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Studying the Course of the Writing Process for Understanding Expertise in Composition: Eye and Pen Studies
Denis Alamargot
*Université de Paris-Est Créteil, France*

This presentation demonstrates the value in studying the temporal path of the writing process, in order to deeply understand the development of writing expertise. After describing the "Eye and Pen" software and methodology, we will present an experimental study that has allowed us to evaluate the conditions for attaining expertise in composition. More precisely, these studies were designed to enhance our understanding of the changing relationship between low (handwriting, spelling)- and high (conceptual)-level writing processes in the course of development. A dual description of writing processes was undertaken, based on (a) the respective time courses of these processes, as assessed by an analysis of eye and pen movements, and (b) the semantic characteristics of the writers' scripts. To obtain a more fine-grained description of processing strategies, a "case study" approach was adopted in the first study, whereby a comprehensive range of measures was used to assess processes within five writers with different levels of expertise (7th, 9th and 12th grader, graduate student, and professional writer). The task was to continue writing a story based on an excerpt from a source document. The main results showed two developmental patterns linked to expertise: (a) a gradual acceleration in low- and high-level processing (pauses, flow), associated with (b) changes in the way that preceding text was (re)read. Implications for academic teaching will be discussed.

After the Big Bang: The Expanding Universe of Writing Studies
Chris Anson
*North Carolina State University, USA*

Fifty years ago, the energy behind a swirling mass of questions about the nature and development of writing led to an eventual explosion of research that sees no sign of abating. Over time, entire worlds of inquiry formed, each revolving around its own methodological system and pulled inward by the gravitational force of its focus. As their ecosystems have flourished, it has become increasingly difficult for inhabitants of these worlds to keep up with the activity within them, much less turn their gaze outward. But not exploring and exchanging with other worlds of research—no matter how distant, no matter how alien their methods and assumptions—limits our collective understanding, hems in our imagination, and leaves us without a basis for theorizing universal models of writing.
Our current conversation about transnational writing projects and pedagogies recognizes that the teaching and learning of writing are conditioned by geopolitical, historical, social and institutional dispositions of a given setting, as well as by globalization (Anson and Donahue, Horner, Martins, Thaiss et al, Muchiri et al). Building on this premise, my essay offers a close look at how the practices of a transnational writing program can reveal synergies and potentially occasion tensions between local political and academic cultures. I discuss the adaption of some features of the Anglo-American writing tradition in Russia where higher education has become an important vehicle for enhancing the country’s global competitiveness and national pride. It is also a space where, historically, definitions of citizenry and civic engagement have been propelled. In the recent Soviet past, the notion of civic responsibility translated into a uniform, state prescribed “civic position” steeped in Communist ideology. Presently, because the country is in transition, it is not uncommon to include “the betterment of Russia” in universities’ mission statements, a rhetorical move that links higher education with the needs of the country.

One such need is to place the country on the map of internationally competitive education through internationalization initiatives (Maltseva, West and Frumina) that have included, with increasing frequency, implementations of U.S.-based writing pedagogies. I view one such implementation against the backdrop of Russia’s changing socio-political and educational landscape. I concentrate on the bilingual writing program, Writing and Communication Center (WCC), that I founded at Moscow’s New Economic School (NES) in 2011. Conceptually and methodologically informed by U.S. composition principles and writing center theory, the program has always been led by U.S.-trained WPAs, but it employed both Russian and American consultants. The work of the WCC comprises curriculum development, WAC/WID faculty development, as well as writing and oral communication tutoring for students and professional development projects in collaboration with other universities.

I investigate the foundational framework, pedagogical approaches and administrative decisions of the WCC in its first two years of existence (2011-2013), concentrating on those aiming to facilitate independent critical inquiry and academic integrity through student-centered practices. My analysis suggests that these two common features of Anglo-American writing instruction when practiced abroad can function as vehicles for developing students’ civic responsibility necessary for participating in the academic and professional cultures globally and for contributing to the democratization of local political and social structures. While these practices may place a transnational WPA into highly contested, interrelated terrains of pedagogy, policy and politics, they also instill a civic dimension in her practice. In addition, I have found that a firm institutional support is essential for productive fostering of a teaching and learning environment where literacy habits are developed in connection with civic habits.
A Discursive Context for the Essay Genre in U.S. English Studies
Laura Aull
Wake Forest University, USA

Since Kitzhaber’s survey in the 1950s and the Dartmouth Seminar in the decade after, the essay genre has continued to play a prominent role in U.S. English instruction and assessment. Students are regularly assigned essays as reading material, and they write essays for low and high stakes assessments at both secondary and college levels. In recent decades, rhetorical and linguistic genre studies have likewise developed, though generally with more of a focus on socio-cultural contexts in rhetorical genre studies and more of a focus on discourse in linguistic genre studies. As a result, we know little about the discourse patterns of the essay genre commonly used in English composition courses. This talk presents a corpus-based discourse analysis of the composition essay canon and student essay writing in contrast with published academic articles. In so doing, it considers what we learn by investigating the discursive context of genres and what such knowledge reveals about the history of the essay and U.S. English composition studies.

Slouching Toward Sustainability: Mixed Methods in the Direct Assessment of Student Writing
Ellen Barton
Wayne State University, USA

The Composition Program at Wayne State University, a large urban research university, has in place a qualitative portfolio evaluation as our assessment of student writing. Following White (2005) and Huot (2009), we set FYW learning outcomes and assessed portfolios with an increasing emphasis on the reflective essay. But we faced serious problems of sustainability: despite two-day reading sessions, we were able to assess only a limited number of portfolios per year, typically around 100. From an empirical perspective, portfolio evaluation was labor-intensive, time-consuming, and methodologically problematic in that it was impossible to evaluate a representative sample in order to ascertain reasonable assurances of the assessment’s validity and reliability. Further, we were making curricular changes, such as revising our learning outcomes, assignment sequences, and rubrics, that were not based upon a solid understanding of the writing of our entire student body. We thus turned to mixed methods, finding many calls for mixed methods in the literature, but most studies focused on measurement at the program level, as in White, Elliot, and Peckham (2015), Dayton (2015), and Elliot and Peckham (2012). However, we wanted to develop a mixed methods approach to the direct assessment of student writing (Walvoord, 2010), as required by our university for its upcoming accreditation review. We found our approach in an unlikely place—thin-slice methods—a quantitative method from behavioral psychology [Ambady (1992); thin-slice methods were popularized as “fast cognition” in Malcolm Gladwell’s (2005) Blink]. Thin-slice methods select relatively small representative “slices” of spoken or written language for multiple readers to score with a common instrument. For our thin-slice data, we chose three paragraphs from students’ reflective essays—the introduction, one body paragraph, and the conclusion—to be scored with a trait-based rubric using a 6-point Likert scale. We first conducted a comparative study of a representative, randomized sample of our FYW students’ reflective essays (n=291) with two teams, vernacularly called the regular team, who followed Phase 2 assessment methods, and the research team, who used thin-slice methods. Somewhat to our surprise, we found that both teams were internally reliable,
our rubric therefore had construct and content validity, and our low positive correlation was significant. We are now conducting a qualitative feature analysis of students’ reflective writing using open inquiry assessment methods in order to propose curricular changes. In our paper, we argue that thin-slice methodology holds great potential for the direct assessment of large, representative samples of student writing, allowing a data-based assessment to undergird our understanding of student writing and our use of that information in curriculum and pedagogy.

