

Writing Research Across Borders II Session J
Sunday, February 20 8:30-10:00am

J1

Converging streams? Rhetorical and textual approaches to genre research and pedagogy (Part I)

Natasha Artemeva, Carleton University, Canada

Graham Smart, Carleton University, Canada

Amy Devitt, The University of Kansas, U.S.

Christine Tardy, DePaul University, U.S.

David Russell, Iowa State University, U.S.

Catherine Schryer, Ryerson University, Canada

Janna Fox, Carleton University, Canada

Mary Jo Reiff, University of Kansas, U.S.

Jaclyn Rea, The University of British Columbia, Canada

Anthony Paré, McGill University, Canada

Janet Giltrow, University of British Columbia, Canada

Heidi S. Byrnes, Georgetown University, U.S.

Anis Bawarshi, University of Washington, U.S.

In 1996, Sunny Hyon identified three major traditions in genre studies as the New Rhetoric school, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and the Sydney school. Over the years, the New Rhetoric school and ESP have been involved in a long and often productive dialogue. As John Swales's (2009) put it, by 2007 "what had become known as the genre movement had coalesced somewhat, with the result that the divisions among" the approaches to genre "have become much less sharp—even if they have not entirely disappeared" (p. 4). At the same time, the New Rhetoric and Sydney school scholars continue to be involved in a debate about the differences in their approaches to genre research and pedagogy (e.g., Freedman, 1993a; Martin, in press). Recently, genre scholars working predominantly within the rhetorical tradition have started to include different types of textual analysis in their studies (e.g., Schryer, 2000; Schryer et al, 2009), and a new discussion has developed about "the return of form" (Giltrow, 2007) in rhetorical genre research and pedagogy (Devitt, 2004, 2009; Devitt, Reiff, & Bawarshi, 2004). It seems that the timing is perfect for us to raise the following questions:

- What is the role of form in rhetorical genre research and pedagogy and how form should be addressed?
- Are some rhetorical and textual approaches to genre converging? Diverging? Why and how?

The proposed roundtable brings together researchers from different genre traditions who are interested in a theoretical discussion of the value, and possible convergence or divergence, of rhetorical and textual approaches to genre studies and pedagogy. The roundtable participants will briefly address the questions raised above and provide illustrative examples from their own research and/or pedagogical practices. The

participants' positions will be discussed with an active involvement of the roundtable audience.

A brief summary of each talk follows:

Speakers 1, 2 & 3: *Where Is the Language? Integrating Analytical and Methodological Frameworks in Genre Research*

While rhetorical approaches have been praised for the rich and thick descriptive detail of their genre analysis, researchers from other traditions have often asked “*Where is the language in rhetorical genre studies?*” In response, Freedman (1993b) observed that “textual regularities . . . function as criterial indicators of genre” (p. 272). In other words, New Rhetoric scholars would argue that the textual is already located within the rhetorical as the underlying regularities of genres are linguistically expressed. We would like to add that a combination of rhetorical and textual genre approaches within an integrated analytical framework may not only better triangulate the research but also address the criticism regarding the “absence” of language in rhetorical genre studies. Examples will be drawn from a longitudinal project that investigates genres of teaching in different disciplines.

Speaker 4: *A Textual-Rhetorical Approach to Researching Genre Knowledge*

This speaker will outline rationale for and examples of a combined textual and rhetorical approach to the study of writers' genre knowledge and its development. The speaker will draw on longitudinal research to demonstrate how insights from both ESP and rhetorical studies can be integrated to offer a multidimensional view of genre knowledge.

Speaker 5: *Taking Form: Corpus Study as Means of Discovering Functional Variability*

Form having long haunted New-Rhetorical Genre Theory (NRGT), both ESP and the Sydney school offer terms on which to meet the *revenant*. Yet these terms in both cases have in mind pedagogical projects, while NRGT gives reason to be sceptical about genre in the classroom: you can't know a genre without lived experience of situation—that is, by form alone. Without dismissing possibilities for reconciling the pedagogically oriented categories of ESP and the Sydney school with the social-action orientation of NRGT, this presentation will suggest alternative terms on which to meet form: methods of corpus study which discover a form's variable function by searching its neighbourhoods of occurrence. In turn these dynamic variations indicate “spheres of activity” (Bakhtin 1986). Examples will be drawn from legal and research genres, and will suggest that with form's return should come a more versatile notion of function.

Speaker 6: *Is There a Text in this Genre?*

When some of my colleagues in rhetoric refer to my work as textual or linguistic, I'm always surprised--not because my work is not textual, but because I have always thought that everyone's work was textual. Having been raised in the study of writing, rather than rhetoric, I have always examined the effects of communication in terms of the language of communication; I have always viewed context as embedded within text.

Working now in the study of genre, when I read other scholars' work, I see not only culture and rhetoric but also materiality and form. When I teach students about genre and its effects, we read not only theory but examples. Form is not unconflicted in genre studies, but it is essential. Including form in genre research and teaching reunites approaches to genre, enabling both research and teaching to recognize what everyday rhetoricians know: we know genres because we know texts.

Speaker 7: Genre as Generative

The concept of genre is generative in that it opens up cross-disciplinary spaces where researchers can combine discourse and qualitative data analysis in order to locate and critique discursive practices. In fact, in order to actually do genre analysis, genre researchers have to identify a set of texts and argue through similarities of form, stylistic choices and social action that these texts constitute a genre. In other words, they have to genre the texts they select while still recognizing the situated nature of these texts. However, this research activity should not translate into generalized didactic pedagogical guidelines simply because of the very situated nature of all texts. In effect, genre researchers need to carefully map their commitments to the various schools of genre research based on their assumptions regarding the social and addressed nature of discursive practices.

Speaker 8: Reconciling Contrasting Approaches to Genre Analysis: The Whole Can Be More than the Sum of the Parts

Two studies conducted by the author show how an ESP or Sydney school approach, both of which are linguistically oriented, and a New Rhetoric approach, which is more contextually oriented, can complement each other when it comes to application to ESP pedagogy. On the basis of two studies, it is argued that the combination of a linguistically focused ESP or Sydney School approach, on the one hand, and a more ethnographic New Rhetoric approach, on the other, offers a powerful way forward for ESP-based genre analysis, the sum of the two approaches, used in combination, equaling more than the two parts taken separately.

Speaker 9: Texts as Instruments and Objects of Genre Analysis

If we take as our object of research *genres* as Carolyn Miller (1984) has construed them, "typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations," then when we research genres we are looking at actions in situations. We are focusing "not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish" (151). To the extent that we understand those actions and situations by means of texts, however construed, we must use textual analysis, however construed, as I have done my own empirical research. But texts are, for research of this type on genres, as for genres themselves, means to an end and not the end or object of research—though a very useful means.

Speaker 10: Genre as an Analytical Tool for Studying the Development of Writing Proficiency in the Workplace

For researchers investigating the learning trajectories of novice writers in professional organizations, New Rhetoric (also known as Rhetorical Genre Studies [RGS]) offers a broader and more productive perspective than do text-focused

approaches to genre. The reason for this is two-fold: first, learning to write proficiently in the genres of a professional organization is so clearly a multi-faceted socio-cognitive experience that to understand such learning in any meaningful way, we need to look beyond texts on the printed page or computer screen to the socio-cultural contexts for writing; and second, RGS can be used symbiotically with other socio-cultural approaches such as activity theory and situated learning theory to explore the writing development of novices in organizations (Artemeva, 2008; Smart 2006; Smart & Brown, 2006). This said, such research can be significantly enhanced when careful attention is also paid to texts—both texts produced by novice writers themselves and exemplary texts produced by more experienced colleagues. I will illustrate these claims with reference to a year-long ethnographic study (July 2008-September 2009) of the writing development of junior economists in a central bank.

Speakers 11 & 12: **The Role of Textual Forms in Rhetorical Genre Knowledge and Transfer**

At the end of Ann John's influential book, *Genre in the Classroom: Multiple Perspectives*, genre scholars from Sydney School, ESP, and Rhetorical traditions debate the value of studying and teaching macro generic forms as opposed to situated rhetorical genres. The debate reflects the tensions and seeming obstacles between rhetorical and systemic functional linguistic approaches to genre. However, the co-presenters will report findings from their cross-institutional empirical study of students' use of prior genre knowledge which indicate that macro generic forms and rhetorical genres function in co-dependent interaction with each other at the cognitive level. The macro generic forms (what Ann Johns has called "pre-genres") that the Sydney tradition promotes seem to be necessary to rhetorical genre knowledge, meta-cognition, and transfer, as students rely on these forms to traverse genre boundaries. In this presentation, we will share findings from the study and discuss their implications for bridging divides (cognitive, textual, rhetorical) between genre traditions.

References

- Artemeva, N. (2008). Toward a unified social theory of genre learning. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 22 (2), 160-185.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In M.M. Bakhtin, C. Emerson, & M. Holquist (Eds.). *Speech genres & other late essays*. (Transl . V. W. McGee). Austin, TX: University of Texas Pres.
- Devitt, A. (2004). *Writing genres*. Carbondale, IL:Southern Illinois University.
- Devitt, A. (2009). Re-fusing form in genre study. In J. Giltrow & D. Stein (Eds). *Genres in the Internet*. (pp. 27-47). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Devitt, A., Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2004). *Scenes of writing: Strategies for composing genres*. New York: Longman/Pearson.
- Freedman, A. (1993a). 'Show and tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27(3), 222-251.
- Freedman, A. (1993b). Situating genre: A rejoinder. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27 (3), 272-281.

- Giltrow, J. (2007). Hauntings . . . : The return of the form. Paper presented at the *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, New York, NY.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (4), 693-722.
- John, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Martin, J. (in press). Writing and genre studies. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Miller, C. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70 (2), 151 – 167.
- Schryer, C. F. (2000). Walking a fine line: Writing negative letters in an insurance company. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 14 (4), 445-497.
- Schryer, C. F., Afros, E., Mian, M., Spafford, M., & Lingard, L. (2009). The trial of the expert witness: Negotiating credibility in child abuse correspondence. *Written Communication*, 26 (3), 215-246.
- Smart, G. (2006). *Writing the economy: Activity, genre and technology in the world of banking*. London: Equinox.
- Smart, G. & Brown, N. (2006). Developing a “discursive gaze”: Participatory action research with students interns encountering new genres in the activity of the workplace. In N. Artemeva & A. Freedman (Eds). *Rhetorical Genre Studies and beyond*. (pp. 241-282.). Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: Inkshed Publications.
- Swales, J. (2009). World of genre—metaphors of genre. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.). *Genre in a changing world*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press. Retrieved April 29, 2010 from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/genre/>

J2

Multimodal composition and the teaching of academic writing conventions for changing audiences, products, and purposes

Upping the Game: Negotiating Academic Expectations and Resistance

Kristin Searle, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Storyboarding the Argument: Facilitating Literacy through Visual Mapping

Jonathan Balzotte, Iowa State University, U.S.

Speaking Up, Speaking Out, and Speaking Back: Performance in and through a Multimodal Composition Classroom

Sundy Watanabe, University of Utah, U.S.

Writing instruction must equip students with the tools, skills, and strategies not just to produce traditional texts using computer technology, but also to produce documents appropriate to the global and dispersed reach of the web. This change requires a large-scale shift in the rhetorical situations that we ask students to write within, the audiences we ask them to write for, the products that they produce, and the purposes of their writing. (Grabill & Hicks, 2005, p. 295)

This panel presents research concerning the experiences of low-income and first generation college students in a multimodal composition course at a large research university in the Intermountain Western US. Specifically, we analyze three separate literate actions or events occurring during the course of the study: resistance, visual mapping, and performance. In our analyses, we draw from qualitative data collected over the course of three years – with primary emphasis placed on data collected during six-week long, summer semester courses – as students in these courses make the transition from high school to college curricula. Data are ethnographic in nature and include student compositions (traditional and digital), interviews with students, videotaped classroom sessions, and field notes. As instructor researchers, we utilize an interdisciplinary framework that integrates insights from rhetoric and composition, New Literacy Studies, education, and anthropology. Our study seeks to answer the following questions: (1) How do incoming first generation and low-income college students negotiate different ways of knowing and different definitions of “what counts” as literacy in relation to their own experiences and trajectories in and out of school? (2) In what ways are these negotiations evident in students’ composition processes, their “texts” and their lived experiences?

