visual arts, human-computer interaction, applied linguistics, language learning and pedagogy, information sciences, and rhetorical studies has overturned conventional wisdoms about every conceivable aspect of the recurrent-yet-changing formations in and through which every communicative act (developmental, functional, artistic, pedagogical, pragmatic) takes place. Claims about "new genres" abound as citizens, media consumers, employees, and employers observe—and participate in—the emergence, hybridization, retrofitting, stabilization, and obsolescence of genres.

Even specialists can find the scope and diversity of significant findings bewildering; meanwhile, national, oceanic, and linguistic boundaries constrain our ability to take advantage of new ideas and to build an effective community of researchers. Important work originates from Australia, Hong Kong, Canada, Norway, the US, the UK, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Denmark, Chile, and Colombia, among other countries.

With the guidance of an international advisory board, a multi-university team is seeking to address this situation by developing GxB: an online combination of peer-reviewed content, user-generated contributions, access to other content on the internet, and academic networking and collaboration tools. GxB aims to serve as an introduction to the multiple disciplinary approaches to genre research, a locus of interdisciplinary and international interaction, and a source of current awareness about research trends. The major features of the site will include the following:

i. ·   a glossary with tools and information for novice and established scholars alike;

ii. ·   disciplinary overviews that summarize and synthesize scholarly research perspectives on genre;

iii. ·   a bibliography linked to the glossary and the disciplinary overviews;

iv. ·   a calendar of scholarly events such as recent publications, conferences, and calls for proposals;

v. ·   a portal to relevant internet sources that helps consolidate and facilitate access to existing work; and

vi. ·   a constantly updated "feed" that reports new genres, news coverage of genres, and provides a way to track genre-related activity in the internet in real-time.

Our poster has two aims. First, it will report our progress to date in building and developing the site, which we expect will include coordination with an academic social networking and bibliography service and development of selected editorial content.

Second, the poster will provide the development team with an opportunity to network with other disciplines and scholarly communities represented at Writing Research Across Borders and to solicit further feedback and participation in developing the site as a communal resource.

The poster will thus provide a way to both inform viewers on the challenges and opportunities inherent in this kind of cross-border research consolidation and outreach as well as to further the development of the site.

Individual Differences and Children's Performance on Curriculum-Based Measures of Written Expression

Rhonda Martinussen, University of Toronto, Canada
Madison Aitken, University of Toronto, Canada

Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) is a promising alternative to standardized measures of written expression that has demonstrated validity and reliability (Marston & Deno, 1981; McMaster & Espin, 2007). However, little research exists examining the student characteristics that predict performance on these tasks. CBM is "a set of standard simple, short-duration fluency measures of reading, spelling, written expression, and mathematics computation" (Shinn & Bamonto, 1988, p. 1). A typical CBM assessment of written expression requires children to write a story in response to a brief sentence prompt. Students are usually given 3 or 5 minutes to write their story. CBM is directly linked to the curriculum in which students are being instructed (Deno, 1985), and more sensitive to small improvements in performance than standardized measures (Jenkins, Deno, & Mirkin, 1979). Research on CBM in written expression has demonstrated the reliability and validity of several CBM writing indices (see McMaster & Espin, 2007 for a review). Given the potential utility of CBM of written expression for screening and monitoring children's progress, it is important to determine those factors that underlie performance on these tasks. The goal of the present study was to explore the individual difference variables that predict children's composition fluency, spelling and grammatical accuracy, and quality as assessed using CBM of written expression.

Method

Participants

Data were collected from two cohorts ($N = 42$) of grade 4 and 5 students ages 9 to 11 from public and private elementary schools.

Measures

A curriculum-based measure of narrative writing was administered. Participants' compositions were scored for Total Words Written (TWW; the total number of words written, regardless of spelling) and Correct Minus Incorrect Word Sequences (CMIWS; measures spelling and grammatical accuracy, taking composition length into account). Compositions were also scored for overall quality on a 7-point scale after being typed and corrected for spelling and grammar. Handwriting speed was measured by the total time participants took to write the alphabet (Berninger, 2000). The Test of Word Reading Efficiency (Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1999) was administered to measure sight word and nonword reading fluency.