**The puzzle of conducting research on lifespan development of writing abilities**
Chuck Bazerman
*University of California Santa Barbara, USA*

While every mature writer is aware that it takes decades for a writer to come to full skill and power, no matter what domain the writer works in, how to research that long and complex development is a puzzle. We have many studies of writers of different ages in and out of school, but these are not easily or unproblematically synthesized. Further, writing development in the childhood, adolescent, and young adult years is intertwined with curriculum and school expectations, it is hard to disentangle development from school achievement. Longitudinal studies are much fewer in number, and are mostly bound by levels of schooling. Longitudinal studies that reach across life periods or institutional boundaries are even more scarce. True lifespan longitudinal studies of writing development are daunting in their scope, as I will explore. But this still leaves us with the puzzle of how we can understand in any detail this core issue of how writers come to be able to do the remarkable things we do through writing.

**The Role of Feedback in Teacher/Student Relationships**
Kelly Blewett
*University of Cincinnati, USA*

Most studies of teacher feedback begin by noting the labor of providing feedback to student writers (Sommers; Knoblauch and Brannon; Lunsford and Connor; Neiderhiser). The amount of work that goes into the feedback seems particularly fraught when one considers how little is actually known about how students read and use feedback (Sommers). During this talk, I will talk about the importance of bringing insights from relational pedagogy to bear on discussions about providing feedback, and particularly why it is important to study the feedback cycle in an actual classroom environment from the perspectives of both teachers and students. While studying situated feedback provides a corrective to scholarship about commenting, doing so presents some methodological challenges including: structuring interview protocols, balancing various sources of data (interviews and textual data), and coding. I will discuss how I've tailored the methods to get closer to the phenomenon I aim to study: students reading instructor comments and revising, and instructors reading student work and responding.
Renewing the Collaboration between L1 and Multilingual Research
Joel Bloch
The Ohio State University, USA

1966, the year of the Dartmouth Seminar, was also notable for the publication of Robert Kaplan’s “doodles” article on second language writing, which for many has marked the beginning of research in second language writing. Kaplan combined two traditions - linguistic research on contrastive analysis (e.g. Charles Fries) and rhetorical theory on organization (e.g. Francis Christensen) – to examine the effect of culture on second language writing. Although today this article is seen as highly controversial and simplistic even by the author, it was the beginning of researching the second language writer as different from the first language writer. Although there has been overlap, since then L2 writing research has largely gone its own way, having its own journals and conferences while continuing to draw upon L1 research. The latter collaboration was the intent of The working party and study group on attitudes towards language, who called for the integration of language and composition research to arrive at a dialogue for “international collaboration” (Sublette, 1973). In his post seminar working paper, Albert Marckwardt (1968) discussed the growing diversity of college students as a motivation for this collaboration. Fishman (1968) and Sinclair (1968) likewise discussed the contributions of multilingualism in the school system. Their argument is even more true today. Today, multilingualism has spread into English-language university so that composition courses are no longer dominated by what the working group referred to as the “native speaker” model. Online teaching, especially MOOCs (Krause & Lowe, 2014), has resulted in university-based courses opening to participants from all over the world. Similarly, research and teaching has spread to all parts of the world, replacing the native speaker model with the multilingual or translilingual model (Canagarajah, 2011). Since Dartmouth, L2 researchers and teachers have created an agenda that sometimes overlaps the L1 agenda and sometimes goes in its own direction, featuring controversies over intercultural rhetoric, genre, teacher feedback and peer review, post process writing, and multilingualism. This paper argues that in the tradition of the 1966 Dartmouth seminar, a new call for integrating multilingual research with L1 research is necessary since as Marckwardt argued, it is important for English-teachers to listen to what these language teachers have to say.

Studying Writing Sociologically
Deborah Brandt
University of Wisconsin, USA

This paper explores how studying writing sociologically in the working lives of everyday Americans can expose fundamental changes in the basis and direction of mass literacy. As a dominant form of labor, writing is overtaking reading as the literacy skill of consequence, bringing with it a cultural and legal history, a set of dispositions, and a developmental arc that stand in contrast to reading-based literacy. The paper argues that as an educational and research community we must more fully incorporate these historical developments into the assumptions we make, the perspectives we take, and the questions we ask.
Situating the Dartmouth Conference for English Studies: Moments, Movers, Monument, Movement, Memory
John Brereton & Cinthia Gannett
UMass Boston, USA & Fairfield University, USA

The Anglo American Seminar on the Teaching of English at Dartmouth in 1966 is often described as “a milestone,” or “watershed” event. Thomas Miller calls it “a formative source for modern composition studies” (2011), and Joseph Harris notes that for many it “a Copernican shift” (1997), while Gold, Hobbs, and Berlin refer to it as “a revelation” (2012).

But what is the IT? As an event, the seminar was a sprawling, multi-day, multigenre event with fifty formal participants from the US, Canada, and the UK, a variety of consultants, keynote speakers, formal papers, eleven different working groups and their attendant reports, that resulted in two full monographs (Growth through English, John Dixon, and The Uses of English, Herbert J. Mueller). The Seminar spawned a host of other books, articles, and pamphlets (e.g. Douglas Barnes’ Drama in the Classroom, Albert H. Marckwardt’s, Language and Language Learning, Paul A. Olsen’s The Uses of Myth, James Squire’s Response to Literature, Geoffrey Summerfield’s Creativity on Writing.) Direct participants continued to give major talks and write about the conference and its complex legacy; many language arts professionals have attributed aspects of their pedagogical development to claims and conversations issuing from that conference.

The Dartmouth Conference has now entered mainstream histories of the development of modern composition-rhetoric history in simple and often reductive ways, even though composition-rhetoric scholars have regularly revisited both the moment and the significance what is now often termed “the Dartmouth Conference” historiographically, most notably by Joseph Harris in A Teaching Subject and his College English essay “After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict,” and the set of responses to him in “Symposium on ‘After Dartmouth:’ Growth and Conflict” by James Zebroski, Sharon Hamilton, and John S. Mayher.

Natural scientists’ translingual practices for writing scientific publication
Melanie Brinkschulte
University of Goettingen, Germany

German universities have recently begun to discuss how to integrate multilingualism as a resource in scientific writing. The approach of translingualism as a writer’s competence of using her available languages as a complex, unified system (Canagarajah 2013) offers new ways of understanding multilingual academic writing processes in international research teams. This presentation discusses findings from interviews conducted with scholars working in international research teams that were analysed through content analysis (Mayring 2010). The findings deliver insights into how scholars implement or consciously deny translingualism in their collaborative academic publication processes. In planning and revision phases, scholars actively use translingual writing strategies. Scholars hold different attitudes about the perceived benefits of translingual practices for writing drafts. This research offers implications for developing a translingual academic writing pedagogy for students learning writing for publications at university.

The Rhetorical Situation, Student Learning, and Transfer of Writing Knowledge from Basic Writing to Writing in the Disciplines
Melissa Bugdal
University of Connecticut, USA

This presentation reports on the results of a two-year longitudinal study at a large public university in the Northeast, USA to better understand if, and if so how, rhetorical key terms that students learn in a basic writing course transfer to later writing situations. In this study, I follow a cohort of six students from the conclusion of a summer basic writing course through their First-Year Composition experiences and into their initial writing-intensive courses across the disciplines. Through RAD research methodology and verbal data analysis of interviews with these student writers, I examine what each self-identifies as transferable skills and knowledge from their basic writing course to later writing situations in and beyond their majors.

Research on Responding to Student Writing: What Students Learn
Darsie Bowden
DePaul University, USA

Speaker will report on the results of a study about how First-Year Writing students responded to instructor comments on their papers. Special attention will be paid to processes at play between students’ receipt of comments on rough drafts and their completion of final drafts.

