Writing Research Across Borders II Session K
Sunday, February 20 10:30am-12:00pm

K1
Converging streams? Rhetorical and textual approaches to genre research and pedagogy (Part II) (See Session J1 for complete abstracts)

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, The University of Tennessee – Knoxville, 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.

K2
Teachers' personal and professional development in writing
Becca Woodard, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.
Sarah McCarthey, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.
Sonia Kline, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

The National Commission on Writing's (2003) recommendations for a "writing revolution" (p. 3) include devoting more time to writing, measuring results, increasing the use of new technologies and promoting professional development for teachers. The panel of four authors will present papers related to two of these aspects: professional development and teachers' use of technology in K-12 settings. Their research focused on teachers' perceptions of professional development, and situated experiences with literacy coaches (Waldpole & Blamey, 2008) and the National Writing Project (NWP & Nagin, 2006; Lieberman & Wood, 2003; Whitney, 2008). The researchers also explored teachers' uses of technology and writing across in and out-of-school settings and the National Writing Project's (2006) slogan that "writing teachers must write." The panel will connect their research to Desimone's (2009) professional development framework based on five core features of teacher learning experiences (i.e., content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation). They will also focus on personal factors, such as teachers' experiences and relationships, which are typically left out of discussions about professional development in writing.

Paper 1: Perceptions of Professional Development on Writing Instruction
Sarah McCarthey, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
This study seeks to determine teachers' perceptions of the impact of various professional development activities on their writing instruction. The study focused on 20 teachers from four districts: two small urban districts (14 teachers) and two rural districts (6 teachers). Researchers conducted three interviews and observations of each teacher over the course of one school year. The semi-structured interviews focused on the opportunities teachers had for professional development including the Summer Institute of the NWP; University Curriculum Specialists (UCS) who modeled writing in classrooms and met with individual teachers; the Summer Academy (SA)—a weeklong seminar focused on differentiated curriculum; literacy coaches in school buildings; and district-sponsored workshops.
Analyses of the interview data demonstrated that teachers believed the university-school partnerships including the University Curriculum Specialist (UCS), the National Writing Project (NWP), and Summer Academy (SA) influenced their writing instruction. All of the teachers (9) who had the opportunity for the UCS to come into their classrooms to model lessons and discuss writing reported that the UCS had a major impact on their curriculum. Almost all of the teachers who had been part of the SA (8 of 9) also reported gaining confidence in their writing instruction. Most important to them was the opportunity to work with colleagues from their school to differentiate their writing curriculum for students of varying abilities. The teachers who were critical of the SA were new teachers who had few opportunities to follow up with leaders or colleagues. The three teachers who had participated in the local NWP described its impact as "life-changing;" the focus on technology was especially informative.

Three of the four districts had literacy coaches in their buildings. Teachers' perceptions varied from very positive (when they had established strong relationships with the coaches who modeled lessons in the classrooms, met with them about writing, or worked directly with their students) to negative (teachers who found the coaches did very little beyond providing a few materials). Teachers reported that district-run workshops and university courses were not effective because they were too brief with little follow through. The professional development activities (e.g., UCS, NWP, SA) that teachers cited as influential on their writing instruction fit the model proposed by Desimone—they had a writing content focus, active learning components, coherence, duration, and collective participation.

However, two issues emerged from the data: (a) Rural teachers had relatively little opportunity for professional development compared to the districts in small urban communities located near a research university, and (b) The relationship between the UCS or the literacy coach and the classroom teacher had a major influence on their perceptions of impact.

Paper 2: The Construction of Teachers' Digital Identities across Time and Space
Sonia Kline, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Educators are increasingly expected to incorporate new technologies into their classrooms –the *Enhancing Education Through Technology Act* (2001), *The National Commission on Writing* (2003) and *Race To the Top* (2009) all identify the integration of computer technology as integral to student success. Dramatic shifts in communication and work practices shaped by technological and global changes also increase the impetus for new technologies and digital literacies in education. These changes are particularly pertinent for literacy educators, born in the 20th century, who must make sense of 21st century communication practices for themselves and their students. The purpose of this study was to examine how teachers constructed digital identities across time and space. Particular attention was given to how teachers perceive digital literacies and new technologies as figuring into their literacy experiences.

The study was undergirded by epistemologies that recognize meaning making as socio-culturally situated and constructed (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Erickson, 1986; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005; Vygotsky, 1978). Identity research (Gee, 2001; McCarthey, 2001; Moje, 2004) and multiliteracies theory (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; New London Group, 1996) provided the theoretical framework. Surveys of all participants (45) who attended a National Writing Project (NWP) institute featuring digital literacies and instructional technologies were used to identify six focal teachers. Qualitative methodology, which features naturalistic settings, descriptive data, concern with process, inductive analysis, and capturing meaning from participants' perspectives (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) was used. The main methods for data collection, which occurred over 12 weeks, were interviews (Brandt, 2001; Patton, 2002) and classroom observations. Teachers' digital portfolios, their blogs, and their students' digital artifacts were also included in the inductive analysis. Two overarching questions provided the focus for this study: What kinds of digital identities do teachers construct, and how do these digital

identities change across time and space? Data analysis focused on the experiences teachers had with digital literacies and new technologies prior to, during, and after the NWP institute. Both in and out-of-school experiences were considered. Findings showed that teachers' digital identities are characterized in five ways: The digital native, the tech-savvy enthusiast, the tentative techy, the tech-doubter, and the technophobe; however, these identities were not discrete and changed over time and space.

Paper 3: <u>Challenging Dominant Conceptions of Professional Development: An Argument for Incorporating Teachers' Out-of-school Experiences into the Conversation</u>
Becca Woodard, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The purpose of this case study was to examine the in and out-of-school literate practices of a teacher who engaged in creative writing outside of school, and to further explore the idea that "writing teachers must write" (NWP & Nagin, 2006). Although research has documented the literate practices of professional writers (Cowley, 1958) and students (e.g., Emig, 1983; Finders, 1997; Fisher, 2005; Moje, 2004), few studies have specified what is meant by writing, acknowledged the writing that teachers already do, or documented teachers' writing practices through observations across settings.

This case study explored a middle school teacher's personal writing history and documented her in and out-of-school writing practices. Research questions included: What is the *range* of a teacher's literate practices? What is the *nature* of her literate practices in and out of her classroom? What f*unctions* do these practices have? Qualitative methodology was used to collect and analyze data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Dyson & Genishi, 2005). Over a three month period, the researcher conducted a series of semi-structured life history interviews (Brandt, 2001) with the teacher, observed her classroom writing instruction, observed her participation in writing events outside of school (e.g., a creative writing group, one on one instruction), and collected written artifacts.

Preliminary results showed that there were both consistencies and discrepancies in how the teacher wrote outside of school and how she encouraged her students to write. Consistencies across settings included the qualities of teacher-student talk around writing and the practice of naming occluded writer moves; discrepancies across classroom and out-of-school writing events centered on the types of writing valued and the structures of events. The teacher's personal and institutional literacy sponsors played powerful roles in how she constructed writing; both were reflected in her classroom practices. While this study indicates that teachers' out-of-school writing experiences impact their classroom practices, further research is needed on how different types of sponsors and communities of practice affect teachers' classroom practices, and on the role of curriculum in mediating those practices.

K3
National projects of writing instruction

PROTEXTS: A National Project for the Teaching of Texts Production in
Compulsory Education, in Portugal

Luísa Álvarez Pereira, University of Aveiro, Portugal
Inês Cardoso, University of Aveiro, Portugal

The research Project that we will present fits within the field of the Didactic of Writing (DW), a decisive area for cognitive development and for the construction of knowledge, but with very recent tradition within the portuguese educational system (Pereira, Aleixo, Cardoso, & Graça, 2009). Regarding the particular research conducted by our team, it becomes evident the complexity of processes on different textual genres production and the need of an oriented teaching/learning and a teacher's monitoring, without, however, neglect the motivation and the personal relationship with the writing competence development (Pereira, Cardoso, & Graça, 2009).

Our aim is to overcome a situation in which the information available, namely with regard to the most relevant processual models of writing (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980), which lack the support of a consistent didactic modularization, as well as specific instruments, has not yet produced the desirable outcomes at the level of school curriculum and practices of teaching of writing (Pereira, Aleixo, Cardoso, & Graça, To be published).

Besides, the DW faces a crucial problem: specific orientations were not established to lead to a school system that favours the progression of written production of students, during the three cycles of compulsory education; neither the New Programmes of Portuguese, approved in 2009, indicate precisely what distinguishes a well succeed written production of a particular genre in a cycle and at the end of the next cycle.

Hence, our aim goes to develop and validate didactic dispositives (with or without the use of Information and Communication Technologies) which can assure the development of texts production, considering all the cycles of compulsory education, generating models of analysis (on the internal schematic structure of texts) consistent with the theoretical references from several areas related to the DW and to the cognitive development of children. These models will lead to the illustration of self-regulation mechanisms, which should be extended to other levels of education, but also because it is crucial for the definition of external evaluation criteria and for the designing of curricula paths and definition of degrees of progression in writing, not yet conceptualised. In fact, teachers' performance at this level generally lacks sound theoretical foundations.

The project will provide extensive (questionnaires, at national level, to teachers and students from compulsory education) and intensive studies, fit within the sequence of training workshops for Portuguese (discipline) teachers managed by the research team members. The comparison between the written achievement of experimental and control groups will give consistent data regarding the selection of didactic dispositives with more adequacy to the teaching of writing, as a promoter of progression in articulation with the three levels of education and, mainly, regarding the main oriented parameters for the teaching and assessment of writing skills, by cycles and age, indicating more accurately

what can be taught by level (cycle) with respect to kinds of textual genres regarding the narrative, argumentative and expositive types.