In attempting to answer these questions, a study of signs, symbols, and images – semiotic perspectives, in other words – informs our analyses (see Hocks, 2003; Hull & Nelson, 2005; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001; Lea, 2004). Additionally, our understanding of generative themes as they develop through particular histories and in particular events and modes (i.e. student engagements in the classroom and beyond with image, speech, music, text, each other, and the institution) is informed by Lemke’s (2000) cross-timescale relations and Wortham’s (2001) model of identity construction. Finally, to understand how students negotiate different literate practices and for what purposes, we employ critical discourse analysis (Huckin, 1995) and notions of primary and secondary discourse communities (Gee, 2005).

Panelist 1: Upping the Game: Negotiating Academic Expectations and Resistance

As the recent debate between Hesse and Selfe in “Interchanges” (2010) indicates, many complex and nuanced negotiations must take place within the university environment when trying to introduce the concept of multimodal composition. We experienced no less difficult negotiations as we encountered varying degrees of buy-in and resistance from students, other instructors, and administrators concerning expectations for the course. By resistance, we mean behaviors that directly or indirectly indicated unwillingness or refusal to accommodate or engage with instructors, peers, and/or course content. Much of the resistance we both observed and experienced arose because of differences between our multimodal classroom practice and participants’ prior understandings of what “should” take place in a writing classroom. For example, some administrators hampered course progress, goals, and student trust by demanding an excessive focus on grammar and punctuation. Additionally, some students expressed disapproval with the filmic aspects, indicating their preference for poetry and literature. Interestingly, still other students struggled during the first course offering with what seemed (at the time) an innocuous requirement that their film projects be posted to a private Facebook group rather than a similar MySpace group; and, in retrospect, the choice of Facebook over MySpace had racial and cultural implications that resonated for the rest of the semester. Given the intersecting dynamics of race, class, culture, religion, language, gender, and age inherent in this particular composition course within this predominantly White, monomodal, and monolingual institution, the resistance we experienced should not have been a surprise. Yet, the very use of multimodalities in this classroom space opened up new possibilities for everyone involved, including administrators. Our experience points to the tremendous need to understand more about what role a globalized, technological, and multimodal perspective plays in the university writing classroom. As one of our students so eloquently put it, it is time to “up [our] game.”

Panelist 2: Storyboarding the Argument: Facilitating Literacy through Visual Mapping

Researching into multimodal praxis has become important as an educational goal since technological developments have put resources for a wide range of communication modes in the hands of the general population. Composition scholars have shown interest in multimodal classroom practices both as instructional goals and instructional methods (Kress, 2003; Selfe, 2009; Wysocki, Johnson-Eilola, Selfe, & Sirc, 2004). One significant obstacle for multimodal classroom instruction, however, is how to teach students to transfer the academic conventions learned multimodally to the written essay. The inclusion of filmic composition assignments in basic composition courses can, to some degree, overcome this obstacle and benefit beginning writers by providing visual mapping of the rhetorical conventions used in academic argumentation. This presentation contributes an analysis of a technology (iMovie) used to help students acquire rhetorical moves in film that transfer to writing. As a technology, iMovie provides a format – storyboarding – that facilitates writer/ filmmaker and instructor “talk” about conventional compositional moves. We used storyboarding as a method, a technique, to talk about both modes of argumentation because it provides a way to address transitions, tangents, evidence, and thesis. Panelist 1 presents two examples of this technique and illustrates how students were able to acquire new strategies of argumentation through

storyboarding. As with previous introduction of new technologies into the classroom, there is still much to be learned about how to integrate these new media into instruction and about the sheer mechanics of the process. However, we find storyboarding a great help to students as they learn the rhetorical strategies and conventions valued by the academic institution.

Panelist 3: Speaking Up, Speaking Out, and Speaking Back: Performance in and through a Multimodal Composition Classroom

Victor Villanueva (2009) has argued that through writing students come to know and reflect upon a dominant language and how “a dominant set of ways with the language” instantiates power relationships (p. 29). This knowledge and reflection, he suggests, can illuminate inequities, which, once named, can be changed. Other scholars note, however, that if classroom production remains solely focused on written discourse, upending inequities is unlikely (Archer, 2006; Collins & Blot, 2003; Lillis, 2001). Implementing multimodal pedagogies and products, we suggest, provides an effective avenue through which instructors and students can both engage and critique academic discourse. These pedagogies build on students’ existing knowledge, afford innovative and collaborative avenues of expression, and provide tools with which to effect “alternative images . . . and contradictory visions of outcomes” for society and academia (Flower, 2003, p. 56). Utilizing data from the larger study, Panelist 3 looks at the way one student’s performance embodied Flower’s alternative images and visionary outcomes. These actions occurred during the first course and arose first during a fishbowl discussion and second in filmic choices. Taken together, these performances demonstrate, in the student’s words, an “urge to answer” the challenges encountered when entering a new academic discourse community. Months after the course ended, this same student sent an unsolicited email to the researcher panelist, explaining and discussing an experience that occurred while taking a course in her major, which subsequently influenced the beliefs and actions of two younger, female students who took the multimodal course during the second year. This influence turned up in their filmic composition. Such forward reaching and ongoing performances demonstrate transformative shifts students can experience as they learn to speak up, speak out, and speak back to systems of power.

Conclusion

Some argue that multimodal production and pedagogies are better suited to after- and out-of-school environments. We, however, maintain that multimodal praxis is viable within an institutionally sanctioned context. Its affordances far outweigh the (sometimes substantial) limitations. Just as it is important for students to know how to communicate in conventionalized (i.e. alphabetic) ways, so it is important they know how to critique those very practices and be able to recognize and utilize other available resources that exist within themselves and their multiple communities.

References

- Archer, A. (2006). A multimodal approach to academic ‘literacies’: Problematising the visual/verbal divide. *Language and education* 20(6), 449-462.
- Collins, J. & Blot, R. (2003). *Literacy and literacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Flower, L. (2003). Talking across difference: Intercultural rhetoric and the search for situated knowledge. *College composition and communication* 55(2), 38-68.

Grabill, J.T. & Hicks, T. (2005). Multiliteracies meet methods: The case for digital writing in English Education. *English Education*, 37(4), 301-311.

Hesse, D. & Selfe, C. (2010). Interchanges. *College composition and communication* 61(3), 602-610.

Huckin, T. (1995). Critical discourse analysis. *Journal of TESOL-France*, 2(2), 95-112.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.

Lea, M. (2004). Academic literacies: A pedagogy for course design. *Studies in higher education* 29(6), 739-756.

Lillis, Theresa. (2001). *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. New York: Routledge.

Selfe, C. (2009). The movement of air, the breath of meaning: Aurality and multimodal composing. *College Composition and Communication* 5(3), 411-436.

Thesen, L. (2001). Modes, literacies and power: A university case study. *Language and Education*, 15(2&3), 132-145.

Villanueva, V. (2009). From edge city. *Council chronicle*, 18(3), 28-29.

Wysocki, A. F., Johnson-Eilola, J., Selfe, C. L., & Sirc, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Writing new media: Theory and applications for expanding the teaching of composition*. New York: Hampton Press.

J3

The “Things They Carried”: Insular knowledges and the remaking of pedagogy

Jennifer Johnson, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Moe Folk, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Mysti Rudd, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Nicole Warwick, Cal State University, U.S.

This panel focuses on the complexities inherent in attempting to extend locally internalized theory and practice to a variety of writing classroom contexts. Finders and Rose (2002) and Payne and Enos (2002) discuss how core concepts in composition, like reflection and process, are in danger of becoming “slogans” or “being reduced to universalized boiler-plate steps.” In short, the more unquestioned pedagogical philosophies and assumptions become core concepts for students and teachers alike, the more jarring any shift in theory and practice eventually becomes, to the ultimate detriment of both. As such, these presentations seek to determine how a more nuanced understanding of what Selfe and Hawisher (2004) termed “cultural ecology”—a complex set of interrelated social, educational, economical, and cultural factors ranging from the individual to the global—can be fruitful for writing research theory and practice. This panel offers reasons for, and ways of, enacting new knowledges in teacher preparation programs, working with over-prepared students, negotiating institutional-pedagogical disjuncts, and complicating digital source selection.

Panelist #1: Writing Across the Local Ecology: Evolving Meaningful Research Writing in First-Year Courses

In *Relations, Locations, Positions*, Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon (2006) call for “the study of writing [that] inquire[s] into the mediating influences of an array of material and conceptual spaces,” (p.14) since “responsible discourse...depends on a self-conscious awareness of how one is located,” (p.12). But location—and its implied prerequisite: re-location—is often ignored as teachers migrate from institution to institution, carrying their same theory, texts, and writing assignments with them. While the field of retention studies includes much scholarship on the adjustments that first-year students must make in order to succeed in the academy (Tinto, 2006; Seidman, 2005; Braxton, 2000, 2008), less attention has been given to the cultural, institutional, and pedagogical adjustments that first-year faculty must make in order to engage first-year students in meaningful inquiry in a location that may be foreign, or even hostile, to both teacher and student (Crosling, Thomas, and Heagney, 2008). Teacher retention has never been as important as student enrollment in most secondary institutions, but under the current economic climate, if tenure-track teachers can’t make the necessary adjustments to their pedagogy (and quickly!), there are more than enough replacements eagerly waiting.

In an effort to better understand the particular context of teaching in a state school where so many students go home on the weekends that Thursdays finds the town crawling with party goers, Panelist #3 will rely on Bourdieu’s concept of “habitus,” (1992), to explore the intersections and disjunctures between “history brought to the present in institutions” and “history brought to the present in person,” (Cushman, 2006). This presentation will address the following research question: What should newly-hired

faculty learn about the specifics of the local ecology and the corresponding adjustments faculty might make in order to more successfully engage first-year students in meaningful inquiry, both inside and outside of English Studies?

To gather evidence of the adjustments that new faculty have made at this state school, Panelist #1 will conduct a survey of recently-hired tenure-track faculty across the disciplines requiring a research component in first-year courses. Particularly noteworthy respondents will be interviewed about their strategies. This research will illuminate the inseparability of location and successful pedagogical strategies, while also acknowledging the difficulty in jettisoning past strategies to try on new ones that might not align with a teacher's theory, but have been proven to work. The research goal is to raise awareness of how locality impacts research writing pedagogy.

Panelist #2: Observing English Graduate Students in Action: What TA Educators Can Learn

Stenberg (2005) argues that if we want to initiate "disciplinary and pedagogical change," we need to focus on teacher-preparation sites, the place where we shape the next generation of our professoriate (p. 30). However, the very reason that Stenberg sees teacher preparation courses as sites for change is also the very reason there may be problems: Literature, creative writing, and composition students come together in one location that provides them the opportunity to learn and learn to work together; however, the opportunity also exists for them to learn *not* to work together.

TA resistance is a major obstacle in TA programs (Bishop, 1997; Farris, 1996; Ebest, 2002). Though resistance is often attributed to graduate students and their personal philosophies, (Bishop, 1997; Farris, 1996; Ebest, 2002), I contend that TA educators and compositionists have not explored enough the ways they contribute to TA resistance. That is, there is more for us to learn as educators of teachers of writing about working with graduate students (Rose and Finders, 2002; Rickly and Harrington, 2002).

A new graduate course at the California State University where I work presents a unique opportunity for research about graduate education. In Fall 2010, my program will offer a new culminating experience for *both* rhet/comp and literature graduate students. It is not a literature course, nor is it a rhet/comp course; it's a course specifically designed for both types of graduate students, where they will be working toward mutually-held goals: writing for publication and conference presentations. Such a course presents a unique opportunity for research that could benefit TA educators.

I will rely on qualitative research methods: course observation, interviews with teacher and students, as well as document collection (syllabus and assignments). Leading my research are questions such as: What are the instructor's goals, how does she set up the learning environment, and how willing are graduate students to learn from each other and work together as they engage in class discussion, peer review, and the planning of their graduate conference? Are graduate students as resistant in this environment as they are purported to be in TA programs?

In part, it seems the very purpose of TA programs (learning to teach writing) contributes to TA resistance because composition becomes privileged over literature. Therefore, when the course is neither a composition nor literature course, I expect to find that graduate student resistance will diminish in such a course.