From Perception to Performance: Examining the Impact of a Writing Studio Program on Student Academic Performance and Retention
Polina Chemishanova
University of North Carolina at Pembroke, USA

This presentation discusses how the first-year writing program at a midsize regional university has fostered ongoing institutional and financial support for and emphasis on the teaching of writing. Specifically, the presentation examines how the PlusOne component of the first-year composition sequence has allowed us to reconceptualize approaches to student retention and success and foster ongoing support for writing instruction and pedagogy. It evaluates the impact that the PlusOne program has on students academic performance and persistence in an effort to identify high impact pedagogical practices that support the development of writing abilities.

Writing and Speaking and/as Inoculation
Josh Compton
Dartmouth College, USA

We are dissuaded from thinking of writing courses as one-shot inoculations against lifetimes of bad writing. But what if our writing courses are inoculating—not against bad writing, but against attitudes toward writing and learning to write? And what if the act of writing itself has inoculation properties—rhetorical effects that influence how students think about the specific issues and arguments about which they are writing and speaking?

My position is that our writing courses, and writing itself, are indeed inoculating. I draw on my work with inoculation theory to show how the conventional point-counterpoint
mode of invention leads to essays that can both persuade and confer resistance to future persuasion—inoculating both writers and readers. Experimental research can help us to identify and track these effects across time, giving us—and our students—a wider view of the potential effects of student writing on our student writers and their readers.

I further contend that professors can also inoculate their students—and that professors often do, intentionally or not. Raising and refuting challenges—the explanatory of inoculation theory—is embedded in many writing and speaking pedagogies, as we help our students to anticipate and work through the challenges of communication, from workshop discussions to one-on-one conferences to low-stakes writing and speaking to revisions. Besides serving as sound writing and speaking pedagogy, under certain—and even common—conditions, such instruction might also have inoculative effects. Experimental research could help to assess student responses to these preempted challenges of writing and speaking, identifying potential effects of inoculation on student self-efficacy, student attitudes toward writing and speaking, and student emotions.

Quite simply: In this presentation, I ask for another look at inoculation as an analogic in writing and speaking—taking a wider view of what it means to inoculate (and to write, and to speak), and proposing inoculation research as a way to identify and measure the inherent inoculative effects of writing and speaking. Writing and speaking courses can’t inoculate against lifetimes of bad writing and speaking, but they can—and often do—inoculate in other important, often unnoticed, ways.

Collaborating across Disciplines and Contexts: Reflections from the Civil Engineering Writing Project
Susan Conrad
Portland State University, USA

In this presentation I will reflect on methodological issues that have contributed to the success of – and the challenges in – the Civil Engineering Writing Project, a large-scale project to study writing and improve undergraduate writing instruction within civil engineering. Since 2009, with funding from the National Science Foundation, I have worked with engineering faculty at four universities and professional engineers in industry to investigate the writing done by civil engineering students and professionals; to develop teaching materials that integrate writing instruction into civil engineering classes; and to assess the effectiveness of the new materials. Our approach is mindfully eclectic, bringing together methodological features that are rarely combined in writing research. For example, our data include over 900 texts, which give us large-scale empirical evidence of the patterns in writing, yet we also conduct intensive interviews of engineering students and professionals to gain insight into individuals’ writing practices and beliefs. Our analyses make use of computer-assisted, quantitative analyses of linguistic features, allowing us to study far more writing than otherwise feasible, but we also evaluate writing effectiveness qualitatively and holistically. In addition, our research interpretations and teaching materials rely on the combined expertise of applied linguists, professional engineers in a business context, and academic engineers in a university context. With examples from the work, I will explain that no single data source, analytical technique, or disciplinary group could produce results of the same depth, breadth or applicability as the current project. At the same time, challenges abound not just for practical factors, such as time, but also in negotiating sometimes opposing epistemologies and values that characterize the different perspectives in the work.
Keeping Translingualism Critical
Lucas Corcoran
The Graduate Center, CUNY, USA

Freirean-inspired critical pedagogy left an indelible mark on the teaching of writing in U.S. colleges through the 1970s to the early 1990s. In its early formulations, it challenged writing teachers to discuss the relationship between literacies and ideologies with their students even in composition courses that institutions deemed “basic” or “remedial.” Despite its pioneering emphasis on ideology in the writing classroom, critical pedagogy often assumed a monolingual and mononational classroom, gave scant attention to monolingualistic and mononational ideologies, or passed over such questions in silence. This silence around questions regarding language and nationalism has often boxed critical pedagogy into positing binary models—the oppressor and the oppressed, the teacher and the student, false consciousness and reality—that make sense against the backdrop of consistent and relatively stable disparities of cultural, linguistic, and material capital contained within a monolingual and mononational framework.

These theoretical lacunae embedded in the late twentieth-century U.S. manifestations of Freire’s work, I hypothesize, have caused the term “critical pedagogy” and its close congener “critical literacy” to have fallen out of the purview of critical scholars working in composition/rhetoric and literacy studies. In this presentation, I seek to trace how scholars, who have abandoned the binaries of critical pedagogy in favor of critiquing asymmetrical power relationships and the complex discursive formation of subjectivities, largely have continued the “critical” work of critical pedagogy within the emergent field of transnational and translingual studies of composition, rhetoric, and literacies. I argue that transnational and translingual scholarship has formed a theoretical continuity with the basic tenets of Freire’s work—namely, (i) the irrevocable interconnection between power and literacy, and (ii) the need to make this interconnection visible to students through the processes of dialogic classroom practices—that situates transnationalism and translingualism as the new focal points for inquiry into the relationship between power, language, and literacy. The reality of translingual and transnational students in U.S. writing classrooms has once again made ideology’s place in the writing classroom prominent. This presentation seeks to promote and maintain the critical elements of transnationalism and translingualism, and to put these approaches in dialogue with earlier critical and dialogic approaches to the writing classroom.

Developing the ‘text-ethnographic’ approach to study academic writing for publication
Mary Jane Curry
University of Rochester, USA

In the past two decades, pressure has increased on multilingual scholars working outside of Anglophone contexts to publish in high-status English-medium journals. Research on the experiences of 50 scholars in four European contexts over 15 years documents that language and writing per se are often less salient to these scholars’ ability to publish in specific journals than are the social practices of academic writing and publishing (Curry & Lillis, 2004). These practices include scholars’ interactions with different kinds of ‘literacy brokers’ (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010) and participation in academic research networks (Curry & Lillis, 2010), as well as politics of publishing, including national and regional research investment levels (Curry & Lillis, 2014; Lillis &
Curry, 2013) and journal gatekeepers’ ideologies about the resources of English and academic writing (Lillis & Curry, 2015). This presentation explores the ‘text-ethnographic’ methodology we developed during this longitudinal research, starting with its grounding in the epistemological principles undergirding the project (What do we want to know and how can we find it out?). It takes account of the forces affecting scholars’ work lives (globalization of higher education, global competition for universities to be ‘world class’, the spread of English as a presumed academic lingua franca) and hones in on the affordances of the range of data collected (multiple drafts of texts, correspondence with journal gatekeepers and other literacy brokers, emails, individual and group interviews with scholars (face to face and over phone/SKYPE); policy and other documents, field notes, observational data, and photographs). The methodological choices represented by these components of ‘text-ethnography’ will be discussed in relation to our evolving understandings of the issues confronting multilingual scholars in the fast-changing landscape of their/our work lives.