Pereira, L. A., Aleixo, C., Cardoso, I., & Graça, L. (2009). The teaching and learning of writing in Portugal: The case of a research group. In C. Bazerman, R. Krut, K. Lunsford, S. McLeod, S. Null, P. M. Rogers & A. Stansell (Eds.), *Traditions of Writing Research*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Pereira, L. A., Cardoso, I., & Graça, L. (2009). For a definition of the teaching/learning of writing in L1: Research and action. *L1 - Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 9*(4), 87-123.

K3 (continued)
National projects of writing instruction

Teaching Writing Using Computers in Grades 4-8 Classrooms across Canada
Shelley Stagg Peterson, University of Toronto, Canada
Jill McClay, University of Alberta, Canada

Purpose

This paper presents one part of the results of a national study of the teaching of writing in Canadian grades 4-8 classrooms: the use of computers in writing instruction. Two research questions framed the study: (1) For what purposes and how frequently do teachers use computers to teach writing? (2) What assumptions about writing do their practices with computers suggest?

Theoretical Framework

New Literacies theory is grounded in the understanding that writing is an "ideological practice, implicated in power relations and embedded in specific cultural meanings and practices" (Street, 1995, p. 1). Writing practices are shaped by social rules about how to use literacy and how to distribute the meanings to others, who should be distributing and who should have access to those meanings (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000). Social intentions, values, and assumptions are as much a part of one's writing practices as are the physical and material aspects of writing.

Data Collection and Analysis

Telephone interviews were conducted with 162 female and 54 male teacher participants. In each Canadian province, two rural and two urban school districts participated. In addition, classroom visits with participating teachers in nine classrooms in three provinces contextualized the portrayals of teaching writing that emerged from the telephone interviews. Classroom visits included observations of regularly-scheduled writing classes, informal conversations with five students in each class, analysis of student compositions, and audio-recorded interviews with teachers following the observations. Data from telephone interviews and classroom visits were analyzed using constant comparison thematic coding (Cresswell, 1998).

Results

Seventy-six percent of participating teachers use computers to teach writing. In 11% of participating teachers' classrooms, students create websites and webcasts and participate in blogs. This fairly extensive use of computers to teach writing has not been indicated in previous surveys of teachers' writing instruction: fewer than 25% of teachers surveyed in 1993 (Laframboise & Klesius) and in 2008 (Cutler & Graham) used computers on a regular basis to teach writing.

Restricted access to computers plays a role in the frequency and types of interactions that students and teachers have with computers in writing classes. Typically, participating teachers have one computer in their classrooms and a scheduled time to use the school's computer lab. Like the 1200 American teachers surveyed by Adelman, et. al. (2002), teachers are less likely to provide opportunities for students to write with computers in labs because of scheduling difficulties and the inconvenience of moving students to and from the labs.

Equally influential are assumptions about writing development. From the teacher known as the "techno guy" in his school to the least confident computer user, there was near universal agreement that the initial stages of writing should be carried out with pen and paper. In addition, many participating teachers believe that spell checkers hamper students' spelling development.These problematic assumptions reflect what Merchant (2008) refers to as a sequential model for the development of digital writing. Learning to use computers is viewed as adding an unnecessary complexity to the early stages of writing.

References

Adelman, N., Donnelly, M. B., Dove, T., Tiffany-Morales, J., Wayne, A., & Zucker, A. A. (2002). The integrated studies of educational technology: Professional development and teachers' use of technology. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved on April 5, 2010 at http://policyweb.sri.com/cep/publications/SRI_Professional_Development_Report_2002.pdf

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (2000). Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context. London: Routledge.

Cresswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cutler, L., & Graham, S. (2008). Primary grade writing instruction: A national survey. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100(4), 907-19.

Laframboise, K. L., & Klesius, J. (1993). A survey of writing instruction in elementary language arts classrooms. Reading Psychology, 14, 265-284.

Merchant, G. (2008). Digital writing in the early years. In In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear & D. Leu (Eds.), Handbook of research on new literacies, pp. 741-774. New York : Routledge.

Street, B. (1995). Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education. New York: Longman.

National projects of writing instruction

Teachers' Writing Assessment and Feedback Practices in Grades 4-8
Classrooms across Canada

Shelley Stagg Peterson, University of Toronto, Canada
Jill McClay, University of Alberta, Canada

Purpose

This paper will report the findings from a three-year study that examined the practices of and contexts for teaching and assessing writing in contemporary Canadian middle grades classrooms. Teachers' assessment and feedback practices are the focus of this paper.

Prior to this study, the only comprehensive national data on classroom writing practices in Canada came from an analysis of teachers' responses to a questionnaire component of the national writing test, the 2002 School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP), for 13- and 16-year olds (Hunter, Mayenga, & Gambell, 2006). In their analysis, researchers found that 58% of the 4070 secondary teachers who completed the questionnaire provided written feedback on students' assignments and discussed with their students the criteria for assessing written assignments.

Theoretical framework

Multiliteracies theory (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000; New London Group, 1996) posits literacy as both a set of social practices, embracing linguistically and culturally diverse ways of using language, and also a vast array of representational modes, such as graphic designs and web-based media, as well as print. Accordingly, assessing writing and providing feedback to students on their writing are social practices influenced by perspectives of what constitutes good writing and good assessment practices within teachers' local contexts and within the broader contexts of education and society.

Data sources and research methodology

Data sources are telephone interviews with 216 grades 4-8 teachers of writing in rural and urban settings in the ten Canadian provinces and two of the three territories. The interview protocol included 20 base questions concerning all aspects of teachers' contexts and practices for teaching writing. Questions relating to teachers' assessment and feedback practices included: How do you give feedback to your students on their writing? What do you use to assess students' writing? Do students give feedback to each other on their writing? How important do you feel that peer and teacher feedback is in helping students with their writing? Through constant-comparison analysis (Glaser, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1994), four researchers drew up thematic codes and then compared and discussed codes to create a standardized codebook.

Results

Participating teachers' feedback to grades 4-8 students on their writing appears to have been framed by two assumptions: that effective feedback fosters students' growth as writers and is as objective as possible. Teachers were particularly concerned about the

impact of feedback on students' self-esteem and on their enjoyment and sense of ownership of their writing. Teachers followed some of the practices that Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) identify as effective: (1) encouraging teacher and peer dialogue by scheduling time for peer editing and student-teacher conferences; and (2) enhancing students' motivation and self-esteem as writers. Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam (2003) note four areas of important ideas for transformative assessment practices: questioning, feedback, sharing criteria, and self-assessment. Of these, the teachers in this study were highly conscious of feedback and sharing criteria as important, but were less focused on questioning and promoting self-assessment, indicating areas for professional development for the majority of teachers. This issue, together with teachers' distrust of the subjective nature of writing assessment, should be examined in professional development initiatives and future research.

References

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (2000). Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context. London: Routledge.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice. Berkshire ENG: Open University Press.

Glaser, B. (1992). Basics of grounded theory analysis. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Hunter, D., Mayenga, C., & Gambell, T. (2006). Classroom assessment tools and uses: Canadian English teachers' practices for writing. Assessing Writing, 11(1), 42-65.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. Harvard Educational Review, 66, 60-92.

Nicol, D.J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199-218.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

K4
Reinventing (the) research exchange

Joanne Addison, University of Colorado-Denver, U.S.
Jenn Fishman, University of Tennessee-Knoxville, U.S.
Sharon James McGee, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, U.S.
Joan Mullin, Illinois State University, U.S.
Mike Palmquist, Colorado State University, U.S.

Panel Overview:

At the first Writing Research Across Borders Conference at UC-Santa Barbara in 2008, founding members and editors of the Research Exchange led a lively discussion about the creation and initial purpose of the first-ever public-access writing research database. Since that time, the Exchange has undergone many changes, including an initial period of growth, an extended period of stagnation, and most recently an exciting phase of reinvention. Whereas the early Exchange centered on a user-driven database of information about ongoing writing research, the new Exchange is designed to support writing researchers through a combination of interactive mentoring and peer-reviewed publication. The new Exchange is also designed to better address the challenges involved in exchanging data and findings across languages, cultures, and IRB-described boundaries.

At WRAB II, leading members of the current Research Exchange Editorial Board will reflect on the challenges they envision for the renewed Exchange. In the first half of their panel, the group will frame the choices they have made regarding mentoring, data archiving, and publishing in relation to not only early Exchange successes and failures, but also ongoing discussions within the discipline regarding tenure and promotion, digital publishing, and the successful (and successfully recognized) pursuit of cooperative work. Topics will include

- the original impetus for the Exchange;
- early Exchange philosophy, features, and goals;
- articulation and assessment of initial efforts;
- grounds and goals for reinvention;
- an introduction to Research Exchange redux.

In the second half of their panel, the group will extend an invitation to participate to the international writing studies community. Specifically, the group hopes to familiarize conference-goers with future Exchange activities and solicit both feedback and involvement. Discussion will feature a detailed overview of opportunities for mentors and reviewers with a wide variety of methodological and editorial expertises. The discussion begun at George Mason will be continued not only online but also at subsequent professional meetings, starting with the Research Network Forum at CCCC 2011.