Panelist #3: Meeting the Needs of Over-prepared Students: Identifying and Developing Individualized Curriculum

Beginning with Mina Shaughnessy's (1977) ground-breaking work, there has been much discussion within educational circles and composition literature about under-prepared writers in the composition classroom. However, very little discussion has focused on the idea of working with over-prepared students, i.e., those students who come into the first-year composition class having already mastered the skills delineated in the course outcomes. Shelley Reid argues that new teachers should look to our field's literature when faced with an issue they do not know how to solve in the composition classroom, but what if the literature does not address the issue?

Having recently been faced with an over-prepared student in an first year composition course at a large research university in Southern California, I found myself grappling with how best to serve him. Ultimately, I elected to work with him to design an individualized curriculum, consisting of longer, much more in-depth assignments in return for allowing him to skip several class meetings. However, I was not entirely comfortable with this decision. Although I felt confident that I was creating a challenging and stimulating opportunity for this student and that I was also acting under the "teacher as learner" model that Stenberg (2005) advocates in *Professing and Pedagogy*, I also had the nagging feeling that I might be betraying the department somehow by individualizing the established first year composition course for him.

The research questions for this project stem from that experience. I plan to survey my colleagues to determine to what extent these over-prepared students exist in our university's first year composition courses and to find out how faculty have addressed the needs of such students. For comparison's sake, I also plan to interview several writing program administrators about how they would *like* faculty to respond to students like these.

It is my hope that this ethnographic research will bring to light the complexities of working with over-prepared students and that it will also provide an opportunity for us to consider and develop some "best practices" for addressing these students' unique needs while also keeping in mind the needs of faculty and administrators. While the student in my class had chosen to avoid taking the required first year composition course until he was a junior, in the current economic climate it is highly likely that we will be seeing more and more of these over-prepared students in our first year composition courses as the class becomes even more impacted.

Panelist #4: Technological Ethos and Prowess-as-Style: Digital Source Selection for Research Writing

This presentation centers on interrogating the role advanced multimodal production plays when students select and employ digital resources. Specifically, this presentation identifies what strategies students employ when determining a source's credibility and the repercussions those choices have in the context of teaching research writing.

Even though Composition has increasingly embraced multimodal elements in writing instruction over the last decade, the way students and instructors approach an ever-expanding array of digital sources has not evolved at a similar rate. As Apostel and

Folk (2005) argued, universities tend to dissuade students from tapping into a rich array of digital sources because their library websites and writing textbooks often advocate assessing digital information through the lens of adapted book-based criteria promulgated by scholars such as Jim Kapoun (1998). In responding to such a reality, scholars have shed light on ways the complex nature of online research defies simplistic approaches (e.g., Denecker, 2010; Reilly and Eyman, 2007; Purdy and Walker, 2007) and argued that writing instructors and library professionals need to collaborate (e.g., Peele and Phipps, 2007; McClure and Baures, 2007).

However, an aspect of the online research process that needs more attention is the way students perceive credibility based on the design and production of information. Building on notions of style from Brummett (2008), Butler (2007), and Loewe (2005), Panelist #4 defines the concept of multimodal style and its importance to the production and reception of online sources. In addition to reporting on two years of student reflections concerning the credibility of digital sources they chose for research writing projects, Panelist #4 will draw on the results of an experiment where students, English Studies faculty, librarians, and a group of non-English Studies faculty were shown the same websites in multiple design forms and asked to decide which iterations are credible and why. The inordinate number of extremely strong reactions (both positive and negative) to sites whose production were deemed “intricate,” “different” and/or “professional” suggests the importance of negotiating vastly different viewpoints regarding web credibility. The results of the experiment suggest variations in perceived credibility based on (but not exclusively) age, discipline, home country, technical prowess, and class. In order to complicate research writing for a new millennium, Panelist #4 will use newer conceptions of ethos (Hyde, 2004; Smith, 2004) that stress the importance of local contexts to outline a strategy that allows both students and teachers to dwell in both familiar yet transformed spaces.

J4

L2 writing processes in college

The Effects of Performance Level and Homogeneity in DYAD Composition in Two Learning Conditions on Learning to Revise in L2

Elke Van Steendam, University College Brussels, Belgium

There is a vast body of research which studies the composition of groups in collaborative learning. The large majority of the studies which investigate the impact of ability grouping on learning and performance can be situated in science and mathematics education (e.g. Webb, Nemer, & Zuniga, 2002; Webb, Nemer, Chizik, & Sugrue, 1998). These studies show that there is quite some inconsistency as to what the more effective group composition is. In general, however, it can be concluded that strong students fare best in homogeneous groups for learning and performance (Webb et al., 2002), whereas weak students benefit least or not at all from being grouped with another weak student (Hooper & Hannafin, 1991).

In collaborative writing and revision few studies investigate ability grouping. Some studies start from the assumption that heterogeneous groups are preferable (Dale, 1997; Francis & McCutchen, 1994; Saddler & Graham, 2005). Others study the effect of different types of dyads on interaction or negotiation in collaborative writing (Storch, 2004) or peer review (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994). Only in one study, a pilot by Sutherland & Topping (1999), the researchers look at the interaction between an instructional method (Paired Writing) and group composition. None of the studies reviewed, however, examine the interaction between different instructional methods and group composition.

In this study we investigate the interaction between instruction and pair composition in more detail. To be more precise, we test the impact of two types of instruction in collaborative revision for different ability dyads. A revision strategy is instructed in two different ways: either through modelling or through practising (= instruction phase). A total of 247 EFL Business Communication undergraduates are assigned to either a modelling or observation condition, in which they watch an expert peer dyad model an effective strategy for revising the structure and content of a formal business letter, or a more traditional practising condition, in which students in a randomly formed dyad apply the strategy themselves to the same business letter. After the instruction phase randomly grouped dyads in the two conditions emulate the revision strategy with the help of a procedural facilitator (= emulation phase, dyadic revision post-test). One week after the intervention, students are administered an individual revision post-test.

Dyads are categorized as either weak or strong (dyad characteristic 1: Performance) and homogeneous or heterogeneous (dyad characteristic 2: Difference) in terms of initial proficiency on a writing pre-test. The dependent variable is revision skill operationalized by the number of structural and content problems correctly detected, diagnosed and revised in both the emulation post-test and the individual post-test.

Results of multilevel analyses show a significant interaction between ability grouping and instructional method: homogeneous (both weak and strong) dyads benefit most from dyadic observation, whereas weak heterogeneous dyads profit more from dyadic practising for revision. Especially the fact that in the modelling condition weak

homogenous dyads, traditionally considered the least successful combination, even outperform all dyad types in the practising condition attests to the effectiveness of modelling as an instructional method for collaborative revision.

References

- Dale, H. (1997). *Co-authoring in the classroom: Creating an environment for effective collaboration*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Francis, M., & McCutchen, D. (1994, April 4-8). *Strategy differences in revising between skilled and less-skilled writers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Hooper, S., & Hannafin, M. J. (1988). Cooperative CBI: The effects of heterogeneous versus homogeneous grouping on the learning of progressively complex concepts. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 4(4), 413-424.
- Mendonça, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769.
- Saddler, B., & Graham, S. (2005). The effects of peer-assisted sentence-combining instruction on the writing performance of more and less skilled young writers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(1), 43-54.
- Storch, N. (2004). Using activity theory to explain differences in patterns of dyadic interactions in an ESL class. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(4), 457-480.
- Sutherland, J. A., & Topping, K. J. (1999). Collaborative creative writing in eight-year olds: comparing cross-ability, fixed and same-ability reciprocal role pairing. *Journal of research in reading*, 22(2), 154-179.
- Webb, N. M., Nemer, K. M., Chizhik, A. W., & Sugrue, B. (1998). Equity issues in collaborative group assessment: Group composition and performance. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 607-651.
- Webb, N. M., Nemer, K. M., & Zuniga, S. (2002). Short circuits or superconductors? Effects of group composition on high-achieving students' science assessment performance. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 943-989.
- Webb, N. M., & Palincsar, A. S. (1996). Group processes in the classroom. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 841-873). New York: Macmillan.

J4 (continued)

L2 writing processes in college

Text, Cognition, and Context: An Investigation of the Relationship between Perceptions and Writing Performance of Chinese ESL Graduate Students in New York

Yuehai Xiao, New York University, U.S.

There is a body of literature on the three fundamental dimensions (i.e. text, process, and context) of second language (L2) writing and efforts of building product-process models of L2 writing. Yet there are also knowledge gaps in these two areas of research. Based on the review of Cumming (2001), an alternative unifying theory of second language (L2) writing might be needed to unite text, process, and context and explain the interrelationship among the three. Recently, Xiao (2008) attempts to put forth an alternative model of L2 writing by drawing on such scholarship as schema theory, reading research, contrastive rhetoric, genre analysis, reading-writing connections, and current-traditional rhetoric, all within a constructivist framework. He examines the interrelationship among text, cognition and context of L2 writing and proposes a notion of “ formal schemata construction with L2 writers”. By highlighting the characteristics of rhetorical forms in various contexts, formal schemata may serve as a scaffold for novice ESL writers.

The bottom-up approach (i.e. to build a theory based on empirical data) in Cumming and Riazi's (2000) attempt to build a product-process model of second language writing was not successful. Therefore, a top-down approach (i.e. to propose a theory before testing it with data) might worth trying. Using a top-down approach, the proposed mixed-method empirical study aims to refine a hypothetical model of L2 writing and test it with empirical data. Specifically, the proposed study is intended to seek answers to the following research questions:

1. How do college ESL students perceive the interrelationship among rhetorical patterns (text), meaning/L2 logic (cognition), and function/purpose (context) of writing in terms of an argumentative essay?
2. What are some of the most effective learning strategies of building formal schemata (i.e. organized background knowledge of rhetorical patterns and structures) for the participants?
3. How do the students' scores on the two surveys (about perceptions and strategy use) correlate with their writing performance on a timed-essay?

Data will be collected through two surveys, focus group, interviews, and a timed-essay. SPSS will be used to conduct factor analysis and reliability analysis to analyze the survey data. Moreover, the correlation between students' scores on the surveys and their scores on the timed-essay will be examined. The after-test interview data will be used to corroborate with students' scores on the survey and their scores on the timed-essay.

Significance

If data analysis supports the correlation between the students' scores on the two surveys and their writing performance, scores on the surveys could be used to predict

writing performance. And the hypothetical model of L2 writing could be used to inform the theory on the learning of L2 writing and the composing process of L2 writing.

References

- Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. In R. Manchon (Ed.), *Writing in the L2 classroom: Issues in research and pedagogy*, Special Issue of *International Journal of English Studies*, 1, 2, 1-23. University of Murcia, Spain.
- Cumming, A., & Riazi, A. (2000). Building models of second-language writing instruction and achievement. *Learning and Instruction*, 10, 3, 55-71.
- Xiao, Y. (2008). Building formal schemata with ESL student writers: Linking schema theory to contrastive rhetoric. *Asian EFL Journal*, V.32, Professional Teaching Articles, 13-40

J4 (continued)

L2 writing processes in college

Toward a More Comprehensive and Clear-cut Conceptualization of the Composing Process

M. Abdel Latif, Cairo University, Egypt

Following the seminal works of the 1970s (e.g. Emig, 1971; Perl, 1979), researchers have used the think-aloud method to collect data about writers' composing processes. The vast majority of composing studies, either in L1 or L2/FL, employing the think-aloud method have depended on using a coding scheme to analyse students' composing processes. Reviewing the previous coding schemes developed by FL/L2 writing researchers revealed that we still lack a more comprehensive and valid coding scheme for analysing FL/L2 writers' think-aloud protocols (author, 2008). The present study addresses this issue by proposing a coding scheme derived from 19.5-hour think-aloud protocols generated by 30 Egyptian EFL student writers. The scheme has six main composing components: planning, monitoring, retrieving, reviewing, text-changing, and transcribing. A main contribution of the proposed coding scheme is its clear-cut and more comprehensive conceptualization of composing process components. These six composing components are more fine-tuned than the ones- ranging from three to four in number- proposed in the cognitive models of Flower and Hayes (1980), Kellogg (1996), and Chenoweth and Hayes (2001). The gap this new conceptualization of composing process fills in is that it better describes or predicts the interaction among composing components, i.e. how the allocation of efforts to one component influences the efforts allocated to another. Moreover, when analysing writers' think-aloud protocols using the composing components proposed by this study, their composing processes are expected to be shown as more recursive than when analysing the protocols using the components proposed by these three models. That is, because this conceptualization calls for analysing writers' composing behaviours in a more analytic way, researchers are expected to identify more behaviours or strategies in writers' think-aloud protocols and in turn to find writers switching from one component to another more recursively.