**Decolonial Rhetorics and Sequoyan**
Ellen Cushman
*Northeastern University, USA*

Translation offers possibilities for understanding where difference is created and where knowledge systems can be valued equally. Perhaps because of its potential interpretive and methodological value, translation has drawn considerable interest in writing research and scholarship in recent years. Yet, as with most concepts and practices in disciplines, translation is not innocent but has been used to place othered people’s understandings in and on English speakers’ terms. How might the process of translation delink from its imperialist legacy to enact its decolonial potential? This question is particularly important when studying texts written in indigenous languages. In this talk, I’ll present decolonial translation as a methodology useful for understanding documents written in both Cherokee and English. I’ll offer an extended example of how this works to surface understandings critical to creating alternatives to the tenets of Western thought. I’ll end by suggesting implications for further research and scholarship using decolonial translation.

**Review of Current Studies of Student Text and Student Reflection at Dartmouth College**
Christiane Donahue
*Dartmouth College, USA*

This session will introduce several key writing research initiatives at Dartmouth College, and discuss their impact on faculty and on the research landscape. The initiatives include: a three-year textual analysis of first-year student writing across three required first-year courses; an in-progress portfolio study involving the same first-year courses but moving into sophomore year and pre-college experiences; Dartmouth’s participation in the national Citation Project; and surveys of first-year students using the Writing Program Administration’s questions about writing administered nationally via the National Survey of Student Engagement. The presentation will conclude with a brief description of future plans and directions.
Sensation and Writing: Action for Somatic Minded Writing Instruction
Summer Dickinson
Indiana University of PA, USA

There’s nothing quite like the sensation that accompanies an idea. ---Panagia

The position of spatiality and the affective nature of space has made, as of late, solid strides in writing pedagogy research. Writing teachers are asking questions, such as: How does the interconnectedness of materials and emotions affect writing? What role do states of discomfort, pleasure, or many other sensations have in writing pedagogy? More specific to my interest here, what qualities of sensational affect should be considered with writing pedagogy creation and implementation?

Feminist theorists have examined the bodily experience for some time and psychoanalytic theorists have explored the connection between sensation and aesthetics (Micciche 2014, 491-93); however, writing pedagogy has yet to determine sensation’s place. For this presentation, I explore how sensational affect can interplay with the writing process. Said explicitly, I will discuss sensation through theorist Panagia’s concepts regarding the term, position his ideas, and begin a discussion regarding its relevance to a writing pedagogy which gives consideration to the sensation in writing place. I argue the application of Panagia’s construct of sensation, a focus on the interaction of aesthetic qualities in environmental conditions, can encourage composition and writing instructors to highlight a student’s attention to physiological reactions, creations, and stimulus that often foreground the writing process by focusing on Panagia’s five qualities of sensation

Panagia’s qualities of sensation I discuss in this presentation call for instructors to be somatic minded in writing spaces and pedagogy but also suggest that the sensation being created by space, sensation interacting with emotion, and sensation guiding language play primary roles in the writing process. Sensational affect leads instructors be more sensation minded and reconsider how writing pedagogy may interact, include, or disengage these qualities.

Crow: Corpus & Repository of Writing
Bradley Dilger
Purdue University, USA

The CCCC “Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers” declares these writers “an integral part of writing courses and programs,” but ESL writing programs are often separated from writing program administration. Administrative initiatives can better meet the needs of diverse students through collaboration between writing programs and applied linguistics. Crow, the Corpus & Repository of Writing, brings together these stakeholders by creating a web-based platform for sharing student writing and associated teaching materials for corpus research and professional development.

Crow is inspired by two sources: recently developed student academic writing corpora (e.g., MICUSP and BAWE), which recognize the interest in and importance of this language use domain, and teaching materials archives (e.g. DRAW and Pedagogy Toolkit), designed to allow instructors to share and reuse their work. Our project integrates both approaches into a single system centered around writing produced by a diversity of students and instructors.
The main features of Crow include the development of an online interface where scholars can submit texts, and the pedagogical artifacts associated with them, including syllabi, assignment sheets, readings, and schema-building activities. These additional materials support corpus-based and qualitative research into the interactions between student writing, classroom practices, and curricular structures. In sum, Crow promotes research and mentoring consistent with Aull’s (2015) inquiry approach that combines “rhetorical and linguistic genre studies, pedagogical applications for first-year classrooms and implications for writing assessment and transfer research” (7). Additionally, rhetoric and composition and applied linguistics researchers and practitioners can share resources and experiences through Crow, enhancing each field’s data-driven research methods, pedagogical development, and mentoring experiences.

This poster shows key features of Crow and outlines our approach to sustainable development of this innovative collaborative research project.

“T’m not the same person”: Tracing laminated literate practices through times, places, and selves
Ryan Dippre
*University of Maine, USA*

Translation offers possibilities for understanding where difference is created and where knowledge systems can be valued equally. Perhaps because of its potential interpretive and methodological value, translation has drawn considerable interest in writing research and scholarship in recent years. Yet, as with most concepts and practices in disciplines, translation is not innocent but has been used to place othered people’s understandings in and on English speakers’ terms. How might the process of translation delink from its imperialist legacy to enact its decolonial potential? This question is particularly important when studying texts written in indigenous languages. In this talk, I’ll present decolonial translation as a methodology useful for understanding documents written in both Cherokee and English. I’ll offer an extended example of how this works to surface understandings critical to creating alternatives to the tenets of Western thought. I’ll end by suggesting implications for further research and scholarship using decolonial translation.

**Writing Studies 2016: A Crowd-Sourced Experiment in Demarcation**
Dylan Dryer
*University of Maine, USA*

As "College Writing: From the 1966 Dartmouth Seminar to Tomorrow" took shape during late 2015 and early 2016, the steering committee faced the challenge of organizing a internally coherent yet widely inclusive conference around this "parliament of disciplines" (Prior & Lunsford 2008). Who to invite? How to craft the CFP? How to organize the sessions? What did we mean by "method" and "methodology"? What were we missing, and more importantly, how would we even know? To help us pinpoint some of what we knew and didn’t know, several members of the Committee contributed to a google document (jocularly known as "the field in one table") where we tried out different ways of sorting out which methods were being applied to which kinds of problems, and more generally, how those problems were defined. This still-living
document will form one of several loci of activity during the Institute preceding the Conference; a poster-sized version of it will be prominently displayed during the working sessions and participants will be encouraged to contribute, revise, and even contest its categories. Consolidated versions will appear each morning. During the Conference, this paper will report on the key areas of consensus and tension in the revisions, explaining what these negotiations over category, typology, and rhetorical framing of the work done in different domains of Writing Studies can tell us about the past and future of the field.

**Escribiendo Juntos: A Study of a Biliterate Family Writing Project**  
Jessica Early  
*Arizona State University, USA*

This qualitative study examines an after-school biliterate family writing project, which took place at a K-8 elementary school in the southwest region of the United States. It details the ways teachers, parents, students, and family members worked alongside one another to co-construct a biliterate writing community. This is a study of curricular and teaching choices as well as an examination of student and family language choices and written responses to a family writing curriculum. Findings from this study contribute to the growing and much needed understanding of effective ways to build writing opportunities for students and their families to support and honor biliteracy and to practice, extend, and bridge school and home-based writing practices. This study documents a process of bi-directional transfer of information with potential benefits to both families and teachers.