K5
Science journalism: Genre, content, and audience

Nancy Robb Singer, University of Missouri-St. Louis, U.S.
E. Wendy Saul, University of Missouri-St. Louis, U.S.
Angela Kohnen, University of Missouri-St. Louis, U.S.

Context

This *panel presentation* examines the benefits of integrating literacy learning and science curricula by teaching students to critically write in the genre of science news. This writing in the disciplines research and its pedagogical implications are derived from data gathered from the first two years of the "Science Literacy through Science Journalism" program, a project exploring the intersection of science content and writing in order to further students' civic understanding of and public engagement with science and technology.

By spring 2011, the project will be in the third year of its funded four-year National Science Foundation grant. Data presented in this panel discussion will be gathered from 40 teacher participants and over 2000 student participants as well as interviews with practicing scientists, science journalists, and science editors.

Related Research

Addressing the broader literacy work teachers and students do together, many current researchers have called for writing instruction to: focus on content over form, structure, and conventions (Hillocks, *RTE*, 2005; Brannon et al., *EJ*, 2008); engage students in "real-world" audiences and purposes (Wiggins, *EJ*, 2009); and practice writing in multiple genres (Fleischer & Andrew-Vaughn, *EJ*, 2006; Dean, *Genre Theory*, 2008). This panel builds on these calls by demonstrating the ways learning to write journalistic science can foster students' literacy development with respect to science content, information literacy, and writing for a pubic audience in a "real-world" genre.

Research Questions and Methodology

The grant uses both qualitative data (e.g. interviews, think-alouds, etc.) and quantitative data (e.g. surveys, transfer tasks) to answer these overarching questions:

(1)   Is the teaching of science journalism an efficacious, replicable and sustainable model for improving science literacy?
(2)   How useful are science-related standards and rubrics for scaffolding and evaluating students' science writing?
(3)   What is the nature of the engagement in science this apprenticeship model invites?

The panelists for this presentation are all literacy-focused faculty and graduate students who are additionally interested in questions such as:

(1)   What kinds of conversations about genre, research, and expertise does teaching science journalism alongside traditional English curriculum invite?
(2)   What does multimodal composition look like in an English classroom? How do students read and interpret graphs and images within science articles? How do students compose with graphs and images alongside written text?

(3)   How can teachers use data generated from authentic writing assignments to assess student learning? What do standards and rubrics look like for these kinds of assignments?

Overview of Findings

In this panel discussion, three presentations will report on the progress of the SciJourn project in developing standards and measures for science content literacy and engagement, as well as implementing those practices in the classroom.

Panelist one, a co-PI on the grant, will facilitate a discussion with audience members focused on published student writing in *SciJourner*, the online and print student-produced newspaper funded by the NSF grant. Through an inductive discussion, Dr. Saul will involve conference participants in reading students' articles with respect to science content, genre conventions, and writing for a public audience.

Panelist two will discuss how the grant team discovered salient features of the genre of science journalism. Drawing on think-alouds and interviews of practicing science journalists, Dr. Singer will share the process of moving qualitative data into articulated standards for teaching science journalism and how these standards complicate the ways English teachers have often thought about teaching writing.

Panelist three a practicing secondary English teacher, will address how she scaffolded multimodal assignments and mini-lessons as she incorporated science journalism into her high school English classroom. Specifically, Ms. Kohnen will demonstrate how she engages her students in studying the genre of science journalism by contrasting it with the traditional research paper. Finally, she will articulate some of her experiences, struggles and surprises in trying to teach this genre to her students.

K6
Writing science across borders and languages
Discursive and Stylistic Variations in Grants Proposal Writing in Nepal and the USA: An Intercultural Technical Communication Case Study
Santosh Khadka, Syracuse University, U.S.

I plan to present the findings of a research I conducted examining the genre features of and stylistic variations in grants proposal writing in Nepal and the USA and analyzing how or whether those variations reflect the socio-cultural imprints and/or communicative/discourse conventions of practitioners/technical writers in the regions.

This case study presentation will build on and extend the ongoing disciplinary conversation about the indispensability of intercultural technical communication in the era of economic, political, cultural and technological globalization. Recent scholarship in intercultural technical communication is echoing the inevitability of technical communication across borders. For instance, Dragga Sam claims that "today's technical communicator…is often a multicultural, intercultural communicator engaging issues of translation, interpretation, and localization," but regrets that so "little research or guidance is available [for Technical Communicator] to identify the practices of ethical intercultural technical communication." Similarly, Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Ann Hill Duin, and Talene Palvetzian contend that "technical communication (TC) in both the workplace and higher education is undergoing powerful change as a result of globalization." And Jan M Ulijn and Kirk St. Amant state that "if professional communicators wish to achieve effective intercultural communication, they first need to understand how these cultural factors can affect professional interactions." These scholars among many others are pointing at the fact that technical communication now is transborder phenomenon increasingly informed by the forces of globalization. Therefore, more research into more genres of technical writing/communication across cultures, borders and spaces is absolutely necessary in order to provide technical communicator with resources to turn to in case s/he faces challenge of communicating effectively and successfully in changed working environment. My presentation tries to respond to that need (or call) and contribute to build up such a much needed research corpus. As Sam also highlights, my presentation takes into consideration the fact that the existing research corpus on intercultural technical genres and practices is mostly about major/popular genres (of TC) like e-mail or memo and dominant cultures like Chinese and American therefore not adequate to prepare the technical communicators to go to global market place.

Contextualizing my case study with a brief literature review on intercultural technical communication, I will closely look at and analyze the genre and stylistic features of a small sample of grants proposal writing from Nepal and the USA. After observing and highlighting the genre or stylistic variations or uniformity, I will dwell on the major question: what underlie the variations or similarities in them? Is it cultural/ discursive conventions or socio-economic factors or something else? And potential implications of the findings for curriculum design and pedagogical approaches to technical communication both in Nepal and the USA will wrap up my presentation.

K6 (continued)
Writing science across borders and languages
Production of Scientific Papers: Requirements and Supports

Alma Carrasco, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico
Angélica Moreno , Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico
Rollin Kent, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico

Within the frame of a wider study about the *training trajectories of young scientists* (Kent et. al., 2009), this paper presents the publication criteria in refereed journals that doctoral students in physiology must meet as part of graduation requirements. Our purpose is to identify the writing models they try to copy or reproduce. We carried out interviews with researchers and doctoral students at a physiology research center in a Mexican university. In addition we analyzed the structure of published texts in important and valued journals in physiology. Among those journals recognized by this scientific community are the following: *Nature, Journal of Neuroscience, Brain, Journal of Physiology,*and *Journal of Pharmacology*.

In the selection process of PhD new applicants, reading comprehension and linguistic competence in English play an important role. According to our findings in the natural sciences, such as physiology, astrophysics and biotechnology, the academic tutor guides the PhD student in developing writing skills along the lines set out by the scientific community. The opposite occurs in the Social Sciences (Carlino, 2004). We recognize the existence of different kinds of writing as well as different academic writing requirements according to each discipline (Carlino, 2004; Albert, 2002).

Several genres were identified from those journals, such as articles, letters, reviews, book chapters and brief communications. Each one of them offers varied communication possibilities for distinct audiences. The research paper is the most used and demanded genre for doctoral students, rather than books (cf. Shaw, en Flottum, 2007). We will present the features of those genres and their structural (form and content) requirements.

Participating in the international academic production requires young scientists to write in English, the language of science (Nerad & Heggelund, ed., 2008; Mauranen, en Flottum, 2007). All internationally recognized scientific journals (such as those listed in the Science Citation Index) demand it. According to Buckingham (2008), these publications work as a model for the students.

The production of a text to be published is a lengthy but crucial process of doctoral training. It usually follows various steps. For the Mexican doctoral students we interviewed, we identified them as follows:

- At the beginning they write in Spanish and then translate into English

- Later, they write in English supported by a native speaker editor expert in the discipline

- Finally, they directly and independently write in English

It is clear that for non-English speakers learning to write scientific texts in English is more than a technical or merely linguistic procedure. Our research attempts to reconstruct the PhD experience as a *process of identity formation*. Therefore, in addition to recording

the actual steps in developing linguistic competence and the various genres that PhD students learn to develop, we attempt to integrate the students' perceptions and values of this experience in our analysis of scientific writing. The adaptation processes experienced by Mexican PhD students to exigencies of this type of academic production will be the focus of this research.

K6 (continued)
Writing science across borders and languages
Producing Scholarly Texts: Writing in English in a Politically Stigmatized
Country

Mehdi Riazi, Macquarie University, Australia

This paper presents the findings of two studies on producing scholarly texts in English in Iran as a politically stigmatized country. The paper will set out with a brief sketch of the recent turmoil between Iran and the English speaking countries, in particular the United States and Britain, and the impact of this on language policy in Iran. The paper will then present the current position of English language in Iranian education system with an emphasis on its role in tertiary academic settings. In the next part of the paper two studies will be presented. The first one is a text analysis of 171 scholarly papers published in English in the Iranian journals of humanities and social sciences along with interviews with a limited number of authors of the papers. The aim of this study was to unfold the rhetorical structure of the papers using Bruce (1983) and Swales (1990) frameworks and the authors' views on the structure of the papers. Findings revealed two distinct rhetorical organizations; one represented empirical studies and matched typical English scientific papers and the other represented narrative and descriptive studies. The second study conducted within the context of recent writing research of non-native scholars writing in English (Canagarajah, 1996; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007) The purpose of the study was to find out how Iranian university scholars approach producing texts in English and publishing papers in international journals. 72 academics across different disciplines (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Art and Humanities) were interviewed to unfold their experiences of writing up and publishing their research in English. The study addressed three major questions, 1) What are the Iranian scholars' attitudes towards publishing articles in English?, 2) What problems they encounter when trying to get published in international refereed journals?, and 3) What strategies do they use to publish articles in international refereed journals? The recorded interviews were transcribed and analysed using the three overarching themes of attitudes, problems, and strategies. Results of the analysis indicated that participants had a positive attitude towards publishing papers in English as a means of knowledge production while asserting that their main problems in writing research articles were those of introduction and discussion sections of the papers. The major strategies they reported were revising and editing, discipline-specific reading and writing, and networking with colleagues from English speaking countries. The point will be discussed that despite the harsh and even conflicting relation between Iran and English speaking countries which has certainly affected mutual academic relations among universities and research centres, the academics seem to recognise publishing in English as a loyalty to their scientific disciplines. However, this is mainly because most of the current university academics are graduated from English speaking countries. With the growing substitution of experienced professors with recently graduated ones particularly those graduated from internal universities this trend might change in the next decades.