J5

Writing in the sciences and engineering: Writing and learning processes of advanced undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and professional scientists

Carl Whithaus, University of California, Davis, U.S.

Karen Lunsford, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Marie C. Paretti, Virginia Tech, U.S.

Mya Poe, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.

Panel Overview

Building on research in WAC/WID (Hall, 2009; Neff & Whithaus, 2008; and Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006) and technical communication (Grabill, 2006; Henry, 2006; Spinnuzi, 2003; and Spilka, 1998), this panel explores a variety of learning processes that occur in academic and professional research environments. Drawing on research at six different sites, the papers that make up this panel trace the evolving expectations about science and engineering researchers' writing abilities. The first paper, "In the Borderland between Engineering and Science: Enabling Undergraduates to Move Between Worlds," provides a case study of the communication challenges in undergraduate materials science, documenting the tensions that students encounter as the move between the epistemologies and the written genre expectations of "pure science" courses and their applied science/engineering courses. The second paper, "The Development of Writing Abilities in Biomedical Engineering Graduate Students," uses longitudinal data to show that influences on graduate students' professional identity formation are integral to writing development and that those influences can have long-standing effects on writing development. The third paper, "Professional Development of Postdoctoral Scientists: Reports from Advanced Writing Programs in Norway and the U.S." reports on a study being conducted at the U of California-Santa Barbara and the U of Bergen, Norway in which advanced writing programs are being developed for postdoctoral scientists. The final paper in this session, "Impacts of Feedback on the Development of Scientific Researchers' Writing," examines response practices of research scientists working at a government agency and in a biomedical research lab, suggesting that much of the feedback advanced writers of scientific documents receive in these two locations resembles a style of corrective teacher-student feedback rather than a potentially more productive collegial model of response and feedback.

Taken together these four papers create a dialogue about writing in science and engineering. As case studies, each of these papers relies on analyses of participant interviews and multiple pieces of textual data. While it would be impossible for this panel (or any panel) to outline a developmental course for scientific researchers from undergraduates to professional researchers, putting these discreet case studies in dialogue with one another will sketch some of the shared challenges and dynamics that advanced writers in scientific fields face. Understanding these dynamics may enable writing researchers and science educators to develop (a) more effective curricula at the undergraduate level, (b) innovative means of assisting graduate student and postdoctoral researchers with their writing, and (c) techniques for integrating productive collegial models of response and feedback into professional research environments.

Paper 1

In the Borderland between Engineering and Science: Enabling Undergraduates to Move Between Worlds

Marie C. Paretti

Researchers traditionally separate science and engineering when examining both writing practices and the development of writing skills, often framing the differences in terms of the scientific method versus the design process. And the difference in epistemological approach does often result in different genres and communication patterns. Yet a number of subfields within engineering operate in a borderland between the two domains – a borderland that is growing as engineers increasingly draw inspiration from natural systems, develop nanoscale technologies, and collaborate with scientists on contemporary challenges. This paper examines the kinds of communication challenges students face as they move between the epistemologies and related genre expectations associated with scientific and engineering writing practices by using the field of materials science and engineering as a case study. Students in this field are immersed in a range of scientific approaches to the development and analysis of material properties and structures that draw heavily on the physical sciences, and particularly chemistry. At the same time, they are often expected to apply that knowledge to common engineering projects such as process design and material selection, and in doing so have to translate scientific approaches into engineering decisions. Examining this particularly borderland provides a lens for thinking more broadly about the ways in which the epistemological framework of scientific communication intersects with the needs and interests of other disciplinary domains.

Paper 2

The Development of Writing Abilities in Biomedical Engineering Graduate Students

Mya Poe

Longitudinal research has been an important methodology in composition research for the last 30 years (Walvoord & McCarthy, 1990; Haswell, 1991; Beaufort, 2007). As Rogers (2006) has noted, “these studies provide strong support for the continual embedding of writing tasks throughout the college curriculum because they link the development of writing abilities to multiple interactions rather than simply carrying forward or transferring prior learning. . . . [In the end,] development arguably has more to do with becoming an insider than merely acquiring greater syntactic fluency or the ability to use more words per t-unit.”

From 2007-2008 a MIT-based research group studied the writign development of 17 students in seven science and engineering “communication intensive” courses. As reported in *Learning to Communicate in Science and Engineering: Case Studies from MIT* (2010), we found teacher support, structure of assignments, and assessment practices were all important factors contributing to students’ writing development. Specifically, in regards to writing development in science and engineering contexts, we found that having students engage in “authentic” exercises that are like those used by professionals was

critical to student learning (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001); that students needed to engage in different kinds of writing activities in different ways to gain “adaptive expertise” (Bransford et al., 1999), and that in order to develop a nascent professional identity they needed communication tasks and mentoring that allowed them an idea of themselves as “capable of constructing knowledge, as in control of their thoughts and beliefs, and capable of expressing themselves” (Baxter Magolda, 1999, pp. 253–254).

In a follow-up study conducted two years later (2010-ongoing), we have again followed student writing development, this time outside of classes. In this new research, our goal has been to re-examine several of the conclusions we reached in the earlier work, particularly the relationship between students’ stance on scientific knowledge making and their development as communicators. In this presentation, we discuss the preliminary results of one of those follow-up case studies—a study of four graduate students from a biomedical engineering course. Using interview data and analysis of student writing, we suggest that identity formation is integral to writing development in ways that are often indirect from specific communication tasks (such as students’ relationships with mentors) and that those influences can have long-standing effects on writing development. In addition, we show how writing can act as a site of action for the development of scientific knowledge if writing is repeatedly used for social purposes in a group. The findings from this follow-up study are helpful in assessing our initial findings and shed light on how scientists develop as writers in graduate academic environments.

Paper 3

Professional Development of Postdoctoral Scientists:

Reports from Advanced Writing Programs in Norway and the U.S.

Karen Lunsford

In January 2010, the U.S. National Science Foundation introduced a new requirement for grant proposals: essentially, if a proposal requests money for a postdoctoral scholar, then the PI must also indicate how the postdoctoral scholar will be mentored. The mentoring includes, above all, assisting postdoctoral colleagues with publishing their work. Such a requirement extends parallel programs for graduate students that have been developed not only by the NSF (i.e., the IGERT program) but also by counterparts in many countries, such as the Norwegian Council on Research. In particular, these programs have responded to a decided shift to specialized forms of English as the lingua franca for scientific publications (e.g., Cronin, 2005; Gross, Harmon, & Reidy, 2002). Because English is a second or third language for many scientists, these programs often incorporate WAC/WID and ESL/EFL specialists. However, although some studies (e.g., Blakeslee, 2001) have focused on the development of writing abilities and professional identities among scientific graduate students, very little is known about how postdoctoral scientists—particularly international scientists—develop both their scientific English and their sense of themselves as fully recognized scientists.

This talk reports on a study being conducted at the U of California-Santa Barbara and the U of Bergen, Norway. At both universities, I am a WAC/WID writing consultant involved with new, advanced writing programs directed towards postdoctoral scientists. I

am analyzing, through surveys, interviews, and textual analysis, the experiences of postdoctoral participants in these programs. In particular, I am interested in the following questions: a) what strategies do they employ not only to write their articles, but also simultaneously to translate them across multiple languages, including English? b) what advanced rhetorical instruction best serves this population? c) how does their practice with different communication techniques also affect their scientific collaborations? The comparative data from these programs should give writing specialists better information on how to assist these advanced scholars.

Paper 4

Impacts of Feedback on the Development of Scientific Researchers' Writing

Carl Whithaus

Drawing on data from two ongoing research projects, this presentation will analyze the types of feedback research scientists receive when working in professional environments. The first site for data collection is a department in the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), and the second site is a biomedical research lab in Northern California. These projects involve collecting multiple versions of participants' writing samples, feedback on those samples, and interviews with participants. The collected documents include departmental scientific memos (often 8-20 pages), environmental impact reports, journal articles, and grant applications. Feedback and response has been found to range from conversations to quick email response to detailed written feedback. Text of the written feedback has been included in the study, while conversational feedback has only been captured through references in the interviews.

This presentation aims describe the types of feedback found in two scientific research environments. It will also examine (a) whether these methods of feedback should be duplicated in the methods of feedback in undergraduate writing-intensive science courses, (b) if the methods found in professional research environments themselves might be modified to become more effective, or (c) if the feedback processes in professional and undergraduate environments might productively be put in dialogue with one another to sketch out some effective techniques for feedback appropriate in each context. Preliminary findings suggest that much of the feedback received in these two locations resembles a style of corrective teacher-student feedback rather than a potentially more productive collegial model of response and feedback. These findings suggest that either (b) or (c) will be the model for refining feedback strategies argued for in this presentation rather than (a). However, data will be collected up until December, 2010 and may suggest a greater relevance for "back mapping" feedback methods from professional environments into upper division undergraduate courses.

J6

Expressive writing, emotions, and the self

The Effects of Expressive Writing

David Galbraith, Staffordshire University, U.K.

Co-author not presenting Norma Sherratt

Research by Pennebaker has suggested that expressive writing about past traumatic events can lead to beneficial effects on health and cognitive functioning. Klein and Boals (2001) suggested that expressive writing leads to a reduction of intrusive thoughts, and that this should lead to a freeing of working memory (WM) resources. This was supported in an empirical study suggesting that expressive writing leads to an increase in WM capacity after writing. In the present study, we aimed to replicate this effect, and to investigate whether it varied as a function of self-monitoring, and individual differences in emotional expressivity. We also examined whether it is specific to verbal WM, or whether it also occurs for non-verbal measures of WM capacity.

All participants were asked to complete an emotional expressivity questionnaire (Gross and John, 1998), measuring five facets of emotional expressivity: Expressive Confidence, Positive Expressivity, Negative Expressivity, Impulse Intensity, and Masking. They were also asked to complete a Self-monitoring scale (Snyder and Gangestad, 1986). 84 low and high self-monitors (categorised using a median split of scores on the self-monitoring scale) were then randomly assigned to either an expressive writing condition or to a control condition. In the expressive writing condition, participants wrote about a past traumatic event for 20 minutes on 3 separate occasions spread over a two-week period. In the control condition, participants wrote descriptively, on the same occasions, about the events of the day. Before writing, all participants completed the OSPAN test of WM capacity and the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ). Two weeks after the final writing session, they completed the same measures again, and also a non-verbal test of WM capacity (symmetry span).

The results showed a significant effect of expressive writing on OSPAN scores, with writers in the expressive writing condition, but not the control condition, showing increases in WM capacity. This replicates Klein and Boals' findings. By contrast, there were no differences in symmetry span as a function of writing condition. This suggests that the effect of expressive writing is specific to the verbal component of working memory, and is compatible with the assumption that the effect is related to the reduction of intrusive thoughts, which are assumed to be verbal in form. Individual differences in emotional expressivity affected the size of this effect: individuals who habitually express their positive and negative emotions in their everyday lives showed smaller effects of expressive writing, while individuals who typically mask their emotions in their everyday interactions showed stronger effects of expressive writing. Although effects on health were in the same direction, they were not statistically significant, possibly because of a lack of statistical power.

The presentation will conclude with a discussion of the use of writing as a therapeutic tool, of the broader implications for theories of motivation in writing, and of the functions of fictional writing.

J6 (continued)

Expressive writing, emotions, and the self

Rhetorics of Relocation: Constructing Identity across Displacements

Katrina M. Powell, Virginia Tech, U.S.