**Internationalising the Home Student: Building Intercultural Communicative Competence and Perceptions through a First Year Composition Course**  
Johanna Einfalt  
*University of the Sunshine Coast, Australia*

This presentation will discuss the use of cooperative inquiry as a means for developing students’ intercultural competency in a regional Australian university. Despite there being general agreement that developing intercultural communication skills in university students is crucial for preparing these students to operate effectively within diverse contexts, it is less clear how this can be successfully promoted as part of the first year experience. To explore this issue, an intervention promoting intercultural competency skill development will be developed and assessed for impact. This intervention will be aligned with a compulsory first year composition course. A Participatory Action Research (PAR) theoretical approach has been selected to guide the development and assessment of this intervention, to enable negotiation, reflection and the potential for sustained change. The rationale for using such a collaborative and inclusive research approach to develop and assess the outcomes of this intervention will be highlighted as part of this presentation.
"One Professor at a Time: An Archipelagic Model of Learning to Write in the Disciplines"
William FitzGerald & Brynn Kairis
Rutgers University-Camden, USA

How do students enter an academic discourse community? In hopscotch fashion, from one course, assignment, and professor to another, building a composite picture (or failing to do so). This conclusion we draw from an IRB-approved research study in progress that examines how well students “give professors what they want” in the English major of a mid-size research university. The study began with a focus on the professed abilities of students to adjust their writing to expectations of specific instructors. Are students really so flexible? More significantly, what does this belief in the value of shape-shifting say about how students understand learning to write in a humanistic discipline like English?

We are analyzing results of a "triangulated," mixed methods study of "meeting expectations" in disciplinary writing through 30-minute recorded interviews with 10 majors and 6 tenure-track faculty on learning/teaching to write literary-critical essays. We’re also analyzing 23 papers collectively produced by/for interviewed study participants in 2015. (Each student wrote for at least two professors.) We want to know how students understand the task and actually write for Smith or Jones. We want to know how Smith or Jones understand and communicate their expectations. Based on preliminary results, we don’t see students’ vaunted flexibility students. Rather, we see students grappling with writing TO and BEYOND the audience of a single teacher and the degree to which their disciplinary formation depends on assembling instructor “islands” into an academic archipelago, a chain of such islands forming a great whole.

For Dartmouth, we address methodological and conceptual concerns informing this study with a focus on the need to develop a rich, integrated data set (i.e., students, instructors, and papers in a local context) and on bringing a range of analytical tools (e.g., stylistics, coding of interviews and essays) to bear upon this data. Our takeaway is the value of multi-perspectival approaches on writing phenomena to reveal what a single focus approach to assembling and analyzing data cannot. How do each of these data points support, extend, or complicate each other? Beyond this, through analyses of texts and interviews with both sets of subject participants, we identify factors that contribute to difficulties in disciplinary formation for apprentice writers.

Writing as Understanding
David Galbraith
University of Southampton, UK

This talk will begin by discussing the classical models of cognitive processes in writing developed by Hayes and Flower (1980) and Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987). It will argue that, although these models persist as touchstones of cognitively oriented research on writing, they need to be revised to take account of recent developments in cognitive science. This will focus on theories of knowledge representation, and distinguish between implicit and explicit representations of knowledge. It will propose an alternative dual-process model of writing, consisting of a dynamic interaction between implicit and explicit knowledge, and involving the constitution of the writer's understanding during writing. The talk will then describe two examples of research using different methods to test the model. The first example describes the results of a
study using keystroke logging to identify the processes involved in the development of writers’ understanding as a consequence of writing. It shows that this is related to two independent processes - implicitly organised spontaneous sentence production and explicitly organised construction of the global structure of the text - and suggests that conflicts between these two processes are the source of a fundamental conflict in writing. The second example describes the results of a study investigating the effects of removing visual feedback on the development of ideas during writing. It supports the distinction between the two different components of understanding, and suggests that visual feedback affects the explicit organising process but not the implicitly controlled sentence production process. The talk will conclude by discussing the broader implications of the model for theories of writing, suggesting that it cuts across the cognitive/social divide in writing research, and implies a need for research uniting the two perspectives.

Choose Your Tools Wisely: A Review of the Available Tools for the Rhetorical Analysis of Text, Talk, and Other Verbal Data
Cheryl Geisler
Simon Fraser University, Canada

Researchers working in the area of composition and rhetoric approach verbal data — texts, talk, and the myriad forms of online discourse — with a sophisticated understanding not just of what the language says but also of what it does. Traditionally, rhetorical analysis has relied on close analysis of a hand-full of texts, but when we are faced with the daunting task of extending our sophistication to deal with too many words, we look around for electronic tools that can help us manage our work. Increasingly we have turned to the software packages for qualitative data analysis (QDA), sometimes also known as CAQDAS – Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis, for support in coding verbal data. In this workshop, we will review the options available for QDA, and then take an in-depth look at the variations in how they support the analysis of language, in particular:
• the data workspace,
• the analytic procedure for segmenting/exerpting and coding,
• the code structure,
• data review & retrieval, and
• second coding and reliability.
This presentation will be useful for anyone trying to choose a software package for the analysis of verbal data or seeking to develop workarounds to better support sophisticated analysis.

Doing Visual Research In the Digital Age
Laurie Gries
University of Colorado, USA

In this 20 minute, multi-media presentation, Laurie Gries will discuss how empirical studies of visual rhetoric and circulation studies can be assisted by digital visualization techniques. Gries models how computational analysis can assist us in studying how images circulate and transform across media, form, and rhetorical function as they enter into various collective activities across the world. Gries argues for more experimentation with software development and data visualization in order to enhance our abilities to study visual rhetoric in the digital age.
"Content-Less Pandering": Collaborative Learning Mediated through Wikis
Charles Grimm
Georgia State University, USA

My presentation will discuss first the differences in how students approached the wiki space as creators (creating knowledge) and collaborators (working among an existing corpus). I hope that this microcosm will allow a reflection on a possible resolution in the debate Harris outlined among the British and American factions in 1966 between a student-centered pedagogy and an academic branch of research. After examining the specifics of my data, I will set the findings within the ongoing conversations surrounding composition’s preference for writing in online spaces and students’ reflections on the assignment in terms of viewing this online writing as an accessible style of academic/research writing.

Looking at the future of writing in higher education with a pair of glasses focused on disciplinary literacy expertise
Magnus Gustafsson
Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

This is a presentation not of a research project nor of a methodological approach, but an invitation to a sustained and more informed discussion about the affordances and situatedness of providing writing development in higher education in ways that are integrated with the acquisition of disciplinary expertise. In short, how do we best promote disciplinary literacy expertise given our respective contexts? We recognise these types of activities under different labels but the seminar maybe writing in the disciplines is the most immediately relevant one. For a European context, integrating content and language in higher education has long been an umbrella term for similar activities.

Drawing on sites in Europe, South Africa, and the US, I offer the beginnings of a description of the variation in this endeavor and the challenges of transferring our insights and observations between us in the writing studies community. I also attempt to outline and provide connections among the various frameworks that might be seen to inform disciplinary literacy expertise. These include, but are not limited to, Genre-based writing instruction; Academic Literacies; English for specific purposes (including academic purposes); threshold concepts framework; constructive alignment.

Was Dartmouth a Watershed?: what the archives can tell us
John Hardcastle
University College London, UK

At a time when teachers are constrained by national testing arrangements and a centrally mandated curriculum, there is fresh interest interest in the history of progressive English teaching. This paper reports on work on a growing archive of materials relating to Dartmouth and its legacy. My contention is that building the archive involves recovering important theoretical perspectives and a spirit of collaborative inquiry.
A decade ago, some of us became concerned about the way neo-liberalism was altering the educational landscape – new kinds of schools (academies), increased testing, league tables, new inspection regimes, constant political interference and so on. We were concerned, too, that the memory/history of progressive/radical state education was being deliberately effaced. Yet there was no existing account of the history of English we could settle on. So Peter Medway and I contacted surviving teachers and former pupils to discover what went on in schools between 1945-1965. We interviewed 84 teachers and pupils from three London schools that had a reputation for progressive English teaching. And we discovered that there was once extensive voluntary involvement of teachers in local working parties and research groups, often in partnership with the universities and progressive education authorities. In sum, teachers themselves played a leading role in curriculum change.