K7
Writing L2 research articles

Taiwanese Graduate Students' Perceptions of the Problems in Writing Research Articles in English
Shih-Chieh Chien, Taipei Medical University, Taiwan

Abstract

In Taiwan, nowadays issues related to writing and publishing in international English language journals have attracted considerable attention from the Taiwanese government authorities, particularly the Ministry of Education, National Science Council, as well as universities, teachers and students. For example, in some universities, publication in international English language journals has become a graduation requirement for the doctoral students. However, publishing at the doctoral stage is not an easy task because it is challenging even for practicing researchers. As English has gradually become the major international language of research and publication, there is a need to explore the problems in writing research articles in English for non-native speakers of English. This paper presents the results of a study regarding Taiwanese graduate students' perceptions of the problems in writing research articles in English, and their learning experiences of writing and writing strategies for producing them. The study seeks answers to the following questions: What are Taiwanese graduate students' perceptions of writing research articles in English? What are their problems? What are their strategies for successful writing research articles? Through semi-structured in-depth interviews, the findings reveal that to deal with the difficulties, the students' strategies can be categorized into two types. The first type is the subject knowledge in their own field. There are a number of problems, such as not reviewing earlier literature well, not relating the study with other studies, and not employing sound research methodology. The second type is predominantly related to English language use, such as lack of writing skills to logically develop their articles, weak critical thinking and synthesizing abilities, and incorrect use of writing conventions and some textual features. This disadvantage may result in a relative inferiority in expressing their ideas clearly in the English language. In terms of helping graduate students in writing research articles in English, in this study the students suggest that their classes should offer more opportunities for them to read and write academic English. For teachers who want to give more effective instruction and guidance to their students, consciousness-raising with regard to the subject knowledge of particular disciplines and the writing training at different language levels such as vocabulary, grammar and discourse through a series of related workshops could be beneficial to them.

K7 (continued)
Writing L2 research articles
Writing Research across Languages
Tony Silva, Purdue University, U.S.

Can writing research truly cross borders if reported primarily in only one language? Given the dominance of English in academic publishing worldwide, this is a question in need of serious consideration. The presenter will report on a recent scholarly interchange on this topic. The interchange was prompted by two Chinese scholars who proposed submitting English versions of papers already published in Chinese in order to foster the equitable creation and distribution of and access to knowledge. This proposal drew responses from editors of journals who publish exclusively in English and a scholar of publishing practices. The respondents, though generally sympathetic to the Chinese scholars' position, voiced some reservations and offered other options. The strongest reservation was the suggestion that many academics would find dual publication totally incongruous with the tradition of originality in publication. Options ranged from putting English translations on authors' websites to creating sections in popular English language journals where detailed summaries in English could be published to founding a global translators' organization, subsidized by scholars working in English dominant countries. The presenter will discuss and critique these proposals and responses and attempt to make a persuasive case for bi- or multi-lingual scholarly publication.

Presenter Contact Information and Biodata

Tony Silva
Purdue University
Department of English
Heavilon Hall, Room 433
500 Oval Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2038 USA

Phone: 765-494-3774
Fax: 765-494-3780
Email: tony@purdue.edu

Tony Silva is a professor in the Department of English at Purdue University, where he directs the Graduate Program in Second Language Studies/ESL and the ESL Writing Program. He is the co-founder and former co-editor of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* and the co-founder and co-chair of the Symposium on Second Language Writing.

K7 (continued)
Writing L2 research articles

The Introduction Sections of Research Articles Produced by Students in the Field of Linguistics in Turkey: The Use of Citation Patterns and Reporting Verbs

Ozden Fidan, Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey

Research in Genre Theory seeks to account for the ways people use language in particular communicative situations and employs research findings in literacy education. Genre Analysis, which is the powerful tool of Genre Theory in describing form-function correlations in academic and professional texts, can be utilized in studies in Applied Linguistics, especially the development of Academic Literacy. Academic Literacy practices constitute central processes through which students learn new subjects and develop their knowledge about new areas of study. In these practices, genre-based pedagogies present teachers and students a different view of writing, supplying students within a contextual framework for writing and offering them an explicit understanding of how texts in the target academic genre are structured.

This study aims at investigating whether student writers in the discipline of Linguistics in Turkey will be able to produce academic texts as responses to the norms socially accepted in the discipline when they are provided with a genre-based academic writing program. The genre focused on the research is the Introduction sections of research articles, mainly the citation patterns and the reporting verbs. The Introduction sections of research articles produced by student-writers are compared to those produced by professional writers. The findings reveal that genre-based pedagogy contribute to the academic literacy skills of the students, like the use of citation patterns and the reporting verbs.

Keywords: Academic Discourse, Academic Literacy, Genre-based pedagogy, Research Articles, Citation Patterns, Reporting Verbs

Bibliography

Bazerman, C. ve Paradis, J. (1990) (Haz.) *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities.* Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Pres.
Berkenkotter, C. ve Huckin, T. N. (1995) *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication.* Hove, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Charles, M. (2006) "Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses   used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines"   *ESP.   25. 310-331.*
Hyland, K. (1999) "Academic Attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary Knowledge" *Applied Linguistics. 20 (3).* 314-367.
Hyland, K. (2000) *Disciplinary Discources: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* London: Longman
Hyland, K. (2002) "Genre: Language, Context, and Lıteracy" *Annual Review of Applied Linguisitics.* 22: 113-135

Johns, A. M. (2005) "English for Academic Purposes: Issues in undergraduate writing and reading" içinde *Directions in Applied Linguistics*. Bruthiaux, P. (Haz.) 101-116. GBR: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lea, M. R. (2004) "Academic Literacies: a pedagogy for course design" *Studies in Higher Education*, 29/6. 739-756.

Samraj, B. (2004). Discourse features of the student-produced academic research paper: variations across disciplinary courses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* Volume 3, Issue 1, January 2004, Pages 5-22

Schleppegrell, M. (2004) *The Language of Schooling:A Functional Linguisitics Perspective.* Lawrence Erlbaum Assc.

Swales, J. M. (1990) *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, S. ve Hawes, T. (1994) "Reporting verbs in medical journal articles" *English for Specific Purposes* 13: 129-48

Thompson, G. ve Ye, Y. (1991) "Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers" *Applied Linguistics, 12(4)*. 365-382.

K8
High school students and the practices of academic writers
Differentiation of Writing Repertoires in Swedish Upper Secondary School
Pernilla Andersson Varga, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Research question
My research in progress concerns practices of writing within the subject in Swedish in Swedish upper secondary school. The overall research question is: What type(s) of writing repertoires are students, studying the same core subject, but attending different study programs, offered to mobilize?
Background
The Swedish upper secondary school- a school form that 98 % of all 16-19 year olds attend - was reformed in the early 1990's, with the overall aim to prepare *all* students for vocational and civic life, as well as for further studies - and to give students a general qualification for university studies. All study programs, vocational as well as more academic ones, were made to last for three years, and eight compulsory core subjects were introduced, among these, Swedish. The syllabuses were framed to give teachers a great deal of liberty when designing their teaching, as long as the goals to attain were reached.
Material and method
I carry out an ethnographic study (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007) of four study programs: two vocational ones - the Business and Administration program and the Electricity program and two more academic ones - the Social Science program and the Natural Science program.
My data consist of:
1. Field notes from writing lessons observations and ethnographic talks with four Swedish teachers, teaching at the four programs

2. Recorded and transcribed semi structured teacher and student interviews

3. Instructions to writing tasks

4. Student texts

5. Teachers' response to student texts

The period of the data collection is extended over four semesters (autumn 2008 – spring 2010) when the students study the final course in their mother tongue subject, which is concluded with a compulsory national test. Here the main task is to write an expository text including references to other texts.
Findings
One of my preliminary main findings illustrates the tensions between the weak framing (Bernstein, 1996) of the syllabus of the Swedish subject and the relatively strong framing (Bernstein, 1996) and demand for performativity (Ball, 2006) of the compulsory national test – and how this phenomenon affect the teaching affordances. It seems that teachers' notions of their students' background and their expectations of the students' future have great impact on what kind of challenges they give their students, in this case of what kind of writing tasks they present in the class room.

The two teachers at the vocational study programs offer resistance to the demands of the national test, arguing that they do not match with the habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) of their students. Still, in spite of her verbally expressed conviction, one of these teachers does afford her students a number of writing tasks that correspond to the demands that the national test calls for. My preliminary analyses of these students' texts show that they very well answer to the demands made in the syllabuses and national test.