Results

Three hierarchical multiple regression analyses were carried out. Age, gender, handwriting speed and reading fluency were entered as predictors of TWW. Handwriting speed ($\beta = -2.72$, $p < .05$) was the only significant predictor of TWW. Age, gender, reading fluency, and handwriting speed were entered as predictors of CMIWS. Gender (females > males; $\beta = .3$, $p = .002$) and reading fluency ($\beta = .42$, $p = .001$) were significant predictors of CMIWS. The only significant predictor of composition quality

was TWW ($\beta = .44$, $p < .05$).

Importance

The findings suggest that teachers and school psychologists using CBM of written expression should also measure handwriting speed and reading fluency, and take gender differences into account to understand children's performance on these tasks. In addition, the results demonstrate that different factors predict performance depending on the CBM index measured. Overall, the results provide further insight into the characteristics of children who exhibit weaknesses on different CBM indices of writing.

References

Berninger, V. W. (2000). *Process Assessment of the Learner – Test Battery for Reading and Writing.* Pearson: Toronto.

Cragg, L. & Nation, K. (2007). Self-ordered pointing as a test of working memory in typically developing children. *Memory, 15*(5), 526-535.

Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. *Exceptional Children, 52*(3), 219-232.

Jenkins, J. R., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. (1979). Pupil progress: Measuring pupil progress toward the least restrictive alternative. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 2*(4), 81-91.

Marston, D. B., & Deno, S. (1981). *The reliability of simple, direct measures of written expression* (Research Report No. 50). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities.

McMaster, K., & Espin, C. (2007). Technical features of curriculum-based measurement in writing. *The Journal of Special Education, 41*(2), 68-84.

Shinn, M. R., & Bamonto, S. (1998). Advanced applications of curriculum-based measurement: "Big ideas" and avoiding confusion. In M. R. Shinn (Ed.) *Advanced applications of curriculum-based measurement* (pp. 1-31). New York: Guilford Press.

Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (1999). *Test of word reading efficiency* (TOWRE). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Multilingual Writers' and their Experiences in Undergraduate Programs
Annette Bradford, American University, U.S.

Multilingual Writers' and their Experiences in Undergraduate Programs
This poster presentation reports on how prepared L2 writers feel to tackle undergraduate
writing tasks at universities in both the US and UK. While the presenter acknowledges
that students arrive in English language undergraduate programs after having had varying
levels of writing instruction, she has observed an apparent mismatch between student
expectations and the writing tasks they are expected to perform, even after having
completed academic English training.
This presentation describes the results of a pilot survey of 50 first-year undergraduate L2
writers undertaken at American University, Washington DC and Lancaster University,
UK. It investigates the types of writing instruction the writers had before entering their
current program of study, and the types of writing that they have had to carry out once
enrolled. It examines their perceptions of successful writing and reveals the students'
feelings in regards to confidence and preparedness towards the tasks. Follow-up
interviews with students further uncover their frustrations and desires about writing
tuition.

Although such a survey can only provide a snapshot of the feelings of L2 writers. It is
hoped that this poster will have wide audience appeal as it provides insight to L2 writers
studying in two different contexts - the UK and the US. These insights inform not only
administrators and instructors on EAP/IEP programs, but also those involved planning
and teaching writing and content courses at US/UK universities. Results will be analyzed
and compared with those obtained from similar studies such as the Valuing Written
Accents project at George Mason University, USA.

Undergraduate Epistemic Success in Writing: An Analysis of Sentence Subjects in Six Honors Theses

Dayna Goldstein, Georgia Southern University, U.S.