This project examines the literal and figurative border crossing that occurs as bodies are forcefully displaced. Examining multiple narratives, this research examines displacement rhetorics across different kinds of events such as natural disaster, civil war, and eminent domain, and across technologies such as letters, and oral histories, digital stories. No matter the event, persons in the process of being displaced are on the move. As displaced bodies move, so too do the identities they carry and inhabit move, and with moving bodies come “moving identities.” Deeply informed by postcolonial theories of displacement, the notion of “moving identities” is a way to theorize rhetorics of displacement and to understand the complex ways identity constructions within relocations occur, and the ways gender, class, sexuality, race, and technological access influence those constructions. The terms refugee, dispossessed, and the displaced come with evocations of certain identities, driven by certain institutional narrative structures. Given the recent dissemination of digital narratives on the web, access to digital technologies has dramatically changed the ways that stories get told and distributed. I examine several kinds of narratives across displacement events to present a counter to the accepted narrative that the displaced are only victims, that they must always be victims, and that their only recourse is to narrate their victimhood, whether in print or online. With systematic examination of oral histories, letters, and digital stories of the displaced (such as Hurricane Katrina victims, Sudanese refugees, and those displaced because of land condemnation), I situate the individual’s (private) narrative within the dominant (public) narratives about the particular event. The narratives people tell about their displacements serves as a form of action to counter what has been told about them by those with discursive power. In doing so, I suggest a systemic change to displacement policy (as it relates to eminent domain in this country) that accounts for individual response to displacement. This theoretical and conceptual change in displacement policy could affect the *actual processes* of displacement, which historically have had devastating and long-term effects for communities. These revised processes of displacement would include formal policies whereby potential displacees have a voice *during* the process rather than after the displacement has occurred. Ideally, this process would include a concurrent merging of voices where there is not a dichotomy of displacer and displacee, but rather a reciprocal relationship where procedures and policies are set by the diversity of involved parties. These narratives of displacement would recognize the notion of what I call “moving narratives.” People who are being displaced are physically moving, and with them their individual and community identities are figuratively moving, shifting as they relocate their lives. By examining individual identity and oral history through the lens of displacement, we link moving identities with moving bodies, defining displacement narratives as always, already moving. This reconceptualization accounts for the potential violence in any displacement occurrence, calling on policy and decision-makers to re-examine their current processes and renderings of displacement.

J7

Linguistic approaches to teaching writing in primary and middle schools

The Impact of Teachers' Linguistic Subject Knowledge on the Teaching of Writing

Debra Myhill, University of Exeter, U.K.

Susan Jones, University of Exeter, U.K.

The debate about the place of grammar in the English curriculum, and particularly in the teaching of writing, is long-lived, with research reports, professional arguments and policy statements on the topic spanning over fifty years. Following the general trend in most Western Anglophone countries in the 1960s to abandon traditional grammar teaching, there are now many teachers whose linguistic knowledge is limited. Concerns about the level of linguistic knowledge of English teachers have been expressed by Hudson (2004) in the UK, and by Koln and Hancock (2005) in the US, and Gordon (2005) notes teachers in New Zealand recognized '*their own, inadequate linguistic knowledge*' (Gordon 2005:50). This paper reports on the outcomes of a study investigating whether meaningful grammar teaching supports students' writing development, and in particular illustrates the role of teacher linguistic subject knowledge in mediating linguistic knowledge in the classroom.

Methodology

A randomised controlled trial (RCT) was conducted over a period of a year, in which the intervention group taught three units of work on fictional narrative, argument and writing poetry designed by the research team. These units embedded grammar purposefully within the teaching, drawing students attention to the possibilities and effects of linguistic structures. The sample comprised 32 classes of students aged 12-13 from 32 different schools. The teachers undertook a test of linguistic subject knowledge (LSK) and teachers were categorised as high or low LSK prior to random assignment to the intervention or comparison group. In tandem with the RCT, a complementary qualitative study, involving 96 lesson observations, 96 post-lesson interviews with teacher and 96 post-lesson interviews with students, was conducted to permit a rich, nuanced understanding of the statistical results.

Findings

The statistical analysis indicates a strong positive effect of the intervention on the quality of students' writing (ES 1.53), but also indicates that LSK was a factor influencing the success or otherwise of the intervention. Students with teachers with the lowest LSK benefitted least from the intervention, whilst those with average LSK benefitted the most. Qualitative analysis of the teacher interview data indicates that teachers with limited LSK tended to express strong affective responses about grammar, including fear and anxiety about grammar and feelings of professional inadequacy, both with colleagues and in answering students' linguistic questions. Many believed that grammar was too difficult for students and that it did not help their writing. One of the most significant themes emerging from the interview data is that teachers not only lack confidence with grammar itself but more importantly with the applied linguistic knowledge which can mediate learning meaningfully.

Conclusion

Andrews suggests that it is *'likely to be the case that a teacher with a rich knowledge of grammatical constructions and a more general awareness of the forms and varieties of the language will be in a better position to help young writers'* (Andrews 2005:75). This study is important in establishing and illuminating this relationship between pedagogical practice and teacher LSK.

J7 (continued)

Linguistic approaches to teaching writing in primary and middle schools

Beyond the Headline Findings: Understanding the Complexity of How
Contextualised Grammar Teaching Impacted Differently on Two UK Schools

Susan Jones, University of Exeter, U.K.

Introduction

This paper will present two exemplar case studies to explore the implications of findings from a nationally-funded study measuring the impact of contextualized grammar teaching. Against a contested background regarding the value of explicit teaching of grammar, this study responded to calls for an RCT to establish ‘if grammar teaching works’ but embedded the trial within a qualitative framework. Moore, Graham and Diamond (2003) argue that ‘*to undertake a trial of an educational or social intervention without an embedded qualitative process evaluation would be to treat the intervention as a black box, with no information on how it worked, how it could be improved, or what the crucial components of the intervention were.*’ The case studies will illuminate the socially-situated and complex nature of the intervention.

Methodology

32 schools were recruited and randomly assigned to intervention and control groups. Both groups were taught three types of writing, Fictional Narrative, Argument, and Poetry Writing, through the year, employing schemes of work designed by the research team. In both conditions, the learning focus, period of study, resources and learning objectives were the same; however, the intervention group received detailed lesson plans and a day’s training in their use and a pedagogic rationale for the teaching. The comparison group received medium term plans and no pedagogic support or training but taught in their usual manner. Both groups completed pre and post test writing assessments which were scored by an independent organization responsible for marking the National Key Stage tests in the UK. The qualitative data included teacher and student interviews, observation data and examples of student writing. Contextual data relating to individual teachers such as length of service, academic background and linguistic subject knowledge, together with the demographics of the schools were also collected.

Findings

The headline findings of the study indicated a positive effect size of 1.53 for the intervention group. However, the RCT does not provide a simple answer to the question ‘does grammar teaching work’ but suggests that it works differentially for different children in different classes taught by different teachers. Stepwise regression modelling reveals, for example, that the intervention benefited able writers more than less able writers, and also that learners with English as an Additional Language may benefit less. The qualitative data permits rich analysis of how the materials were mediated by the teacher and how students responded to them. This paper will compare a high improvement intervention class with a low improvement intervention class to explore some of the contextual issues impacting on the headline findings.

Conclusion

The study highlights the complementarity of qualitative and quantitative designs which provide rich understanding of complex classroom ecologies. It represents the first robust and large-scale empirical evidence that teaching grammar can positively affect writing attainment. Nevertheless, it is the varied and nuanced ways in which this operates that is the key contribution of this study. Using the qualitative data, this paper seeks to build a picture of two schools for whom the intervention had different outcomes.

J7 (continued)

Linguistic approaches to teaching writing in primary and middle schools

Teaching Grammar for Writing: Espoused beliefs and pedagogical practices

Annabel Watson, University of Exeter, U.K.

Introduction

This research is based on the premise that “understanding teachers and teaching is not possible without an understanding of the beliefs about teaching and learning which teachers have” (Phipps & Borg 2007:17). It is located within the ongoing ‘grammar debate’ in Anglophone countries regarding the place of grammar in the curriculum. Despite the widespread disagreement within the academic community regarding the role and impact of grammar teaching, the experiences and opinions of those who teach grammar to young writers have been largely overlooked. This research presents an opportunity to give some of these practitioners a voice in the debate, as well as to contribute to theoretical understanding of the relationship between espoused beliefs and pedagogical practices.

Theoretical Framework

The benefit of teaching grammar to native writers is widely debated by both the professional and research communities: a paucity of convincing empirical research evidence (Andrews et al. 2006) is counterpointed by the beliefs of linguists drawing on socio-cultural theories, who contend that a contextualised approach to grammar may have the potential to help young writers to explore how language can be shaped for purpose and effect in different contexts (Denham and Lobeck 2010; Myhill et al. 2008). Within such a highly-contested domain, the beliefs held by teachers are likely to be particularly influential in directing their practice (Borg & Burns 2008). By examining how teachers conceptualise grammar teaching, their beliefs about its value, and the relationship of their espoused beliefs to their pedagogical practices, this study illuminates how teachers are grappling with some of the problems identified in the ‘grammar debate.’

Research Question

What beliefs do teachers espouse about the nature and value of teaching grammar for writing, and how do these beliefs relate to their pedagogical practices?

Methodology

This qualitative study was conducted in two phases. The first used interview data from an ESRC-funded RCT trial exploring the impact of contextualised grammar teaching. Thirty-two teachers, each from a different high-school in the UK, were observed and interviewed three times over the course of a year, with questions focusing on their beliefs about writing, their pedagogical decisions and their understanding of ‘grammar teaching.’ The second phase of the study used a case-study approach to investigate the experiences of two teachers from the original sample. Three week periods of lesson observation, supplemented by stimulated-recall interviews and think-aloud protocols, explored pedagogical practices and decision-making.

Findings

Findings from phase one suggest that teachers identify the teaching of grammar with a focus on accuracy, along with “old-fashioned” and unappealing teaching methods. In contrast, what they most value about grammar teaching is its perceived potential to render writing “transparent,” allowing students to explore adaptations of style. This is accompanied by strong feelings of inadequacy and fear amongst many of the sample, relating to both linguistic subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. The case studies suggest that the relationship between belief and practice is reciprocal, with changes in practice (resulting from the use of RCT intervention materials) both reinforcing and challenging beliefs.

J8

Methods and methodologies: writing research in context

Doug Eymann, George Mason University, U.S.

Byron Hawk, University of South Carolina, U.S.

Susan Lawrence, George Mason University, U.S.

Eve Weiderhold, George Mason University, U.S.

Roundtable

Rather than reporting on specific research projects, the aim of this roundtable is to consider the ways in which new writing contexts (and, indeed, new approaches to what constitutes ‘writing’ as an object of study) require a renewed engagement with questions of method and methodology. The participants in this roundtable view writing research as a rhetorical activity whose construction and enactment rely upon engagement with rhetorical principles: as Sullivan and Porter (1997) note, “[t]he asking of the research question itself and the design of a way to address the question (i.e. the inquiry procedures) constitute a rhetorical activity: a rhetorical interaction with research participants. . . . Methodology is not merely a means to something else, it is itself an intervening social action and a participation in human events” (pp. 12-13). Given this view, our primary query is whether the rhetorical situation (that is, context) should mediate writing research methods and to what degree new methods and methodologies should be invented in response to new situations.

The first speakers will argue for the need to see methodology as a form of rhetorical invention and provide a theoretical view of the relationship between method and context; this approach provides the framework for the remaining presenters to draw upon when exploring writing research methodology in specific contexts. The second, third, and fourth speakers will examine methods in writing pedagogy contexts, professional writing contexts, and digital writing contexts, respectively. It is our intention to provide relatively short position statements and arguments and then encourage the audience to participate in a discussion (or debate) about the need for new or reconsidered approaches to methods and methodologies.

Methodology As Invention: Mixing Methods through Emergent Situations

Byron Hawk and Casey Boyle, University of South Carolina

Over the past twenty years, the issue of mixed method research has traveled from social science to psychology to composition studies. Starting with the revival of interest in qualitative methods in the 1980s, the debates have generally centered on using both qualitative and quantitative approaches, the relationship between these two methods, and the external and internal influences on choosing methods. Many researchers implement mixed methods to triangulate data and produce a more accurate, objective, or representative view of the problem assessed. Despite some critiques that argue mixing methods hinders objectivity and some pragmatic extensions of mixed methods into more theoretical or postmodern directions, the debate has largely remained in the realm of the quantitative and qualitative divide and a traditional model of epistemology. Our research question looks to investigate how the notion of mixed methods can be extended beyond mixing pre-established quantitative and qualitative methods toward inventing methods for particular contexts, and what this might mean for a broader definition of writing

research. Following a turn in the social sciences toward actor-network theory and the development of methods for mobile, digital technologies, we survey some of the recent literature to expand quantitative accounts beyond objectivity and qualitative research beyond traditional ethnography. Our primary example is Annemarie Mol's *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Mol examines one disease (atherosclerosis) as it circulates in one particular hospital to show how the multiple places, apparatuses, specialties, and technologies used to discuss, measure, observe, or strip away the disease actually produces what becomes known as atherosclerosis. It takes a constellation of practices to induce these multiplicities to cohere under the name of the disease, from filling out forms, to collecting files, making images, conducting case conferences, and developing doctor-patient relations. Consequently, Mol has to re-invent ethnography based on enactment rather than observation. Rather than producing a more accurate view, Mol invents writing and research methods that co-produce the disease itself. We conclude by arguing that writing isn't just a part of the constellation, but this constellation and production of coherence is writing and methods for writing research should respond accordingly.