References

Ball, Stephen J. (2006). *Education policy and social class: the selected works of Stephen J. Ball.* London: Routledge

Bernstein, Basil (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity.* London: Taylor and Francis Publishers

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

 Hammersley, Martyn & Atkinson, Paul. (2007) *Ethnography: principles in practise.* London and New York: Routledge

K8 (continued)
High school students and the practices of academic writers
Writing Practices in Danish Secondary Education
Ellen Krogh, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

The paper will present preliminary findings from a pilot project conducted 2009-2010 as part of a larger, longitudinal study of students' writing in the disciplines from grade 9 through grade 12. The empirical focus of the pilot project is grade 9 (students aged 15).

The study brings together two theoretical perspectives. One is socio-cultural writing theory (Vygotsky 1986, Wertsch 1998), the other is the 'discursive turn' in disciplinary didactics (Ongstad 2006, Lemke 1990). Methodologically the study is inspired by New Literacy Studies (Barton 1994, Street 2005) in its ethnographic approach and in the understanding of literacies as social practices.

The aim of the study is to create new knowledge about students' learning subjects through writing and learning writing through subjects and to examine the ways in which they develop writing competence through their secondary education.

The research question guiding the pilot project focuses on literacy events (Barton 1994) and writing activities in three grade 9 classes located at different schools, asking which writing practices are found, how students respond to these, and how they relate to students' out of school literacy practices. The data consist in participant observations, assignments, student writing, semi-structured teacher and student interviews and a student questionnaire.

Preliminary findings show expected differences in the writing practices of specific subjects, but also variations at student level and between the three school cases which call for further analytical categories and distinctions.

In the presentation we shall focus on an apparently related distinctions between
1. school initiated and student initiated writing
2. knowledge reproductive and knowledge productive writing.

Observations indicated a predominance of reproductive writing, In one school case, however, more instances of knowledge production were seen, apparently related to the integration of the digital media used by students in their out of school writing.

Interview indicated that school and out of school writing served different purposes for the students. Whereas school writing appeared mainly to serve strategic and ritual functions, out of school writing served communicative functions (Berge 1988), in some cases tied to fairly advanced communication in computer games.

A tentative question is whether students' out of school writing practices may put a pressure for more knowledge production on Danish school writing.

References

Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy. An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language.* Blackwell.
Berge, K.L. (1988). *Skolestilen som genre.* Cappelen
Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking Science.* Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Ongstad, S. (2006). Fag i endring. Ongstad, S. (ed.). *Fag og didaktikk i lærerutdanning. Kunnskap i grenseland*. Oslo University Press. 19-57

Street, B. V. (2005). Recent Applications of New Literacy Studies in Educational Contexts. *Research in the teaching of English.* Vol. 39 nr 4. 417-423

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and Language.* The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind in Action.* Oxford University Press.

K8 (continued)
High school students and the practices of academic writers
Writing Practices in Danish Secondary Education

Nikolaj F. Elf, Southern University, U.S.
Torben S. Christensen, Southern University, U.S.

The paper will present preliminary findings from a pilot project conducted 2009-2010 as part of a larger, longitudinal study of students' writing in the disciplines from grade 9 through grade 12. The empirical focus of the pilot project is grade 9 (students aged 15).

The study brings together two theoretical perspectives. One is socio-cultural writing theory (Vygotsky 1986, Wertsch 1998), the other is the 'discursive turn' in disciplinary didactics (Ongstad 2006, Lemke 1990). Methodologically the study is inspired by New Literacy Studies (Barton 1994, Street 2005) in its ethnographic approach and in the understanding of literacies as social practices.

The aim of the study is to create new knowledge about students' learning subjects through writing and learning writing through subjects and to examine the ways in which they develop writing competence through their secondary education.

The research question guiding the pilot project focuses on literacy events (Barton 1994) and writing activities in three grade 9 classes located at different schools, asking which writing practices are found, how students respond to these, and how they relate to students' out of school literacy practices. The data consist in participant observations, assignments, student writing, semi-structured teacher and student interviews and a student questionnaire.

Preliminary findings show expected differences in the writing practices of specific subjects, but also variations at student level and between the three school cases which call for further analytical categories and distinctions.
In the presentation we shall focus on an apparently related distinctions between
1. school initiated and student initiated writing
2. knowledge reproductive and knowledge productive writing.

Observations indicated a predominance of reproductive writing, In one school case, however, more instances of knowledge production were seen, apparently related to the integration of the digital media used by students in their out of school writing.
Interview indicated that school and out of school writing served different purposes for the students. Whereas school writing appeared mainly to serve strategic and ritual functions, out of school writing served communicative functions (Berge 1988), in some cases tied to fairly advanced communication in computer games.

A tentative question is whether students' out of school writing practices may put a pressure for more knowledge production on Danish school writing.

References

Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy. An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language.* Blackwell.
Berge, K.L. (1988). *Skolestilen som genre.* Cappelen
Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking Science.* Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Ongstad, S. (2006). Fag i endring. Ongstad, S. (ed.). *Fag og didaktikk i lærerutdanning. Kunnskap i grenseland*. Oslo University Press. 19-57

Street, B. V. (2005). Recent Applications of New Literacy Studies in Educational Contexts. *Research in the teaching of English.* Vol. 39 nr 4. 417-423

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and Language.* The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind in Action.* Oxford University Press.

K9
Graduate students becoming teachers of writing
How Teaching Assistants Learn To Teach Writing. Linking Formal Writing
Pedagogy Education to TAs' Previous Knowledge

E. Shelley Reid, George Mason University, U.S.
Heidi Estrem, Boise State University, U.S.

Abstract: Presenters One and Two report on our joint research about how graduate teaching assistants acquire the confidence and skills to teach college composition. Our data comes from a three-year, two-site, two-mode study employing a survey tool and an interview protocol. In sum, TAs in our study report that they rely significantly on their previous experience rather than newly acquired, discipline-related knowledge as the basis for their confidence and problem-solving skills; they indicate that they value extracurricular interventions such as peer-mentoring very highly during their preservice and initial classroom teaching experiences; and they demonstrate that their pedagogy-learning is, like writing-learning, necessarily nonlinear and recursive.
We argue that our results show clear needs for extending TA education beyond the one-shot "pedagogy seminar," through follow-up classes, formalized peer mentoring, and a program of inservice workshops. We also suggest that faculty leading the pedagogy seminar need to take steps to explicitly help TAs link new, disciplinary knowledge onto previously acquired experiences and assumptions about writing, teaching, and learning.

Presenter One: "Icebergs and Interteaching: Linking Formal Writing Pedagogy Education to TAs' Previous Knowledge."
I draw two metaphors from Angi Malderez and Caroline Bodóczky's work on preparing mentor-teachers to help frame TAs' responses and explore how pedagogy faculty might improve their work with new writing teachers. The first metaphor, that of the unseen "iceberg" of assumptions and beliefs that lie beneath the surface of new teachers' practices, helps explain why references to newly learned theories play such a minor role in their reports of gaining skills and solving problems. The second metaphor, that of "interteaching," identifies a time of pedagogy-acquisition behaviors, not dissimilar to language-acquisition behaviors, during which pedagogy education practices can be specially designed to support exploration, articulation, and imperfect but increasingly fluent practice of new concepts.

Presenter Two: "How Ideas Move: Tracing Teaching Practices Within Writing Programs"
I trace how pedagogical ideas are shared and interpreted, and evolve as they move through teaching communities. I use an activity systems theoretical approach to understand the dynamic, interpretive nature of teaching acts within a shared cultural context. Working with this lens, I visually map how new instructors make teaching decisions, how they share their pedagogical resources, and how their pedagogies collectively shape and influence the program. This mapping process, in turn, raises new questions about systems-based practices for enhancing TA pedagogical education.

Study Methodology: This study measures TA responses to general questions about teaching rather than measuring teaching or measuring TAs' satisfaction with their pedagogy education. MA and MFA teaching assistants were surveyed and interviewed anonymously at two sites: a public university in the mid-Atlantic US and one in the western US. In Part One of the study, novice and more-experienced TAs completed a questionnaire that asks them about their perceptions: their confidence- and concern-levels regarding various elements of composition teaching, and what they see as the strongest influences on their teaching success. For instance, respondents at both sites—both first-year and experienced teachers—rate "my experience as a writer" most highly for contributing knowledge and skills to their teaching, and "reading professional articles" and "reflective writing/thinking about teaching" least highly. In all, more than 80 surveys were completed. Multiple-choice responses to the surveys are currently undergoing an initial round of testing for statistical validity, and open-ended responses are being coded to reveal initial patterns of response.

In Part Two (data collection occurring at the same time as Part One), TAs at various stages in their programs describe in an interview what their teaching principles are, and explain how they go about solving pedagogical problems such as syllabus design and classroom management. Responses at both sites reveal that they incorporate knowledge introduced in formal educational settings (pedagogy seminar, writing center tutor training) as well as strategies that have less direct connections to (or perhaps contradict) their formal training. In all, more than 40 interviews were conducted, and are being coded to reveal initial patterns of response.