Collegiate academic writing has been a viable area of study in the field of rhetoric and composition for several decades. Of particular interest has been first-year writing and expert writing, however, the middle of that curriculum spectrum has been widely ignored (Haswell, 1991). Definitions of successful undergraduate writing have been difficult to establish as the varied undergraduate outcomes in writing programs testify (Balzhiser, 2010; McLeod, 1992). Often professors of writing are stuck defining successful undergraduate writing as naïve replications of scholarly work. Yet the discipline, writ large, has yet to identify the epistemic moves of competent undergraduate writers and how they may or may not resemble those of expert writers.

In order to begin to ascertain what a reasonable level of academic literacy is at that curricular joint, I turn to Susan Peck MacDonalds pioneering discourse analysis work in Professional Academic Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences (PAWHSS) (SIUP, 1994). In PAWHSS MacDonald developed a curricular continuum with four stages that writing moves through as academic literacy is developed. I will be reporting on a study of the third or novice stage in which writing approximates disciplinary discourse using the work of six undergraduate honors thesis writers at a southern state compass point institution. I will use the method discussed in "A Method for Analyzing Sentence-Level Differences in Disciplinary Knowledge Making (MacDonald, 1992) on honors theses because I am interested in an epistemic accounting. The method discriminates epistemic sentences from phenomenal sentences. The method involves going through each independent clause in a corpus of at least six honors theses, and identifying the subjects. As the words are being identified as subjects, they are categorized according to whether the subject of a given independent clause is epistemologically or phenomenologically oriented. "The basic dichotomy between phenomena and epistemic distinguishes between phenomena that the researcher writes about (does research on, investigates, etc.) and the concepts, categories, abstractions, or methodological tools the researcher uses to reason about the subject" Macdonald (1992, p.544). Once the subjects are determined to be in one class or another then I determine which of the seven subclasses they fall into. While MacDonald was typically concerned with expert prose she suggested that "we need to explore more carefully how the second and third options might be appropriate at different levels, and how they might differ from each other or from the fourth option, expert prose" (1994, p. 187). The study offers just that.

The poster presentation will reveal the results of replicating MacDonalds sentence level analysis on honors thesis writing, thereby contributing to the available data of what successful undergraduate, yet not expert prose might be conceived as. In turn, this data may be used as a parallel to develop reasonable middle grounds for understanding what epistemic competencies maybe expected of successful undergraduate majors in rhetoric, composition, and writing.

I11 Writing Research Across Borders II Poster Session (continued)
Writing Perceptions and Beliefs of Adolescents In-Care

Julia Ferrari, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Canada
Andrea Regina, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Canada*
Julia Forgie, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Canada*
Rhonda Martinussen, University of Toronto, Canada*
Dale Willows, University of Toronto, Canada*

Summary:
a) Background:
Research has highlighted the poor educational outcomes of maltreated children (Mittic & Rimer, 2002). Studies have shown that maltreated children have lower literacy skills and perform more poorly in all academic areas than their non-maltreated peers (Barnett, Vondra, & Shonk, 1996; Vacca, 2008). Children who experience maltreatment and abuse describe themselves more negatively, report greater feeling of inadequacy and incompetence, and manifest lower self-esteem (Harter, 1999). Victims of childhood maltreatment are therefore at greater risk for poor development and cognitive outcomes. The long-terms consequences of low literacy skills and negative self-perceptions are severe and pervasive.

Objectives:
Writing skill and knowledge have been closely associated in samples of children (Saddler & Graham, 2007). This study examined whether at-risk youth in-care with poor literacy skills: a) viewed writing as important; b) identified the purposes for writing; c) ascribe attributes to good writing; d) nominate good writers; e) consider themselves to be good writers; f) identify aspects of writing which are difficult.

b) Method
Participants were 13 current or former (if over 18 years of age) Crown Wards (male n = 7; female n = 6). Participants ranged in age from 16 to 24. The participants were part of a larger literacy intervention study. The inclusionary criteria for the literacy intervention were: to receive scores below the 20th percentile on two of the three standardized reading measures administered at screening (word identification subtest of the WRMT-R; Word Attack subtest of the WRMT-R; Reading subtest of the WRAT-3).
Semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant individually. The interviews were composed of five questions which examined their knowledge about the purpose of writing as well as knowledge of the attributes of good writing and what good and poor writers do. Interviews were transcribed. Answers to each of the five questions were analyzed qualitatively for key themes. Writing samples were also collected and analyses are on-going.