In the 1960s, Peter was a researcher with James Britton’s team working on the development of students’ writing abilities and writing across the curriculum. He worked with many of the British delegates and knew them personally. From interviews with those teachers who were also Dartmouth delegates (e.g. Rosen, Barnes and Dixon) it was obvious that the received story doesn’t pass muster. A sociologists’ fiction of two competing schools, Cambridge and London, representing respectively the claims of literature and language teaching, with London eventually winning out, ignores the depth and diversity of delegates’ viewpoints, their backgrounds and histories, their interests and motivations.

Was Dartmouth a watershed? One delegate, spoke of a ‘debacle’. Current archival research certainly reveals deep divisions and rivalries, but also shared principles forged in the first instance between the wars and then developed in the ethos of democracy, public service and social justice characteristic of the ‘welfare era’.

**Kitzhaber’s Methodological Legacy**
Emily Isaacs
*Montclair State University*

Albert Kitzhaber, in Themes, Theories and Therapy, inscribed within the emerging field of Composition/Rhetoric a research methodology experimented with by others but cemented with his work: a kind of hybrid social-scientific/humanistic methodology that melds data collection with classic humanistic argumentation. In contrast to Stephen Witte and colleagues from the University of Texas, Albert Kitzhaber’s research on the state of First-Year Composition the United States, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, is marked by strong, pointed positions held on the basis of what amounts to fairly limited support from his data. For example, on the basis of his examination of 95 schools, Kitzhaber declares that remedial writing will cease to be necessary. In contrast, Steven Witte and colleagues, writing in the 1980s, take a highly reportorial, non-argumentative approach, and from the vantage point of humanist eyes, seem overly reticent to use data to make arguments. Notably Witte and colleagues’ work was never published in journals or in book form, and Kitzhaber’s was.

In this presentation I will examine Kitzhaber’s foundational work in terms of its establishment of core methodologies that have been used repeatedly. Kitzhaber vacillates between social-scientific and humanistic methods, at one moment declaring his research to be representative of a range of types of institutions across the U.S., and in the next moment making broad claims for which little data is presented in support. I
will argue that as a field we present researchers with an unreasonable task— to be at once truly social scientific by being methodologically consistent, conservative and safe, and also truly humanistic by being rhetorically engaging, pointed in our arguments, and clear in our theses. I will suggest that these pressures to be both social scientific and humanistic is at once admirable and unreasonable, and I’ll argue for a new methodology that begins with close research and ends with a marked, announced move toward theorizing and arguing, and which acknowledges the extent to which one has moved beyond data. We want big arguments, and we should have them; however, we shouldn’t require that we use data to support these arguments.

Our presentation, based on archival and secondary literatures, calls on Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) as an historiographic approach. As Shaun Ramsey explains it (following Paul Prior) in the collection ReFraming Identities (2014), we derive a view of the Seminar that is “situated, distributed, and mediated” (177), involving “persons, artifacts (semiotic and material), institutions, practices, and communities” (Ramsey, 177) to consider the conference in context: its origins, sponsors, rationales, and structures, its participants, and the larger intellectual and educational scene in which it operated (related conferences, seminars, and other initiatives, such as NCTE, CCCC, NDEA, and NATE efforts), to examine the following questions about its legacy: What perspectives were brought to the Seminar and what formal areas of scholarship and pedagogy were identified? Of those, what topics or approaches were taken up across the language arts areas, and where did they find purchase? Were there other potentially relevant topics or issues not selected for formal consideration? What areas or issues received greater or lesser attention? In short, how did the specific legacy for Composition Studies (not English Studies) take shape both during and after the conference.

Writing at University: A Corpus for Studying Students’ Skills and Needs
Marie-Paule Jacques
Université Grenoble – Alpes, France

Writing research in France traditionally focused on the very beginning of the acquisition of writing skills (David & Morin, 2013; Leclaire-Halté & Rondelli, 2014; Plane, 2003). Numerous studies described and highlighted the difficulties encountered by young writers and one of the main challenges was designing teaching materials which facilitated this acquisition.

In the last decade a new interest has emerged, examining writing skills at higher levels of education (Delcambre & Lahanier-Reuter, 2012; Pollet, 2012). This new focus is due to increased awareness of the need to continue writing instruction even at university. French universities do not have writing centers as in the USA. Some degree programs in French universities propose writing courses, but they are usually restricted to students majoring in Literary studies or Linguistics, or to foreign students. Hence, the needs of undergraduate and even graduate students are still only partially understood.

For this reason, a few years ago our team began assembling a corpus of student writing (Jacques & Rinck, forthcoming) which we refer to as “Advanced Literacy” because it comprises writings from the first up to the fifth year of university. I will present in detail the principles we followed in order to make this corpus “searchable” with the help of the methods and tools of Corpus Linguistics. It includes different genres of texts, from several universities, written by students with different majors, in response to a variety of
writing instructions. Each file is provided with metadata so as to allow a selection of the
texts under different criteria, e.g. level, genre of text, etc. Each subpart of the corpus
contains at least ten texts, to ensure a sufficient number of occurrences of the
phenomena to be studied.

I will illustrate the kind of research which the corpus supports with an example: the
choice of verbs and their syntactic structure when citing someone else’s work. Students
often make mistakes either when choosing the verb or when inserting it in the sentence.
In the first case, they misunderstand or are not aware of the semantico-pragmatic value
of the verb (using for example prétendre – to claim – instead of dire – to say). In the
second case, they erroneously combine the verb with a preposition or omit the
preposition. The corpus search makes it possible to observe regularities and to assess
which constructions remain tricky for students, even in higher education.

Reimaging Our Understanding of WPA Work at Two-Year Colleges
Joe Janangelo
Loyola University Chicago, USA

In this presentation, I will share and reflect on findings from a study I conducted with
Professor Jeffrey Klausman who teaches English and directed the writing program at
Whatcom Community College. Together, we sought to record the experiences and
perceptions of faculty members who are doing writing program administration work,
and who hold the title WPA (writing program administrator), at North American two-
year colleges. By sharing and examining excerpts from our survey participants’
comments, this talk seeks to raise awareness of the challenges facing those who promote,
work toward, and participate in the development of two-year college writing programs.
Vangie Beal defines reimaging as “the process of removing all software on a computer
and reinstalling everything.” Beal argues that “a reimage is necessary if your operating
system becomes damaged or corrupted.” Based on our findings, I will suggest ways that
professional organizations such as the Council of Writing Program Administrators
(CWPA) would do well engage in an intellectual reimaging. That would help us see
beyond four-year school notions of coherent “writing programs” and designated,
pedigreed “writing program administrators” to better understand and value literacy
stewards and stewardship at two-year colleges.

Centering Experiences: Writing Center Practices and the Discursive Resources of
Social Class
Aimee Krall-Lanoue
Concordia University Chicago, USA

Individuals’ class backgrounds have profound implications for the ways they
understand themselves as learners and seek out important resources. This project uses a
survey of student use of the Writing Center at Concordia University Chicago, alongside
interviews, to understand the relationship between social class and student use of the
Writing Center
The effectiveness of web-based peer review is all about social presence
Djuddah Leijen
*University of Tartu, Estonia*

Web-based peer review is commonly used to support the writing process of students. This support aims to improve student’s reflection on writing and learning how to write. This talk will propose measuring different aspects of student’s interaction and in what ways these interactions influence the uptake of peer review in student’s revision. I propose a method to measure social interaction to better understand the impact successful or unsuccessful social interaction has on the writing process in a web-based peer review system.