Related Literature: In US composition studies currently, we have very little research to help us answer the question of how TAs *learn* to teach writing, though there is a growing body of work theorizing how to *teach* writing pedagogy. We don't dismiss the important analyses that have so far been published about best practices in pedagogy-education: in the recent collections edited by Sidney Dobrin, by Betty Pytlik and Sarah Ligget, by Robert Tremmel and William Broz; in monographs like those by Sally Barr Ebest, George Hillocks, Ruth Ray, and Shari Stenberg; in individual articles such as those by Doug Hesse, Catherine Latterell and Nancy Welch. Yet while much research supporting this body of work has been insightfully theorized, only some of it has been rigorously qualitative, and very little has been quantitative, longitudinal, or designed to compare practices/responses at multiple sites, as ours is.

K10

Environments for learning and responding to college level writing

Writing as a means of "direct learning through direct action": Case studies
of service-learning students working across cultural borders

George L. Boggs, University of Georgia, U.S.

This research highlights the affordances and constraints of writing as a tool for bridging academic and non-academic learning about cultural borders. Vygotsky's theory that learning involves changes in a person's relationship to her environment (1994) draws attention to the tools employed to negotiate complex physical arenas, tasks, and social networks of school and non-school settings hybridized in some service-learning contexts. This research focuses on three undergraduates who employed independent and collaborative writing to complete a variety of tasks in a human geography course designed to "hover between the university and the community." It investigates writing as a component of *their* efforts to hover, asking how it mediated their perception of and ability to work across the cultural borders of an affluent university population and nearby poor, urban communities.

Environments for learning and responding to college level writing
> In the Trenches: A Snapshot of College Writing Instructors' Current Response
> Practices
> *Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, U.S.*

Despite decades of scholarship providing advice to classroom instructors about how they *should* respond to student writing, little is known about to what extent real-world instructors actually follow these suggestions. With the exceptions of the studies by Connors and Lunsford (1988; 1993) and a recent replication study by Lunsford and Lunsford (2008), there have been few attempts to examine teacher feedback in its natural settings, let alone the bigger-picture issues of *what* instructors do in constructing response systems in their classes, *why* they do what they do, and *how they feel* about their efforts.

To obtain a contextualized and real-world picture of how writing instructors conceptualize and execute response in their classrooms, we surveyed 129 instructors at eight instititions—six community colleges and two four-year universities—in our region. We used a 25-item online survey which asked a range of questions about teacher backgrounds and preparation, about the different ways in which they designed response systems in their classes and about their own approach to written feedback. Considering our linguistically and culturally diverse region, we also asked about their approaches to responding to multilingual writers in their classes.

At the end of the survey, instructors were given the opportunity to volunteer for follow-up in-depth interviews. Over 50 survey respondents provided their names and contact information, and we met with 23 instructors from a range of institutions in 30-60 minute semi-structured interviews, taking notes and audio-recording the interviews. As part of the interviews, we asked the participants to bring 3-5 sample student texts that included their written commentary, and we spent time during the interview discussing the commentary with the instructor. Data were collected between September, 2008-January, 2009.

Our analyses included the following:
1. examination of survey percentages and cross-tabulation of selected survey items;
2. categorization and collation of verbal survey comments and interview responses;
3. descriptive analyses of the written teacher commentary on the student papers (following Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997);
4. construction of case study narratives for the 23 interview participants and examination of the narratives to discover common themes.

All data analyses were conducted by a team of six researchers between January-March, 2009.

We found that the college/university writing instructors in our sample indeed report following many of the so-called best practices advised by experts (e.g., Straub & Lunsford, 1995) but that they also experience high degrees of frustration with the time and effort response requires and with its apparent lack of effects on at least some

student writers. Close examination of both written commentary on student papers and of instructor survey and interview responses revealed some possible explanations for these frustrations and ways in which instructors may be inadvertantly undermining their own efforts. This presentation will briefly review those findings and provide suggestions for continued research on the critical and central concern of response in composition instruction. (*472 words)*

References

Connors, R., & Lunsford, A.A. (1988). Frequency of formal errors in current college writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle do research. *College Composition and Communication,* 39(4), 395-409.

Connors, R. & Lunsford, A. A. (1993). Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication, 44*, 200--223.

Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6,* 155--182.

Lunsford, A.A., & Lunsford, K.J. (2008). "Mistakes are a fact of life": A national comparative study. *College Composition and Communication, 59*, 781-806.

Straub, R. & Lunsford, R.F. (1995). *Twelve readers reading: Responding to college student writing.* Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Environments for learning and responding to college level writing

The Development of Academic Literacy in Collaborative Learning Environments
María Cristina Arancibia, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

Poor performance of Chilean secondary students in writing and comprehension tasks has long affected their performance in their freshman year at universities. At present, the extended use of technology in tertiary education has offered a viable possibility to tackle this issue. We propose a study aimed to describe and evaluate the acquisition of academic literacy by the implementation of collaborative learning environments enhanced by the use of synchronous and asynchronous Internet resources.

Relevant Bibliography
Carlino, P. (2005). *alfabetización académica*. Buenos Aires: FDCE.
This book discusses the importance of reading and writing to foster efficient learning in the university. The author discusses the role of professors in developing academic literacy in their students.
Bazerman, C., Little, J., Bethel, L., Chavkin, T., Fouquette, D., & Garufis, J. (2005).
Reference guide to writing across the curriculum. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press
This book provides a complete overview of WAC whose origin may be traced back to Great Britain. The authors introduce their readers to the theory that embraces the epistemic nature of writing and provides helpful hints to evaluating and teaching writing in academic settings.

Research questions
What effect does peer correction of essays using asynchronous and synchronous communication tools have on the quality of subsequent written tasks?
What effect does the participation on discussion forums have in the ability of individuals to comprehend and apply disciplinary concepts in their arguments?

Methods
Participants
40 university freshmen of Licenciatura en Letras from the Universidad Católica de Chile.
Instrument
Reading comprehension tests and writing tasks
Procedure
A quasi experimental study is proposed. The research consists of a single-group time-series design. The study is carried out in the context of a core curriculum class. Subjects were given a pre-test to evaluate their ability to comprehend and write academic texts at the beginning of the term before the pedagogical intervention is given. The pedagogical intervention consists of providing individuals with reading and writing tasks. After every reading task participants are invited to discuss a question in a student forum. Participation in forums is followed by the application of reading comprehension tests. Writing tasks are completed individually and evaluated by a team of teachers. Feedbacks to individual

essays are sent back to students who work collaboratively in peer correction of their essays using *G-docs*.

Data and findings
The study is being currently conducted; however, preliminary results in reading comprehension tests and academic writing tasks have shown modest improvement in the performance of such tasks. We hope extended exposure of the individuals to collaborative learning environments enhanced by the use of technology will render significant progress.

The scope and duration of the research project
The primary focus of this study is the implementation of collaborative learning environments enhanced by the use of synchronous and asynchronous technological tools to describe the way knowledge is transferred from the group to the individual. The study is being conducted during the first academic term of 2010.

K11
Teachers of writing in early and middle grades

The Relationship between First-Grade Teachers' Theoretical Orientation to Writing Instruction and Student Writing Performance

David Coker, University of Delaware, U.S.
Kristen D. Ritchey, University of Delaware, U.S.

Despite the proliferation of literacy-related research, there has been little attention devoted to writing instruction in the primary grades. In addition, there is also relatively little empirical evidence on the current nature of writing instruction in schools. Much of what has been reported recently relies on teacher surveys without an analysis of student writing (Cutler & Graham, 2008; Graham, Harris, Fink-Chorzempa, & MacArthur, 2003). While teacher surveys have provided researchers with important information, these reports are unable to assess the impact of teachers' instructional practices and theoretical orientations on student performance. This study was designed to examine:

(a) the relationship between teachers' theoretical orientation to writing instruction and students' writing outcomes, and

(b) the relationship between the types of instructional activities and student writing outcomes in first grade.

Participants and Measures

The participants were 12 first-grade teachers and 156 first-grade students from 11 classrooms in three schools in a district serving urban and suburban neighborhoods in the Northeastern United States.

Teachers' theoretical orientation to writing was assessed using the Writing Orientation Scale, developed by Graham, Harris, MacArthur, & Fink. (2002). The Writing Orientation Scale identified three factors to describe teachers' theoretical orientation (natural learning, explicit instruction, and concern for correctness). The final section of the survey contained 13 questions about specific writing instructional activities (adapted from Cutler & Graham, 2008).

Students completed Sentence Writing, a curriculum based measurement of writing for beginning writers, designed to assess their ability respond to two sentence prompts (Authors, 2010). Sentence Writing was administered three times during an approximately six-month period in the spring of the school year (January, March, May). To control for incoming differences in students' writing proficiency, gain scores were analyzed.

Results and Discussion

We found a positive relationship between gains in the quality of student writing and teachers' support for explicit instruction ($r = .71$, $p = .009$). The analysis of the teacher survey revealed few relationships between instructional practices and student outcomes; however, teachers who reported encouraging their students to use invented spelling were found to have larger gains in the quality of student writing.

Overall, these findings suggest that emphasizing explicit instruction and encouraging students to use invented spelling may be beneficial during first-grade writing instruction. Although many questions remain about the most effect approaches to early

writing instruction, these results provide some hypotheses that are likely to fuel future research.

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

Authors. (2010).

Cutler, L., & Graham, S. (2008). Primary grade writing instruction: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(4), 907-919.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., Fink-Chorzempa, B., & MacArthur, C. A. (2003). Primary grade teachers' instructional adaptations for struggling writers: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 279-292.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., MacArthur, C. A., & Fink, B. (2002). Primary grade teachers' theoretical orientations concerning writing instruction: Construct validation and a nationwide survey. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27*, 147-166.