Visibility and Accountability: Methods in Writing Pedagogy Contexts

Eve Wiederhold, George Mason University

The rise of visual culture as a central site of rhetorical inquiry presents a need to develop responsive pedagogies. This presentation will explore the ways in which discourses of visibility privilege a particular kind of knowledge production while influencing public conversations about what to look for when assessing student and teacher productivity. I will address this topic through two sites of inquiry: the recent endeavor by the Los Angeles Times to evaluate teachers and then publish the names of teachers and how they ranked in their study; a perceived hostility to composition theory sometimes expressed by MA students earning degrees to teach secondary education who see little value in studying texts that do not immediately translate into concrete practices. In both cases, a presumed value is attributed to the fact of representability, as if, for example, showing "results" is tantamount to offering accurate and objective demonstrations of effectiveness. The priority placed upon visibility inhibits the development of alternative responses to the question of how discourses of accountability intersect with rhetorical production.

Teaching Research Methods Rhetorically: Theory in Empirical Studies of Writing

Susan Lawrence, George Mason University

Research methods textbooks are strong on discussing the connection between research questions and methods. In distinguishing between method and methodology, moreover, they invoke the theoretical assumptions about subjects and objects of knowledge that underlie our approaches to research. But our methods texts have little to say about how, in our empirical studies of writing, theory comes into play also as we draw explicitly on specific theories of rhetoric, composition, discourse, and culture. What relationships obtain between this kind of theory and the research study? Prompted by the need to address this question with students in a research methods class, this presentation takes a rhetorical approach to theory in research studies, conceiving of theory not as a reality external to a study that is then brought "in" to it, but rather as a discursive entity

constructed in and through the research activity and writing. From a discourse analysis of how theory is constructed in empirical studies of writing-in-context, I argue first for the need to teach students about theory's epistemic *dynamis* in empirical research, and second for the benefits of conceiving of theory, like methodology, as a rhetorical invention.

Digital-Native Methods for Digital Writing Research

Douglas Eyman, George Mason University

This presentation argues that because most textual production has now shifted from analog means of production to digital, including the use of multiple modes and media, the practices and processes of composing that writing research takes as its object of inquiry are undergoing radical changes – changes that necessitate concomitant changes in research methods. Once a digital text has been placed on the Internet, the media of delivery and the rhetorical context itself may change as the work is appropriated and/or re-mixed, or via the circulation activities of software agents whose programs decouple a text from its original rhetorical situation. And perhaps most importantly, the always-in-circulation nature of digital texts help to make explicit the fact that rhetorical activity is always situated within an economics of production.

Digital networks, digital media, and digital production carry their own affordances, practices, and economics, but to date there is a gap between the methods available for theorizing and analyzing digital works and the analytic tools digital texts and networks themselves make possible. Thus, I argue for the development of “digital-native” methods that can apply digital analytics to digital work, rather than relying on the application of analog (print-based) methods. New methods are needed because most current research methods are grounded in print-based literacies, but the current composing practices of writers (in a wide variety of writing contexts) engage multiple media and modalities, many of which are enacted within digital networks.

References

Sullivan, Patricia, & Porter, James E. (1997). *Opening spaces: Writing technologies and critical research practices*. Greenwich: Ablex.

J9

Coming to grips with complexity applying recent research frameworks in the investigation of newswriting

Aleksandra Gnach, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Daniel Perrin, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Doing writing research in real life settings means tackling writing-related problems by accessing them within appropriate research frameworks. Researchers want to get multi perspective, vivid insights into culturally and socially contextualized language use, in order to develop situated knowledge about what works for whom under which circumstances.

In keeping with the conference theme of crossing borders, the panel explores and relates recent and emerging research frameworks applied in writing research, such as Focused Ethnography, Integrative Social Theory, and Dynamic Systems Theory. We aim to provide and discuss knowledge generated in large-scale research projects in order to evaluate existing projects and to facilitate the design of future writing research.

- **Focused ethnography in the research of newswriting**

- **Realist social theory in the research of newswriting**

What people do influences the world, and the world influences what people do. On the one hand, an influential headline might slightly change the way a language is used by a certain community, on the other hand, writing for the media in order to be understood means respecting a language's existing structure. This interplay of agency and structure through social practices is what most integrative social theories explain. In doing so, Realist Social Theory (RST) – more than any other integrative social theory – focuses on the different natures of agency and structure: on their distinct properties and powers (Sealey & Carter, 2004, 16).

RST separates four “domains”, four layers of the social world: Psychobiography consists of the individual's mentally represented physical, emotional, and cognitive experiences – a person's “individual truth” (Craib, 1998, 31). Situated activity means what people do in context, for example, writing news or interact with peers. Social settings are the social contexts of human agency, such as families or workplaces with their routinized practices, for example a newsroom staff's shared practices of language use. On the most macro level, the domain of contextual resources comprises the cultural capital available to a particular group of people at a particular place

and time, such as democracy, national wealth, or the language of a community into which somebody is born.

RST is not methodologically prescriptive. However, to reconstruct the interplay of relations and processes in this “emergent, complex, densely symbolic world” (Sealey & Carter, 2004, 196), RST researchers must combine multiple perspectives and methods in empirical research. If possible, case studies are combined with corpus research, and theoretical knowledge is combined with “insiders’ knowledge” (197): the professional or everyday knowledge of the people being researched.

In my presentation, I will draw on data from ethnographic case studies to evaluate how the combination of different research methods (ethnography, conversation analysis, and keystroke logging) can help to reconstruct text production practices in newsrooms as well as the interplay of situated activity and social structure.

- **Dynamic systems theory in the research of newswriting**

Doing research in the framework of Dynamic systems theory (DST) means exploring behavior within and across very different levels and timescales. As DST considers everything to be connected with everything else, decontextualizing and atemporalizing single phenomena are out of the question (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). Instead, DST research foregrounds certain aspects and investigates them in more detail, but remains open to contextual behavior that might explain change. This calls for multi method approaches combining in-depth case studies and large corpora as well as analysis and modeling.

Case studies can reveal where, when, how and why change happens on the micro level of situated activity. In the critical situation of newswriting, a new pattern of process management or product design can emerge when a journalist tries to juggle conflicting expectations. If the new pattern succeeds it might become part of that journalist’s repertoire. Understanding such micro development (Thelen & Corbetta, 2002) means shifting from a static view of newswriting to the dynamic perspective of DST.

However, DST research can also proceed heuristically, starting with assumptions instead of data. In this case, the processes of change in a dynamic system are reconstructed through *dynamic models*: simulations and analogies which are tested against reality for best fit. The outcome of a computer simulation is compared with observations of the real-world system under investigation. Relations are redesigned and parameters adjusted until the model behaves like the observed reality. The dynamic model simulates change through iteration of

algorithms: rules are applied in loops where the output of one loop is the input for the next. Thus, the mechanisms of change in the model are exactly known and can be taken as metaphors for the principles of change in the real world system.

In my presentation, I will draw on both case studies and corpus analysis from two large research projects (2005-2009; 2010-2012) to explain and illustrate the application of a DST framework in the analysis of newswriting.

Craib, Ian (1998). *Experiencing Identity*. London: Sage.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, & Cameron, Lynne (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics* (2 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sealey, Alison, & Carter, Bob (2004). *Applied linguistics as social science*. London et al.: Continuum.

Thelen, Esther, & Corbetta, Daniela (2002). Microdevelopment and dynamic systems. Applications to infant motor development. In Nira Granott & Jim Parziale (Eds.), *Microdevelopment. Transition processes in development and learning* (pp. 59-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

J10

Icons and argument: Key issues in the use of visual images in writing instruction and practice

Tom Huckin, University of Utah, U.S.

Maureen Mathison, University of Utah, U.S.

Overview: The increasing use of visual imagery in this age of the global Internet has confronted writing researchers and teachers with some cogent issues. For example, why do simple icons like Kaplan's contrastive-rhetoric 'doodles' and Bitzer's rhetorical triangle have such enduring appeal for writing instructors? Given the static nature of such icons, how relevant are they to increasingly dynamic conceptions of the learning process? Also, while 'visual argument' has assumed an increasingly prominent place in composition courses, textbooks, journals, and conferences, there are reasons to doubt that it even exists. Speaker 2 claims it doesn't, Speaker 3 claims it does, in a debate centered ultimately on disciplinary contextualization.

Speaker 1: There's No Such Thing as Visual Argument (Tom Huckin, University of Utah)

In recent years the notion of 'visual argument' has enjoyed increasingly broad acceptance in the US composition world. It is routinely included in writing handbooks and textbooks and is a popular topic at national and regional composition conferences. Indeed, 'visual argument' is now treated as a given in our field, a reified concept whose ontological legitimacy appears beyond dispute.

This paper takes a contrarian position, arguing that if we define argument as "taking a position on an issue and supporting it with evidence and good reasoning" (Hult & Huckin), there is no such thing as 'visual argument.' I will begin with a survey of current writing handbooks and textbooks, composition conference papers, course titles, and other indicators of the status of 'visual argument' in the US today. I will then make the following counter-argument:

1. Virtually all the examples cited in the above literature rely on supplementary language, hence do not illustrate *visual* argument but rather *multimodal* argument.
2. Even with linguistic supplementation, so-called visual arguments fail to satisfy the basic requirements of argument. They (a) fail to make an explicit claim, (b) do not lay out their premises, (c) provide little or no supporting evidence, (d) do not consider and refute alternative views, and (e) do not build a compelling case.

Point 1 will be supported by an empirical survey of the literature. Point 2 will be supported by empirical data gathered from university-level writing students.

Proponents of visual argument object to the above two points on at least four grounds: (1) argument can consist of other than propositional content (Blair); (2) mixtures of verbal and visual are still 'visual' (ibid.); (3) argumentation in general is enthymematic, and 'visual arguments' are no different (Birdsell & Groarke); and (4) almost all arguments, including traditional ones, rely on the audience's contextualization (ibid).

I will refute all of these objections as follows: (1) such a characterization changes the standard definition of 'argument' (Fleming; Gross); (2) only the verbal part can do the heavy lifting, and in any case such mixtures should be labeled 'multimodal,' not 'visual';

(3) enthymemes have at least one stated premise in addition to a conclusion, while ‘visual arguments’ do not; and (4) ‘visual arguments’ rely far more on contextualization than do verbal arguments.

At stake in all this is our very role as writing teachers and researchers. My talk will conclude with a full discussion of the implications of diluting the traditional conception of argument, including especially its impact on pedagogical praxis.

Speaker 2: When the Visual Constitutes Argument: The Case of Science/Technology (Maureen Mathison, University of Utah)

This paper addresses visual argument from a unique perspective, that of its use in science, adding to the debate about whether or not as Fleming writes, a picture can be an argument (1996). Since Fleming’s article, several scholars have attempted to develop a theory of or approach to visual argument. Birdsell and Goarke (2007) address how visuals can function as propositions because the representation the image signifies is taken to be true. In his recent article, “Toward a Theory of Verbal-Visual Interaction: The Example of Lavoisier,” Gross (2009) makes the case that by definition visuals themselves cannot comprise the whole of an argument. There are two reasons for this: 1) traditional notions of argument claim that propositions are verbal, while visuals only supply evidence for a proposition and 2) propositions can either be true or false, but a visual cannot be judged accordingly. The core of my paper addresses whether or not traditional notions of argument can explain the propositional role of visuals in an increasing visual and technological world where information flows fast, and images increasingly substitute for verbal explanation.

To examine how traditional argument structure might function through visual images, I interviewed graduate students in the biomedical field, a scientific area that relies more on visuals and technology to make its claims. All students received the same two visual texts, one in their research area and a second from popular culture. Under both conditions they were asked to discuss the visual and their representation of it, as well as imagine a counterclaim or negation of it. Students are more likely to identify an implied argument in their field than they are in popular culture.