c) Results
Preliminary results indicate that youth in-care (61%) view writing as important for future success, 87% of those youth expressed that the ability to write is important to obtaining and keeping a job. In addition, of the youths who viewed writing as important, 87.5% saw communication as the principal use for writing. However, although they place importance on writing, they do not view themselves as capable writers.
When asked to identify things that make writing difficult, the most frequent responses (54%) dealt with spelling, punctuation, and neatness. Although the ability to write well

was largely viewed by the youths as out of their control, failures were often attributed to lack of skills and motivation or uncontrollable external factors such as quality of instruction. Also, the youths seem to be unaware of the cognitive components which could help or hinder the writing process.

d) Importance

This study provides greater insight into the perceptions and beliefs about writing of at-risk youth in-care, a population about which little is known. Although, they do not see themselves as capable writers the youths view writing as a critical skill necessary for future success. Perhaps, these findings can enable literacy programs to better target skills which this population values.

I11 Writing Research Across Borders II Poster Session (continued)

Students from 2nd Grade who Write in Dyad with their Teacher's Support:
Impact on Interactions and Written Productions

Natalie Lavoie, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Canada
Jessy Marin, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Canada
Jean-Yves Levesque, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Canada*

In order to encourage achievement of a greater number of students, the Quebec Education Program recognizes the importance of social interactions in learning. Moreover, in the last few years, investigations have revealed that scaffolding seems to be an efficient teaching-learning strategy. However, little investigations have interested themselves in the scaffolding effect on students regarding the quality of produced interactions, and a review of existing literature shows that this object has not been sufficiently studied in writing situations with young writers. Various authors who have shown the positive effects of collaboration between peers in a written production context adhere to Vygotski's socio-constructivist theory according to which language interactions lead to construction of knowledge. Yet, these interactions must generate socio-cognitive conflicts in order for the partners to equip themselves to resolve these conflicts. The elaboration level of interactions is defined by three essential concepts: mutual involvement, pro-social involvement and adjustment effort. Quality of written productions is determined by phonogramic and morphogramic dimensions as well as by visuographic aspects.

The objectives of the research are to measure the effect of the teacher's scaffolding on the number and elaboration level of interactions between 2nd grade students in writing tasks and to evaluate the effect of the elaboration level of these interactions on written productions
The sample is formed by 8 classes (4 experimental and 4 control classes) from 2nd grade. The elaboration level of interactions as well as the quality of written productions is evaluated before and after the experiment. Teachers of the experimental groups are trained to scaffold students' interactions. During the experiment, they have the students, formed in dyads, perform a weekly writing task and they proceed to scaffold the interactions, while teachers of the control group carry out usual writing activities with their students. Beyond 3000 interactions were noted and analyzed during this investigation which spread over a three-year period.

Regarding the number of interactions and their elaboration level, significant differences have been observed amongst students of the experimental group. Also, as regards the quality of written productions, changes are only observed in experimental dyads. In other words, the tested device, i.e. scaffolding interactions between students in the moment they are writing, had positive effects. These results will be explained and discussed. In the theoretical point of view they enhance the knowledge on the role of teachers' scaffolding in the development of the students' skills in interacting during written productions and their writing capacity. These results also have consequences on teaching which will be presented.

I11 Writing Research Across Borders II Poster Session (continued)
Adolescents' Disciplinary Use of Evidence in Writing Historical Arguments

Susan De La Paz, University of Maryland, U.S.
Ralph Ferretti, University of Delaware, U.S.
Ronald Wissinger, University of Maryland, U.S.
Laura Yee, University of Maryland, U.S.