Teachers of writing in early and middle grades
> Middle School Teachers' Collaborative Inquiry into Equity Writing
> Pedagogy
>> *Shannon Pella, University of California, Davis, U.S.*

Research Question

What are some of the outcomes when five middle school writing teachers participate in a lesson study that is focused on developing instructional methods to engage culturally and linguistically diverse adolescents in thinking for and about writing?

Theoretical Lens from the Literature

My dissertation study drew from a combination of related theoretical frameworks: situated learning theory and constructivism. Situated learning theory locates the processes of thinking and doing in particular settings and involves other learners, the environment, and the meaning making activities that contribute to new knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As this theory is applied to teacher knowledge development, it posits teachers' co-construction of knowledge as an appropriation and transformation of resources to solve locally identified problems in teaching and learning (Wells, 1999).

Lesson study is teacher-driven and maintained, collaborative, inquiry-based, in the context of real lessons in real classrooms--and it includes both an observation and reflection component (Lewis et al., 2006). The lesson study model in this study was locally designed and was supported by the theoretical frameworks that underlie social learning theory, socially situated learning, and constructivism.

Methods

Data Collection and Analysis

All teacher discussions during lesson planning, observation, and debriefing meetings were video and audio taped. I collected a wide variety of written data from all teacher created materials, curriculum, other material resources, and student work samples. I triangulated these data with email communication, individual interviews, and written reflections from each participating teacher. I took a grounded theory approach to qualitative data collection and analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Data analysis involved applying the "constant comparative method" (Merriam, 2003), by coding and categorizing data from all sources in order to "fracture the data and force interpretation" (Strauss, 1987 p. 55).

Findings

Overview

        The lesson study project afforded participants an opportunity to deeply investigate a variety of materials and prior experiences that reflected contrasting theoretical and practical approaches to teaching and learning writing. As teachers negotiated these contrasting approaches, they determined to structure their writing lessons in such a way as to allow students to wrestle with the same conundrums. As teachers were negotiating what I describe as "theoretical equilibrium", they wanted students to also negotiate, integrate, and balance tensions between divergent theory and practice. In order to reconcile tensions across contrasting theoretical approaches, teachers provided students with opportunities to analyze these approaches and make choices for their own writing.

Specific Findings to be Addressed in the Presentation:

The collaborative planning, observations, and data analysis features of the lesson study protocol afforded opportunities for the teachers to negotiate and balance a variety of theoretical approaches to teaching and learning writing. As a result of negotiating tensions among diverse approaches to writing instruction, participants developed integrated methods to engage students in higher-order thinking for and about writing. I will discuss and detail the following findings as they begin to shape the participants developing equity writing pedagogy:

1. Teachers developed methods to scaffold meta cognition for and about writing, not simply to scaffold writing tasks.
2. Teachers developed multi-modal, collaborative activities that provided opportunities for language development for and about writing.
3. Teachers engaged students in genre analysis to integrate understandings of audience, purpose, text structure, and register both common to and flexible across, school-based writing genres.

References

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, C., Perry, R., & Murata, A. (2006). How should research contribute to instructional improvement? The case of lesson study. Educational Researcher, 35(3), 3-14.

Merriam, S. (2003). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). Dialogic inquiry: towards a socio cultural practice and theory of education. New York: Cambridge University Press.

K11 (continued)
Teachers of writing in early and middle grades
Writing in Teacher Education: A Brazilian and Argentinean Account
Solange T. R. de Castro, University of Taubaté, Brazil
Paula Carlino, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina
Carla L. Reichmann, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brazil

This panel discusses the role of writing in initial teacher education and in teacher development. **Paula Carlino** will speak about literacy across the curriculum in secondary teacher education in Argentina. She will present an analysis of a national survey about what teacher educators in different degrees say they and their institutions do with regards to reading and writing to learn. Through analysis of written reflective reports,
Reading and writing across the curriculum in secondary teacher education in Argentina: What lecturers say they and their institutions do

Paula Carlino
Leandro Bottinelli,
Manuela Cartolari,
Patricia Iglesia,
Irene Laxalt,
Marta Marucco

The present study examines lecturers' reading and writing conceptions and (declared) practices in the Arts and Sciences degrees of non university teacher education in Argentina. An online administered survey of 32 questions was developed by a team of six researchers with the support of the National Institute of Teacher Education. The study focused on lecturers of prospective secondary teachers. A stratified random sample at a national level was designed, selecting 544 lecturers working in 50 institutes at different locations of the country. Besides the quantitative statistical processing of the obtained data, a qualitative analysis of the answers to open questions in the survey was performed.

This paper concentrates on the responses to one of these open questions, in which teacher educators were asked to describe the actions performed by themselves, with other colleagues or at an institutional level to help overcome the difficulties that 90% of them recognize their students face when trying to read and write in the content areas. The analysis of the answers reveals that most of the lecturers mention that they include some literacy instruction in their classes. Nevertheless, a careful examination of the actions described shows that in most cases instruction takes place just at the beginning of the reading and writing processes (through requesting tasks, giving guidelines, teaching techniques) or at the end (assessing student's final products). A minority group of teachers, instead, also get involved providing regular instruction *during* these processes, frequently devoting some of their classes' time to reading and writing to learn tasks. Within this group, a minimum proportion of the respondents promote teacher-student interaction. In other words, just a very few of the lecturers endorse dialogic teaching strategies, advocating for a multiple way feedback (between what the students do, what the teacher contributes and what the students transform, repeatedly) as well as peer interaction through reading discussions and comments on written drafts.

Regarding institutional programs, numerous respondents report actions addressing literacy outside of the content area teaching (student workshops, freshmen courses, advisers' support). A reduced number of answers inform about institutions promoting collective actions that might have some impact on literacy teaching in the future (improvement projects, professional development workshops, faculty agreements).

Within the convergent theoretical frameworks of the "didactics of language practices" and the "WAC/WID" contributions, as well as the "academic literacies" and the "dialogic teaching" perspectives, we analyze these results in terms of a) conceptions on the nature of reading and writing and of literacy learning which could underlie the declared practices, b) consequences of these practices on the prospective teacher's scholarship and c) actions that could be undertaken to produce changes in the current state of pre-service teacher education in Argentina. To illustrate the analysis we include quotes of teachers' responses.

K12
Beyond navel-gazing: Critiquing the personal narrative in the US university first-year composition classroom

Stina Oakes, American University, U.S.
David Johnson, American University, U.S.
Heather McDonald, American University, U.S.
Angela Dadak, American University, U.S.

Overview statement: Personal narrative assignments often elicit groans from professors and students alike. Generic college admissions essays are too fresh in students' minds; professors assign it as a means to get students writing, but dread reading the simple and often self-indulgent results. However, using personal narratives can be a way to hone students' critical thinking, research, and rhetorical skills. This panel brings together four writing instructors with backgrounds in literature, creative writing, cultural studies, and second language writing to examine, defend, and critique the place of the personal narrative in required writing courses at a US university.

In Defense of the Narrative by Stina Oakes, American University, Washington DC <oakes@american.edu>
Many writing instructors are moving away from using narrative writing in their classrooms because it is deemed as "non-academic." I argue against this move. Instead, I embrace and advocate the use of the narrative in order to engage the students in writing and to explore writing conventions on a familiar topic. If thought and analysis are put into the goals and structure of the assignment, students begin to move away from the dreaded "Dead Grandma" essay and into thoughtful, critical self-analysis. I see this process as a way for students to learn how to enter the academic conversation.
At the end of each semester I ask students to reflect on their writing throughout the course. What I have discovered is that they value and appreciate the narrative writing. In my discussion I will address the various student responses and what these demonstrate about the efficacy of narrative writing. I will also explore the problems that arise and how to craft assignments that work to their, and our, benefit.

Narrative Space: Vico, Burke, and Blanchot and the Inventive Parlor, David Johnson, American University, Washington DC <djohnson@american.edu>
Except for the recent endeavors of Greg Ulmer, Victor Vitanza, and Geoffrey Sirc, for the most part, the *narrative* has been removed from serious discussion in rhet/comp theory. I want to recover the importance of the *narrative space* in academic writing by recalling the full attention given to it by two rhetorical theorists, Giambattista Vico and Kenneth Burke, and by the literary/cultural critic, Maurice Blanchot. I argue that the *narrative* affords a *rhetorical place* within which the writer and reader are free to mingle about in order to invent intriguing and useful questions concerning life experiences.

Those Damn Poets: Creative Writing in the Composition Class Heather McDonald, American University, Washington DC < hmcdonal@american.edu>
"You are looking outwards, and of all things that is what you now must not do. . . . There

is only one single means. Go inside yourself. Discover the motive that bids you write. . . ." (Rilke, Letters to a Young Poet).

The January 2009 issue of CCC examined the mutuality and transferability between composition, and its so-called less practical cousin, creative writing. Yet despite the research and theory within academe, creative writing is often maligned as non-rigorous artistic exercise, exclusive to serious research and writing. I argue that writing skills are writing skills. Students often say that they enjoy creative writing because it allows them to think and see in new ways, but hate writing academic essays. We expect students to do the same thing in academic essays, but they do not see how the skills may transfer between the two forms; often, neither do we. Composition does not have to exclude the creative elements of writing, and personal narratives are an excellent way to explore the intersection—even melding--of the two forms. The space that we create in our classrooms can encourage students to engage their audiences through creative elements such as narrative, synthesizing research with imagination and creativity, varying structures, imagery, and vocabulary; in short, creative writing elements can help students understand what writerly choices they must make for various assignments. Many of the elements are important to the personal narrative, so this form is a an essential way for students to not only learn how to engage their audiences, but for instructors to engage and arm *their* audience the skills students need and want.