Examining visual argument from the perspective of science studies (Burri & Dumit, 2009; Daston, 1994; Daston & Gallison, 2007; Jones & Gallison, 1998;) and shared cognition (Cannon-Bowers & Salas, 2001), I argue that visuals can function as both proposition and evidence at once, especially in disciplines that rely on images derived from technology to construct knowledge. Increasingly the image itself is the argument (proposition and evidence) from which the community derives its claims (Amann & Knorr-Cetina, 1990; Carter, 1995; Dumit, 2003 Neuman-Held, 2006) and counter-claims (Edwards, 2009; Oreske, 2003).

References

- Amann, K. & Knorr-Cetina, K. (1990). The fixation of visual evidence. In Lynch, M. & Woolgar, S. (Eds.), *Representation in scientific practice*, pp. 85-121. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Birdsell, D.S. and Groarke, L. (1996). Toward a theory of visual argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 33 (1996): 1-10.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1.1 (1968): 1-14.
- Blair, A. (1996). "The Possibility and Actuality of Visual Argument." *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 33 (1996): 23-39.
- Brennan, Teresa, and Martin Jay, eds. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Burri, R. V. & Dumit, J. (2008). *Social studies of scientific imaging and visualization*. In Hackett, E. J., Amsterdamska, O., Lynch, M. & Wajcman, J. (eds.), pp. 297-317. *The handbook of science and technology studies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Byram, Michael. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling Between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English* 68.6 (2006): 589-604.
- Cartwright, L. (1995). *Screening the body: Tracing medicine's visual culture*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cannon-Bowers, J. A. & Salas, E. (2001). Reflections on shared knowledge, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 195-202.
- Daston, L. (1994). Marvelous facts and miraculous evidence in early modern Europe. In Chandler, J. Davidson, A. I. & Harootunian, H. (Eds.). *Questions of evidence: Proof, practice and persuasion across the disciplines*, pp 243-274. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dumit, J. (2003). *Picturing personhood: Brain scans and biomedical identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Edbauer, Jenny. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (2005): 5-24.
- Edwards, P. (2010). *The world in a machine: Computer models, data models, and global atmospheric networks*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fleming, D. (1996). "Can pictures be arguments?" *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 33, 11-22.
- Gross, A.G. (2009) Toward a theory of verbal-visual interaction: The example of Lavoisier. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 39:2, April, 147-169.
- Jordan, Jay. "Second Language Users and Emerging English Designs." *College Composition and Communication* 61.2 (2009): W310-29.
- Kachru, Braj. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992.
- Kaplan, Robert. "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education." *Language Learning* 16 (1966): 1-20.
- Kramsch, Claire. *Context and Culture in Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Kubota, Ryuko, and Al Lehner. "Toward Critical Contrastive Rhetoric." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13 (2004): 7-27.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone." *College Composition and Communication* 45.4 (1994): 442-58.
- Neumann-Held, E. (2006). *Genes in development: Re-reading the molecular paradigm*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Oreskes, N. (2003). The role of quantitative models in science. In Canham, C. D., Cole, J.J., Lauenroth (Eds.), *The role of models in ecosystems science*, pp. 13-31. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Walker, John A., and Sarah Chaplin. *Visual Culture: An Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's, 1997.

J11

Revision processes and instruction in revising

Charles MacArthur, University of Delaware, U.S.

Ralph Ferretti, University of Delaware, U.S.

Michelle L. Filling, Cabrini College, U.S.

Yi Song, University of Delaware, U.S.

Noreen S. Moore, The College of New Jersey, U.S.

Zoi Phillippakos, University of Delaware, U.S.

Introduction

Revision of writing is important from two perspectives. First, revising is a critical aspect of the composing process that is used extensively by experienced writers (Fitzgerald, 1987; Hayes, 2004). When writers revise, they have an opportunity to think about whether their text communicates effectively to an audience, to improve the quality of their prose, and even to reconsider their content and perspective and, potentially, transform their own understanding. Second, from an instructional perspective, revising provides an opportunity for teachers to guide students in learning about effective writing in ways that will not only improve the current piece, but that will also carry over to future writing. In learning to revise, students get feedback from readers and teachers, learn to evaluate their writing, and discover new ways to solve common writing problems.

This panel will include four presentations: a review of research on revision, a study of revising by young elementary school students, a study of the effects of reader feedback on revising of college students, and a study of revising of argumentative texts by college students.

Presentation: Review of Research on Evaluation and Revision in Writing

Charles MacArthur

The presentation will include highlights from a review of research on evaluation and revision processes in writing. The review will include research on the cognitive and social processes involved in revising and research on instruction directed at improving revision.

Research on the cognitive processes involved in revision has been conducted since the earliest days of cognitive research on writing, with Flower and Hayes and their colleagues (1986) and Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) making important contributions in the 1980s. Though early models focused on identifying problems in communicating intended meaning, more recent models (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2004) also include the discovery of new opportunities to extend ideas as a source of revision. Interest in revising also has a long history from a sociocultural perspective, including work on audience and peer response (Freedman, 1986; Nystrand, 1986). Because writing is a reciprocal process between writers and readers, revision is affected by anticipation of audience and actual responses from readers. Basic research has investigated a number of cognitive and social factors that influence revision, including audience awareness, goals for communication, response and feedback from readers, knowledge of evaluation criteria, topic and genre knowledge, critical reading skills, and metacognitive self-regulation processes. Considerable research has investigated developmental changes in revision knowledge and skill.

Research on instruction informs our understanding of the processes involved as well as how to teach revising. The two most commonly studied approaches to improving revising skill are feedback from instructors and peer response. Closely related research has investigated the effects of observing readers' attempts to understand text. In addition, substantial numbers of studies have investigated the value of teaching evaluation criteria, the use of word processing and other technologies, and strategy instruction. The review will summarize this research and attempt to connect it to the basic research on revising processes.

References

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flower, L., Hayes, J. R., Carey, L., Schriver, J., & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. *College Composition and Communication*, 37, 16-55.
- Freedman, S. W. (Ed.). (1985). *The acquisition of written language: Response and revision*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Hayes, J. (2004). What triggers revision? In L. Allal, L. Chanquoy & P. Largy (Eds.), *Revision: Cognitive and instructional processes* (Vol. 13, pp. 9-20). Boston, MA: Kluwer.
- Nystrand, M. (1986). *The structure of written communication: Studies in reciprocity between writers and readers*. New York: Academic Press.

Presentation: *Knowledge of Revising and Revising Behaviors of Students in the Primary Grades*.

Zoi A. Philippakos & Charles A. MacArthur

Although proficient writers frequently make substantive revisions that affect the overall content, organization, and tone of their writing, school-age writers generally make few substantive revisions (Fitzgerald, 1987). A number of explanations have been offered for this limited revision: difficulties detecting and diagnosing problems, difficulties fixing problems, limited audience awareness and goals for writing, limited understanding of evaluation criteria, narrow schema for revising, and weak executive control of the complex processes involved (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; MacArthur, 2007). Studies with middle and high school students have provided support for explanations involving limited knowledge of revising and evaluation criteria (MacArthur, Schwartz, & Graham, 1991), limited executive control (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Graham, 1997), and limited awareness of audience and goals (Graham, MacArthur, & Schwartz, 1995; Midgette, Haria & MacArthur, 2007).

In the primary grades, revision is a prominent feature of instruction following a process approach. Case studies have shown that conferences with peers and teachers can enable young students to engage in revision (Fitzgerald & Stamm, 1990; Jasmine & Weiner, 2007; McCarthey, 2004). However, research on revising in the primary grades is limited to case studies.

The purpose of the current study was to describe the revisions made by students in grades 1 to 4 and to determine whether revision would be affected by specific goals. A total of 346 students wrote and revised both a story and a persuasive letter. Students were randomly assigned to two conditions for revising. Students in the control condition were given a general direction to make changes after re-reading their work. Students in the treatment condition were provided with specific goals based on text structure. For example, for the story, they were asked to tell more about their characters.

A retrospective recall interview was conducted with a sample of 48 students to identify their reasons for the changes they made. These students also participated in a metacognitive interview regarding their understanding of writing and revising purposes and tasks. The 24 teachers of the students were interviewed to explore potential correlations between teacher beliefs and practices and students' revising. Teachers were asked about their writing instruction in general, instruction in revising, their beliefs about writing instruction and the readiness of their students to learn to revise, and their procedures for monitoring students' growth as writers.

Preliminary analysis indicates that children at all grade levels were able to make revisions and that the specific goals led to more revision.

References

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fitzgerald, J. (1987). Research on revision in writing. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 481-506.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Stamm, C. (1990). Effects of group conferences on first graders' revision in writing. *Written Communication*, 7, 96-135.
- Graham, S. (1997). Executive control in the revising of students with learning and writing difficulties. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 223-234.
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Schwartz, S. (1995). Effects of goal setting and procedural facilitation on the revising behavior and writing performance of students with writing and learning problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 230-240.
- Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35 (2), 131-139.
- McCarthy, S. J. (1994). Authors, text, and talk: The internalization of dialogue from social interaction during writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29 (3), 200-31.
- MacArthur, C. A. (2007). Best practices in teaching evaluation and revision. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 141-162). New York: Guilford.
- MacArthur, C. A., Schwartz, S. S., & Graham, S. (1991). Effects of a reciprocal peer revision strategy in special education classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 6, 201-210.
- Midgette, E., Haria, P., & MacArthur, C. (2008). The effects of content and audience awareness goals for revision on the persuasive essays of fifth- and eighth-grade students. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 21 (1-2), 131-151.

Presentation: *iFeedback: Using Video Technology for Supporting Student Revision*
Michelle L. Filling and Noreen S. Moore

Revision is important because it can help writers improve their writing quality and it provides a learning opportunity for writers as they practice and reflect on compositional goals and problems (MacArthur, 2007). College writing teachers utilize written feedback as an impetus for revision; however, written comments are often provided days after a student submits a draft and are corrective in nature. Corrective comments lead students to believe that revision is an exercise in pleasing the teacher rather than an activity used to re “envision” an idea based on a real reader’s reactions (Butler, 1987). Immediate feedback, such as that provided during a writing conference can be more effective (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Still, one problem of the writing conference is that students do not have a transcript of what was said, so they often forget their ideas and goals when they return to actually do the revisions. Furthermore, the writing teacher often summarizes his response to the student’s writing retrospectively, which may lead to generalizations about the student’s writing that are not particularly helpful.

One solution is to provide students with video feedback where teachers think aloud as they read and respond to students’ writing. This way students have a record of the teacher’s reactions and comments and the teacher can provide specific, in-the-moment feedback, which is directly connected to particular aspects of the writing. Previous research suggests that observation of peer-readers responding to texts helps improve high school students’ writing quality (Couzijn and Rijlaarsdam, 2005). Given the effectiveness of this method with high school writers and peer feedback, it is important to understand if video feedback of teachers giving reader-based feedback would be effective with college students.

In this paper, the authors will present a case study that explores how a college writing teacher utilized reader-based video feedback to help students’ revise. In addition, this study examines college students’ perceptions of the usefulness of this method of feedback. The case study takes place over the course of one semester and includes one class of college students and one faculty member. The data collected and analyzed includes videos of teacher feedback, first and second drafts of students’ essays, syllabi, assignments, rubrics, and students’ interviews. The authors will discuss the results and implications for future use of this type of feedback.

References

- Butler, J. (1987). Remedial writers: The teacher’s job as corrector of papers. In T. Enos (Ed.), *A sourcebook for basic writing teachers* (pp. 557-64). New York: Random House.
- Couzijn, M. & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2005). Learning to write instructive texts by reader observation and written feedback. In G. Rijlaarsdam, H. van den Bergh, & M. Couzijn (Eds.), *Effective learning and teaching of writing: A handbook of writing in education* (2nd ed., pp. 209-240). New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.

MacArthur, C. A. (2007). Best practices in teaching evaluation and revision. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 141-162). New York: Guilford.