The importance of argumentation as written genre exists for many reasons. Stevens, Wineburg, Herrenkohl, and Bell (2005) contend that the nature of effective argumentation differs across disciplines because the epistemological criteria for causal explanations differ. Moreover, advocates for disciplinary literacy propose that teachers guide adolescents to approach reading and writing tasks in secondary content classes based on inherent differences in the ways that experts think in the sciences (e.g., biology; Carter, Ferzli, & Wiebe, 2007), mathematics (Brown, 2007), and history (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Emerging evidence suggests that in science classrooms, secondary students are able to identify claims and evidence when constructing and defending scientific explanations (Berland & Reiser, 2008). Similar findings are evident in secondary social studies classes, as expert teachers support students' abilities to develop interpretations that are supported with evidence (Monte-Sano, 2008), and interventions lead novice and struggling writers to invoke more sophisticated disciplinary arguments (De La Paz & Felton, in press; Nokes, Dole & Hacker, 2007).

The developmental nature of students' use of evidence in disciplinary writing has been the focal point of only a handful of studies. Keys (1999) studied the scientific inferences in middle school students' written reports and noted the paucity of meaningful inferences to new knowledge claims. Coffin (2004) discussed the role of causality in "history" essays written by students, and provided a developmental, linguistic analysis that distinguished between the levels and types of students' causal accounts. Ferretti, Lewis, & Andrews-Weckerly (2009) evaluated the structure and type of arguments written by fourth and sixth grade students with and without learning disabilities from a pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004) to determine how goal setting, grade, disability status, argument structure and type of argument predicted overall persuasiveness; however, their study did not require disciplinary writing. Finally, De La Paz & Felton (in press) modified Toulmin's (1958) argumentation model to capture developments in eleventh grade students' claims and rebuttals in their analysis of eleventh grade writers' historical arguments.

With this perspective in mind, we asked: How do adolescents use evidence in disciplinary arguments? We analyzed two reading and writing tasks that focused on similar types of writing (all document-based historical questions) at the eighth (N = 44) and eleventh grade (N = 67) using data from a larger study that examined the effects of a federally funded Teaching American History grant on student writing outcomes (De La Paz, Malkus, Monte-Sano, Montanaro, in review). Within each grade, we first established that all participants adequately comprehended the primary source excerpts. We then analyzed differences in use of evidence and documents in the writing of students who were previously determined to be good (N = 78) or poor writers (N = 33) at each grade level. Our analysis strategy was primarily based on the prior work of Ferretti et al. and De La Paz and Felton. Our paper reports both developmental trends and patterns related to

differences in writing ability in students' disciplinary arguments from the total set of essays (N = 222).

Word count: 499 Preferred format: Individual presentation, poster presentation
Contact information: sdelapaz@umd.edu

References

Berland, L.K., & Reiser, B. J. (2009). Making sense of argumentation and explanation. *Science Education, 93*,26-55.

Brown, R. (2007). Exploring the social positions that students construct within a community of practice. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*, 116-118.

Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. N. (2007). Writing to learn by learning to write in the disciplines. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 21*, 278-302.

Coffin, C. (2004). Learning to write history: The role of causality. *Written Communication, 21*, 261-289.

De La Paz, S. & Felton, M. K. (in press). Reading and writing from multiple source documents in history: Effects of strategy instruction with low to average high school writers. Contemporary Educational Psychology.

De La Paz, S., Malkus, N., Monte-Sano, C., Montanaro, B., (in review). Evaluating American history teachers' professional development: Effects on student learning. *Theory and Research in Social Education*.

Ferretti, R., Lewis, W. E. & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2009). Do goals affect the structure of students' argumentative writing strategies? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 577-589.

Keys, C.W. (1999). Language as an indicator of meaning generation: An analysis of middle school students' written discourse about scientific investigations. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36*, 1044-1061.

Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Qualities of historical writing instruction: A comparative case study of two teachers' practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 1045-1079.

Nokes, J.D., Dole, J.A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while writing historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 492-504.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 40–59.

Stevens, R., Wineburg, S., Herrenkohl, L.R., & Bell, P. (2005). Comparative Understanding of School Subjects: Past, Present, and Future. Review of Educational Research, 75, 125-157.

Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument.* Cambridge, England: The University Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.