Still in Doubt: Perspectives from Second Language Writing that Clarify and Complicate the Issues Angela Dadak, American University, Washington DC <adadak@american.edu>

With a background in TESOL and having taught English for Academic Purposes classes for international students preparing to study in US universities, when I moved to a mainstream undergraduate writing program I was initially quite mystified when I encountered personal narrative assignments. For years I had been working with second language writing students to craft explicitly stated arguments and grapple with incorporating and citing sources, yet these narrative assignments called for implicit thesis statements and deliberately asked students not to incorporate research. Since those first encounters I have come to better understand the rationale for these texts in writing classes and have seen some excellent personal narrative papers from my students, yet I still have serious reservations on a number of fronts: If a benefit of a personal narrative is to develop one's writing voice, how much of an accent is acceptable in that voice ? How is voice conceived by multilingual writers (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Atkinson, 2001) ? How are peer readers and instructors prepared to deal with– or even recognize – cross-cultural misunderstandings not only regarding topics but also about the genre itself (Leki, 1992; Dyer & Friederich, 2002)? In my presentation, I will review these issues through second language writing scholarship and personal experiences of both instructors and students.

K13
Literacy histories

Sequoyan: Instrumental Logics of the First Native American Writing System
Ellen Cushman, Michigan State University, U.S.

Informally recognized by the tribal council in 1821, the 86-character Cherokee writing system invented by Sequoyah became widely used by the Cherokee within the span of a few years without mass education or print to facilitate its spread. As a number of scholars have noted (Li 2004; Finnegan 1988; Baca 2009; Baca and Villanueva 2010; Harris 2009), writing systems have often been measured using the instrumentality of the Roman alphabet as a baseline against which to judge their workings, and the Cherokee writing system has been approached no differently. When it includes mention of the Cherokee syllabary, studies of writing systems have tended to do so in passing as related to other syllabaries, such as the Vai (Tuchschere and Hair, 2002), or in larger taxonomies of all representational systems (DeFrancis, 1989; Gelb, 1963). At times, scholars have misrepresented the Cherokee syllabary altogether. Linguist Henry Rogers (2005, p. 247) finds that "visually, many of the Cherokee symbols are drawn from upper case Roman letters. Others are alterations of Roman letters or invented symbols." Writing systems scholars got off on the wrong foot when viewing the Cherokee writing system because they presumed that alphabetic writing provides an adequate measure against which all other systems can be judged. "By comparison with this alphabetic ideal," Roy Harris finds, "syllabic writing is automatically seen as something more primitive and clumsy" (1986, p. 39). Because the Cherokee writing system has not been analyzed outside of the alphabetic ideal, discussions of it have largely misrepresented how the syllabary works and beg the question that this presentation will take up: What instrumental logics might be surfaced when the Cherokee writing system is approached through a historical and linguistic analysis of its workings?

Drawing on five years of ethnohistorical research, this paper opens with a brief history of Sequoyah's invention featuring archival reproductions of the manuscript and print versions. Using Florian Coulmas' (2007) framework for analyzing the interpretive and historical aspects of writing systems, differences between the script and print arrangements are brought to light: the print arrangement standardized by missionary Samuel Worcester bent the Cherokee writing system to the orthographic rules of the Roman alphabet, thus obscuring the instrumental logics of the original script. To reveal the instrumental logics of the writing system, results of a linguistic analysis of what each character can potentially *mean* will be presented, and will be followed with a demonstration of its instrumental logic in several samples. The findings, triangulated with Cherokee language teachers, translators, and linguists from the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, suggest that the Cherokee syllabary is actually a morphographic writing system.

This research compliments a growing area of study on the sociolinguistic and anthropological approaches to writing systems (Sebba 2007, 2006; Savage 2008, and Unseth 2005, 2008, Bender 2002, and Morgan 2009). This research also corrects the historical record on Sequoyan as it extends scholarship on regional studies of literacy in America (Brandt 2001; Powell 2007; Duffy 2007; Graff 2007).

K13 (continued)
Literacy histories

Early American Literacy Discourse in Great Britain: Anxiety of Influence or
Rhetoric of Authority
Shawn Casey, The Ohio State University, U.S.

Why does writing about writing travel? My dissertation research explores how the rhetorical meanings of literacy promoted the spread of new approaches to teaching and learning writing throughout the eighteenth-century Atlantic. Specifically, my critical history of writings about writing compares literacy discourses in three centers of commerce, publication and government: Edinburgh, Philadelphia and London, between 1750 and 1800. Our disciplinary histories tend to focus on how anxieties over writing and speaking British English led cultural provinces like Scotland and Early America to develop innovative approaches to standardizing and valuing certain kinds of literacy. My history suggests a more complicated history of mutual exchange.

Addressing iconic figures like Hugh Blair, Benjamin Franklin, and the London-based Scottish printer William Strahan, I investigate how questions of medium, sociality and institution shaded the meanings of literacy practices like writing. Exploring the hybrid meanings that emerge in these contexts helps answer the question of why writing about writing travels by identifying texts and narratives where the meaning of literacy becomes personally or politically consequential. My findings suggest that literacy discourse is shaped as much by adaptations to local rhetorical needs as it is by anxieties about meeting or developing British standards. Comparing the exchange of local rhetorical meanings between contexts helps demonstrate how anxiety as well as social and cultural exigency (and agency) contributed to the creation of new approaches to studying, describing and teaching written composition during the Enlightenment.

I propose a presentation introducing this transatlantic approach to the study of literacy during the Enlightenment and reporting significant findings from my research in European archives this June. During my research trip, I will pursue the records of American students at the University of Edinburgh and American and Scottish authors active in London publishing ventures. For many of these figures the exchange between Scotland, America and England has been documented but not fully explored and described. The general bias toward Scottish or English "influence" fails to acknowledge the significance of American aims and needs in literacy and writing instruction in Europe or how closely Americans adopted and adapted English models for their own purposes. Important documentary evidence, such as records left by American students sponsored by Benjamin Franklin at the University of Edinburgh, has yet to be brought to light and compared to the evidence that is currently used in disciplinary histories, such as the records and notes of Scottish students of figures such as Hugh Blair. My project therefore promises to expand our understanding of the nature of transatlantic exchange while exploring how, where and why new meanings of writing and literacy developed during the Enlightenment. My presentation, suited to join a panel on history or the rhetoric of literacy, deepens our understanding of the factors that defined and promoted writing during the Enlightenment, even while introducing methods and sources that extend the study of writing research further into Atlantic history.

K13 (continued)
Literacy histories

From Glass Flowers to Computer Games: Examining the Persuasive Media
Practices of Plant Biologists
Morgan Reitmeyer, Purdue University, U.S.

While WAC researchers have extensively studied the emergence of media in the undergraduate writing pedagogy, there is still limited information about how other disciplines are adopting new media for professional knowledge making and communication. Recent National Science Foundation funding requirements ask that the scientists provide public communication of their research findings, and these public communications frequently employ multimedia texts. In my multimedia presentation I will be presenting my research, which addresses the following question: How do plant biologists use a variety of media in their professional knowledge making, public communications, and corresponding literacy practices to support their academic community? Understanding the writing practices of sanctioned experts, in this case plant biologists, supports the introduction of a discipline to novice writers. Additionally, I propose that answering this question will also facilitate new collaboration among disciplines, opening up various means of funding and generating innovative approaches to communication for both English studies and plant biology.

Based on previous investigations into the disciplines (Andrews, 1991-1992; Bazerman, 1988; Bazerman, 1994; Bazerman and Harrington, 2006; Chabot and Tomkiewicz, 2008; Langsman and Yancey, 1998; Latour and Woolgar, 1978; Lunsford, 2009, Lynch, 1998; Prior, 1998; Russell, 2006; Samraj and Swales, 2000; Stockton, 1994; Thaiss and Zawacki, 2006) I am using mixed methods in my research including historic case studies, interviews, observation, and textual analysis. This research, which started in spring 2009 and is a continuing project, includes the following:

1.	My historic research starts with the glass flowers of Harvard University, a vivid example of plant biologists creating unique public displays and pedagogy tools, and traces a variety of historic moments (including popularized horticulture and time-lapse photography) to the advent of digital media. By examining the media use of plant sciences in the past I hope to be able to better understand how various emergent media have been adopted in the present.

2.	My journal analysis includes examining specific journals from plant biology from 1970 forward. These journals include Plant Cell, the Annual Review of Plant Biology, The American Biology Teacher, and the Journal of Visual Experiment as well as digital community texts like the American Society of Plant Biology (ASPB) website. I am searching for evidence of disciplinary dialogue about emergent technology, as well as examining how new technology was being used to present disciplinary information.

3.	I will be conducting interviews to triangulate my textual and historic data. My interview subjects include graduate students, postdocs, junior faculty and full professors of plant biology with the aim of understanding how disciplinary communication practices are taught, and negotiated in the larger discipline.

4. I also plan to attend the 2010 American Society of Plant Biology conference as I suspect that a large percent of disciplinary negotiation around communication happens during face to face meetings and through dynamic presentations.

My research aims to understand how academic texts in the biological sciences are using new media communication methods currently available for public and disciplinary communication, and make it possible for plant biology and English studies to use new media in increasingly creative, interactive, and collaborative ways. This presentation will describe my research, and make suggestions for continued investigations of alternative media use in the disciplines.