**Coding Curriculum--Towards a Methodology**
Neal Lerner
*Northeastern University, USA*

The purpose of this session is to investigate methods for identifying how curriculum gets asserted in one-to-one tutorials occurring in a university writing center. My claim is that the field of writing studies has largely figured out pedagogy in the teaching of writing. In classrooms from K to college, the formation of “writing process pedagogy” has created stability and disciplinary content, as well as subject for theory and research over the last 35 years. What is far less developed, however, is our attention to curriculum, and this neglect ultimately hampers our effort to enact meaningful reform and to make a difference in larger conversations about education and literacy.

On the most basic level, the difference between curriculum and pedagogy is the difference between what is taught and how it is taught: between content and instruction. However, pedagogy isn’t just about how one teaches, and curriculum is not merely assigned texts and topics for reading and writing. Instead, curriculum is dynamic and socially constituted, the result of strategic choices in and outside of the classroom, influenced by textbook publishers, state legislators, school teachers and principals, college faculty and their committees. In short, pedagogy and curriculum are inter-related, and progress is not possible by being only attentive to one and not the other.

One particular space that is largely seen as pedagogical is the university writing center. Student writers come for instructional help with their writing, and tutors offer those pedagogical strategies to writers working in a wide range of content areas at multiple instructional levels. Nevertheless, I believe that writing center sessions contain assertions and demonstrations of curriculum. The challenge, however, is how best to identify those.

For this session, my interest in particular is how curriculum is asserted, negotiated, and, perhaps, transgressed in university writing center sessions. The methodological challenge, however, is how to code for curriculum in transcribed dialogue between students and tutors. What constitutes a unit of analysis? How is “hidden” curriculum revealed? Participants will establish a coding scheme, analyze several examples of tutorial dialogue, and work toward revealing the curricular elements that are present in likely all writing center sessions.
The Constraints and Affordance of ‘Good Writing’: What Student Editors Talk About When They Talk About Multimodal Writing
Dalyn Luedtke
Norwich University, USA

While there is significant research describing and theorizing the ways students and writing tutors talk about writing, there is little about the motivations, practices, and language of student editors. Recently, we developed an online writing journal now run by student editors. The goal of the journal began as an effort by two faculty members to showcase the writing coming out of freshman composition courses in order give freshmen, whose publishing opportunities are limited, some motivation beyond the grade, as well as provide models for faculty to use in class and as they design assignments.

As student editors became more active in the process, however, they decided to expand the scope of the journal to include any academic writing—including multimodal projects—produced in English courses at all levels. This presented many of the editors with their first experiences considering submissions like video and comic strips as writing. Based on discourse analysis of rubric creation, the editorial selection process, and faculty outreach to faculty, all of which are discussed during editorial sessions, this presentation will present some of the early findings from research that seeks to analyze how student editors, all of whom come from disciplines outside of English, define and assess multimodal projects within the framework of good, publishable writing. Specifically, this research focuses on three main questions: (1) How do student editors define “good writing”? (2) How do they apply characteristics of good writing to multimodal projects?, and (3) How do students communicate that information to outside parties—namely faculty?

The Role of Writing in Interdisciplinary Social Entrepreneurship Networks
Seán McCarthy
James Madison University, USA

This presentation discusses how two particular research approaches - actor network analysis and network analysis - help to map the interaction between students, writing, technologies, and spaces in undergraduate social entrepreneurship education. The case study described in the presentation involves a team-taught class with students from multiple disciplines who created attachments to drones that sought to detect and detonate land mines and assess riverbed ecologies.

Mixing Methods to Maximize Results: A Case for Using Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Practice-Based Research
Justine Neiderhiser
Ohio Northern University, USA

This presentation addresses the need for researchers to select methods that best align with the questions they explore. In presenting findings from a mixed-methods case study, I argue that research examining pedagogical practices is more powerful when it combines varying methodological approaches that capture participants’ beliefs and actions. In this study, which explored how feedback functioned in a required first-year
writing course, looking across data sets enabled me to develop a more complex understanding of instructor feedback and student response than prior studies which have tended to utilize exclusively qualitative or quantitative methods. For example, interviews with instructors revealed their goals for and beliefs about feedback, many of which aligned with the best practices recommended by composition scholars (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Sommers, 1982, 2013; Sprinkle, 2004; Straub, 1996, 2000). Contrasting those goals and beliefs against a corpus analysis of the written comments the instructors gave students revealed discrepancies that challenge whether and how the goals that instructors set for their feedback can be realized in written comments. Similarly, comparing this corpus analysis to data that emerged from interviews with students enrolled in these instructors’ courses revealed that in contrast to the emphasis that scholars place on commenting practices, students’ goals for and beliefs about writing and instructor feedback had a much greater impact on their responses to the comments they received. These findings emerged from exploring both qualitative and quantitative data and from considering the intersections between instructors’ and students’ experiences. Consequently, I argue that when composition researchers study pedagogical practices, it is necessary to mix methods in order to fully depict the complexity of the practices examined.

"As Close as Possible, As Free as Necessary": Translation and Writing Pedagogy between Constraint and Freedom, Intimacy and Strangeness
Monika Otter
Dartmouth College, USA

Translation has become controversial in language didactics: it is usa,ky discouraged nowadays in the study of modern languages, while it remains essential but much debated in Latin and Greek pedagogy. But translating from other languages has long been central to writing pedagogy, particularly in refining prose style and sensitizing students to nuances of meaning and expression. Historically, translating exercises come under the broad heading of acquiring "copia verborum," "wealth of words" but also "verbal mastery." Although some students may chafe under the regimen of close reading and meticulous recreation of a text, it is far from being uniformly confining and oppressive. Looking at the metaphors used in describing these pedagogies, I reflect on both the history and the present of translating-as-writing, and the freedom that can be found in constructive constraint.

Unsettling Histories: Language Ideologies and Nationalist Formation in North America
Jason Peters
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, USA

My presentation takes as its starting point Joshua Fishman’s paper from the 1966 Dartmouth Conference, “The Depth and Breadth of English in the United States.” Fishman challenged the apparently natural status of English in the United States by calling attention to the fact that “the usual histories of American education” ignore a long history of instruction in other languages in American schools. I unsettle those “usual histories” by reporting on a book-length study of early twentieth century cross-language relations in northeastern North America. The study contributes an historical dimension to conversations about transnational writing and literacies by showing that
one of the today’s metropolitan centers for English—New England, USA—has a complex linguistic history.

Research questions:
1. In what ways have language ideologies historically enabled and constrained transnational writing and literacy in North America?

2. How might contemporary theories of transnational writing and transnational literacy enable historians to re-contextualize the history of English in North America?

3. What alternate histories might be told through this re-contextualization?

Methodology
I theorize both historical research and archival collections as forms of rhetorical invention. Mixing rhetoric and the archive enables me to examine the contingency of historical processes and outcomes and to examine ideology, not only through the words and actions of individual historical agents but in the formation of the archive itself.

Data
I consult manuscripts in the National Archives of Québec (BAnQ); early twentieth century French and English newspapers; and dozens of handmade scrapbooks that make up the institutional archive of l’Union St.-Jean Baptiste. These materials document the activities of Québec nationalists, French-English bilinguals, and Anglo-Americans in New England and Québec.

Conclusion
Dartmouth 1966 connected scholars from England with those in the United States, reproducing the centuries-old transatlantic migration pattern of English as it originally spread to New England. Upon leaving New England this summer, I will travel to Québec City to continue work on this project at the BAnQ. Fifty years later, scholars are capable of representing a different set of linguistic migrations, settlements and cross-border relations, representations that have the capacity to displace the colonial constraints of English’s well-worn transatlantic passages.