Presentation: *Teaching Normative Standards for Argumentation Through the Revising Process: The Effects on College Students' Argumentative Essays*

Yi Song and Ralph Ferretti

Interventions designed to teach argumentative writing strategies (e.g., De La Paz & Graham, 1997a, 1997b; Graham & Harris, 1989; Sexton, Harris, & Graham 1998) are effective at increasing the inclusion of argumentative elements and improving essay quality. However, these interventions have not taught normative standards for judging the reasonableness of students' arguments (Ferretti, Lewis, & Andrews-Weckerly, 2009). Students can use these standards, which are met by answering specific critical questions for particular argumentative strategies (van Eemeren, Grootendorst, & Henkemans, 1996; Walton, Reed, & Macagno, 2007), to answer potential counterarguments and justify the reasonableness of arguments (Ferretti et al., 2007).

We tested this idea by teaching college students, over half of whom are ill-prepared for college-level writing (Achieve, Inc., 2005), a revising strategy that includes argumentation strategies and critical questions (**Treatment 1**). The effects of this treatment were contrasted with another that taught the argumentation strategies without the critical questions (**Treatment 2**) and a no-instruction control condition (**Control**). Compared to the other conditions, **Treatment 1** should impact students' first drafts and revisions by (1) increasing the number of counterarguments, alternative standpoints, and rebuttals compared to the other conditions; (2) improving the overall reasonableness of students' essays; and (3) increasing the use of argumentative strategy-relevant critical questions to justify the reasonableness of their arguments.

Thirty college students, who were matched on the basis of their pretest writing and revising performance, were assigned to the three conditions. First, we graphed students' first and second drafts to identify the structure of their arguments and the kinds of argumentative strategies used by them. Second, a primary trait rating scale was used to assess the overall reasonableness of their arguments. Third, we counted the number of critical questions that appeared in the first and second drafts. Preliminary analyses show that compared to the other conditions, **Treatment 1** resulted in the inclusion of many more counterarguments, rebuttals, and critical questions in students' first and second drafts, and that these essays were judged to be more reasonable. The instructional implications of our findings will be discussed.

References

- Achieve, Inc. (2005). *Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work?* Washington, DC: Author.
- De La Paz, S., & Graham, S. (1997a). Strategy instruction in planning: Effects on the writing performance and behavior of students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 63, 167-181.

- De La Paz, S., & Graham, S. (1997b). Effects of dictation and advanced planning instruction on the composing of students with writing and learning problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 203-222.
- Ferretti, R., Lewis, W. E., & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2009). Do goals affect the structure of students' argumentative writing strategies? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(3), 577-589.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1989). Improving learning disabled students' skills at composing essays: Self-instructional strategy training. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 201-214.
- Sexton, M., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (1998). Self-regulated strategy development and the writing process: Effects on essay writing and attributions. *Exceptional Children, 64*, 295-311.
- van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Henkemans, F. S. (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory: A handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Walton, D., Reed, C., & Macagno, F. (2007). *Argumentation schemes*. Cambridge University Press.

Expertise in graduate and professional writing

What We Know about Expertise in Professional Writing

Karen Schriver, KSA Communication Design & Research, U.S.

Psychology has a rich tradition of studying the nature of expertise—a tradition that began with laboratory studies of skilled chess players (Charness, 1976; Chase & Simon, 1973) and continues with studies of professionals such as composers, painters (Hayes, 1985, 1989), musicians (Lehmann & Ericsson, 1997; Lehmann & Gruber, 2006), ocean navigators (Hutchins, 1995), and airline pilots (Schreiber et al., 2009). But with few exceptions (Kellogg, 2006), notably lacking from this corpus on expertise (Ericsson, 1996, 2009; Ericsson & Smith, 1991) are studies of writing. In particular, missing are studies of professionals who write for a living. Professional writing and information design are important sites for inquiry because writing and design for publication demands complex problem solving in situated dynamic environments in which cognitive, social, historical, political, cultural, and technological forces shape communication activity in powerful ways.

Up to this point, the few reviews available on professional writing concentrate on essayists, advanced academic writers, or poets (Geisler, 1994; Kellogg, 2006, 2008; Wishbow, 1988). This review extends our knowledge by drawing on the international contributions of research on writing and design in the workplace—that is, on studies that shed light on the expertise that underlies the creation of everyday texts for business, education, and government, texts such as proposals, instructions, brochures, online Web texts, technical and scientific reports. This review integrates studies that bear on the nature of expertise in professional writing published over the past two decades (1990–2010) in books, anthologies, and journals, such as the *Journal of Business and Technical Writing* and *Written Communication*.

Guided by the question of whether writing expertise is like expertise in other domains (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001; McCutchen, 2010; McCutchen, Covill, Hoyne, & Mildes, 1994; Torrance, 1996), this review focuses on studies of adult professionals who create purpose-driven texts for diverse audiences—teenagers, adults, general audiences, and specialized audiences (Beaufort, 2008; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993; Carter, 1990; Henry, 2000; Hovde, 2000; Russell, 1997; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1991; Schriver, 1992, 1997; Schriver & Hayes, 2009; van Leeuwen, 2008; van Waes & Schellens, 2003; Winsor, 1998).

This review explores the relationships among components of writing models (Hayes, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980) that have been largely unexplored, particularly the dynamic and fluid relationships between the task environment, especially the social environment (“the audience”: stakeholders, managers, bosses, peers) and the physical environment (“the text so far”: visual/verbal artifacts, medium, technology). In specifying these cognitive and social relations, this research highlights why expert professional communication is so difficult—with its demands for rhetorical sensitivity, subject-matter

knowledge, visual and verbal design knowledge, and for the ability to negotiate rhetorically effective solutions within highly political organizational contexts.

This study examines why professional communicators—unlike experts in other domains who have been found to speed up over time and to work more efficiently and with less conscious effort—may actually exert more effort than inexperienced writers and designers. The review also suggests that as professional communicators work alone or collaboratively with others, they draw on extensive patterned knowledge, both of typical genres and of writing and design patterns that may engage readers. This presentation will propose a preliminary conceptual framework for representing how professional communicators develop their expertise over time.

- Alamargot, D., & Chanquoy, L. (2001). Development of expertise in writing. In D. Alamargot & L. Chanquoy (Eds.), *Through models of writing* (pp. 185-218). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Beaufort, A. (2008). Writing in the professions. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text* (pp. 221-235). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise*. Peru, IL: Open Court Publishing Company.
- Carter, M. (1990). The idea of expertise: An exploration of cognitive and social dimensions of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 41(3), 265-286.
- Charness, N. (1976). Memory for chess positions: Resistance to interference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 2, 641-653.
- Chase, W. G., & Simon, H. A. (1973). The mind's eye in chess. In W. G. Chase (Ed.), *Visual information processing* (pp. 215-281). New York: Academic Press.
- Ericsson, K. A. (Ed.). (1996). *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports and games*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ericsson, K. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Development of professional expertise: Toward measurement of expert performance and design of optimal learning environments*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise: Prospects and limits*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Geisler, C. (1994). *Academic literacy and the nature of expertise: Reading, writing, and knowing in academic philosophy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J. R. (1985). Three problems in teaching general skills. In S. F. Chipman, J. W. Segal & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Teaching and learning skills: Research and open questions* (Vol. 2, pp. 391-406). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J. R. (1989). *The complete problem solver* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Henry, J. (2000). *Writing workplace cultures: An archeology of professional writing*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hovde, M. R. (2000). Tactics for building images of audience in organizational contexts: An ethnographic study of technical communicators. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 14*(4), 395-444.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kellogg, R. T. (2006). Professional writing expertise. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 389-402). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research, 1*(1), 1-26.
- Lehmann, A. C., & Ericsson, K. A. (1997). Research on expert performance and deliberate practice: Implications for the education of amateur musicians and music students. *Psychomusicology, 16*, 40-58.
- Lehmann, A. C., & Gruber, H. (2006). Music. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 457-470). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McCutchen, D. (2010). *Language and memory processes in the development of writing skill*. Keynote presentation to the 12th International Conference of the EARLI Special Interest Group on Writing. Heidelberg University of Education. Heidelberg, Germany.
- McCutchen, D., Covill, D., Hoyne, S. H., & Mildes, K. (1994). Individual differences in writing: Implications of translating fluency. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(2), 256-266.
- Russell, D. R. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society. *Written Communication, 14*, 504-554.
- Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1991). Literate expertise. In K. A. Ericsson & J. Smith (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of expertise* (pp. 172-194). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schreiber, B. T., Bennett Jr., W., Colegrove, C. M., Portrey, A. M., Greschke, D. A., & Bell, H. H. (2009). Evaluating pilot performance. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *Development of professional expertise* (pp. 247-270). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Schrivier, K. A. (1992). Teaching writers to anticipate readers' needs: A classroom-evaluated pedagogy. *Written Communication, 9*(2), 179–208.
- Schrivier, K. A. (1997). *Dynamics in document design: Creating texts for readers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schrivier, K. A., & Hayes, J. R. (2009). Bioengineers as professional communicators: Assessing the impact of the Cain Project on undergraduate professional writing and speaking performances at Rice University. *Technical Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.cptsc.org/research-assess.html>
- Torrance, M. (1996). Is writing expertise like other kinds of expertise? In G. Rijlaarsdam, H. van den Bergh & M. Couzijn (Eds.), *Studies in writing: Vol. 1: Theories*,

- models and methodology in writing research* (pp. 3-9). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). New forms of writing, new visual competencies. *Visual Studies*, 23(2), 130-135.
- van Waes, L., & Schellens, P. J. (2003). Writing profiles: The effect of the writing mode on pausing and revision patterns of experienced writers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 829-853.
- Winsor, D. A. (1998). Rhetorical practices in technical work. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 12(3), 343-370.
- Wishbow, N. A. (1988). *Studies of creativity in poets*. Rhetoric Doctoral Dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Dissertaton Abstracts International database.

J12 (continued)

Expertise in graduate and professional writing

Transmission of Implicit Knowledge: Toward the Expert Levels of Reading and Writing Competence

Vasily Tseptsov, Institute of Psychology RAS, Moscow, Russia

Modern society makes increasingly complex literacy demands of their citizens. Those demands challenge school systems to develop and adapt methodologies to equip students with the necessary language competencies

The traditional definition of literacy is considered to be the ability to read and write, or the ability to use language to read, write, listen, and speak. The (UNESCO) has drafted the following definition: "Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts." Wikipedia.

In our research we studied several particular cases of reading and writing tasks: reading and writing of political texts. We proposed the model based on the "ideologeme" (Bakhtin, 1937) concept and our original definition of psychologically active text (PAT).

Main aim of our research was to explore student's competence in such sort of literacy under both reading and writing conditions.

The ideologeme we observed in the context of semiosis - the process of interaction between several contexts that produce new original meaning. From that point of view, within the system of personal constructs the ideologeme combined with key construct by a *pragmatic link* and could produce pragmatic rules when they are necessary. Among the others we observed the ideologeme "enemy" that is very important in many ideological contexts.

We used extended exploratory monitoring to recover implicit and explicit characteristics of ideologeme at modern media.

Our experimental research consists of two stages:

Reading phase: the subjects read target ideologeme and evaluated its qualitative characteristics with several scales (7 point): they evaluated the clearness (from "clear" to "ambiguous"), utility, social acceptability, sustainability, the degree of agreement with the ideologeme and some others. We applied intergroup design to recover the effects of implicit vs. explicit ideologeme.

Writing phase: the subjects wrote the text on the topic that was considered as political propaganda or they wrote the text on the topic that was considered as a mean of indirect influence. As well we studied the role of visual and textual components combining complex intermodal ideologemes.

Main findings: Even postgraduate students are not able to identify the features of ideologeme while reading. Reading and writing time increases when the ideologeme was under implicit condition. This increment is more important when a subject disagrees with the ideologeme and it means that there are a set of biases interrelated with the ideologeme. The ideologeme intermediates writing and reading process.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. ([1937–1938] 1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*, M. Holquist (ed.), C. Emerson and M. Holquist (trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Reber, A. S. 1993. *Implicit Learning and Tacit Knowledge: An Essay on the Cognitive Unconscious*. Oxford Psychology Series No. 19. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lapshova Ol'ga V., Tseptsov Vasily A. *Structural approach to the representation of political symbols in ordinary mind*. In *Psychological studies of discourse*. Moscow, PerSe, 2004.
- Tseptsov, Vasily, A. (2008) *Image of the enemy in minds and mass media*. In *Situational and personal determination of discourse*. Moscow, IPRAS Publishing, 2008.