Anglophone Writing Assessments: Contexts, Purposes, and Approaches
Les Perelman
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA

This presentation will consist of a comparative survey of some major Anglophone writing assessments. After briefly discussing the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the US Common Core writing assessments, the old SAT Writing Section and new SAT Essay, the GRE Essays, and the Australian ACT Scaling Test Essay in terms of context, purpose, form, and scoring methods, I will focus on a comparison of the two major tests of English for non-native speakers, the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) by the Educational Testing Service in the United States and the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) developed jointly by the British Council and the International Development Plan (IEP): Australia and administered by the Cambridge English Language Assessment.
Professional text production and the digital literacy shift: From focused writing to writing by-the-way
Daniel Perrin
Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

In cultural literacies investigated so far, the functions of writing as a distinctive mode of language use have developed and expanded from mnemotechnical to communicative and epistemic writing. Throughout this development, writing has become an increasingly focused activity: people decide to engage in writing with the intention of producing a text that helps them memorize, share, or elaborate their thoughts. With emerging digital media, however, this focused way of writing has been more and more interfered with a new, fragmentary, and incidental mode of language use we term “writing by-the-way” (Hicks & Perrin, 2014).

Is Assessment Research? If it isn’t Research, Then We Are Doing Something Very Wrong
Mya Poe
Northeastern University, USA

Recently, a colleague of mine submitted a manuscript on the topic of assessment to a leading writing research journal. The journal editor rejected the manuscript, which was one the subject on the ways that table leaders socially constructed writing in holistic scoring sessions, immediately on the grounds that the journal had recently published a special on writing assessment, so it didn’t need to cover that subject again for a while. The fact that a journal editor of leading empirical journal on writing did not view assessment scholarship as “research” speaks to the confusion that assessment researchers often face when submitting their work for publication. Writing assessment scholarship is simply often not viewed as research outside of administrative journals or assessment journals. In this talk, I address the various criticisms of writing assessment as not research and the implications of limiting assessment scholarship to practice or administrative bookkeeping (Erwin, 1991; Upcraft & Schuh, 2002). I go on to explain three ways that writing assessment scholarship can be more intelligible in the writing studies empirical tradition: (1) through the clearer articulation of writing assessment methodology (2) by linking writing assessment methodology to theories of writing and writing development and (3) by positioning results from writing assessment research within the larger empirical research tradition in writing studies. In doing so, my work extends an argument made by O’Neill, Schendel, & Huot (2002) that “by acknowledging that writing assessment is a form of social action because it results in real-world consequences for people and programs, we can promote our values and theories while limiting the costs of assessment to ourselves, our students, and our programs” (p. 13-14).

Growth through embodied semiotic practices: Laminating trajectories of writing, learning, and socialization / The units-of-analysis problem for writing research: Tracing laminated chronotopic trajectories of becoming a biologist
Paul Prior
University of Illinois, USA

The problem of appropriate units of analysis for writing research is not new (see Witte, 1992; Prior, 1998). However, in spite of decades of theoretical development, the dominant units of analysis continue to be taken-off-the-shelf ethnosocial typifications
(named entities on our culture’s maps of social formation and human action) rather than 
grounded theoretical conceptualizations. Challenging such narrow frameworks by 
integrating cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) and actor-network theory (ANT) 
approaches to understand learning/action as the mediated making of people, things and 
society across heterogeneous times, places, and activities (e.g., Hutchins, 1995; Prior, 
1998; Wertsch, 1991; Scollon, 2001; Roozen, 2009), I focus here on a case study of one 
biologist-in-the-making, a post-doc working, among other things, on the 
neuroendocrinology and behavioral display of social bonding in birds. Based on life-
history, semi-structured, and text-based interviews; observations; and a collection of 
texts that reach back to her elementary school years, the analysis traces how a laminated 
history of literate and semiotic engagements have come to form her ways of being-in-
the-world as a biologist. I argue that beyond the theoretical and methodological 
implications of flat (Latour, 2005), historical (Voloshinov, 1973) accounts of dialogic 
becoming, this perspective challenges dominant educational ways of modeling teaching 
and learning as linear trajectories of rational advance along identifiable and 
homogeneous paths, what I have called (Prior, 2016) tales of learning as opposed to 
laminated trajectories of becoming.

Writing Authority in the Disciplines: Literacy Practices and the Legitimization of 
Multilingual PhD Scholars
Shakil Rabbi
Pennsylvania State University, USA

How do the literacy practices of two multilingual writers enable their legitimization as 
scholarly authors? How might these literacy practices draw from their “array of capital,” 
which includes their bank of “multiliteracies,” “multilingual resources” and “the aspects 
of identity”? How might such literacy practices afford or constrain the negotiation of 
power differentials and hierarchies in their field, and what does it have to say about the 
monolingual or plurilingual basis of their respective fields? This study examines 
potential answers to these questions by looking at the literacy practices of multilingual 
graduate students at a large research university in the US using ethnographic methods 
to identify affordances and constraints of plurilingualism for new scholars. Based on a 
year-long study of two international graduate subjects during the last year of doctoral 
work, it situates disciplinarian and professional writings as social practices legitimizing 
them as members and scholars in their respective fields. Specifically, I develop an emic 
perspective on the literacies which make up the writing process of scholarly articles and 
research/fellowship grants. It combines academic literacy practices with plurilingualism 
viewing academic literacies as legitimization practices that are a priori ideological, 
situated, multimodal, and multilingual. Findings suggest social and cultural capital 
affect the academic literacy practices of international graduate writers. This study also 
shows that non-linguistic communicative practices, such as composing graphs and 
charts, lead to the reconsideration of written texts. These stories add to an 
understanding of the academic literacy practices of multilinguals in ways that build on 
the theoretical work of new literacy studies and translingualism.
Multilingual Writers’ Challenge to Research: Then, Now, and in the Future
Dudley Reynolds
Carnegie Mellon University Qatar

It is not just a coincidence that 2016 marks the 50th anniversary of both the Dartmouth Seminar and the TESOL International Association. In 1966, students who challenged traditional pedagogy were beginning to fill seats in English classrooms in the US and UK. They called into question the teaching profession’s understanding of language; they highlighted the need for different forms of instruction and instructional resources; they put a spotlight on the social and cognitive goals of education. Today, as in 1966, the demographics of English classrooms are changing as a result of new migration patterns, globalized educational suppliers, and technological affordances. Using the TESOL International Association’s “Research Agenda 2014” as a touchstone, this presentation takes an historical perspective on the challenges to research presented by the students who fill our classrooms. How has our response evolved over time? How must what we use research to effect change as we head into our next 50 years?

Growth through embodied semiotic practices: Laminating trajectories of writing, learning, and socialization / Relocating literate development: Mapping the laminated trajectories of an engineer-in-the-making
Kevin Roozen
University of Central Florida, USA

Writing Studies’ dominant accounts of writing, learning, and socialization locate literate development comfortably within the presumed temporal, spatial, and generic boundaries of an already-made social world. Using theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches that situate the ontogenesis of textual practice in histories of reuse across heterogeneous times, places, and representational media (Hutchins, 1995; Prior, 1998; Prior & Shipka, 2003; Scollon, 2001; Prior & Hengst, 2010; Wertsch, 1991, 1998), I focus on a case study examining the development of one undergraduate’s ability to act with tables and other inscriptions in ways valued by engineers. Based on three years of semi-structured and text-based interviews, ethnographic observations, and collection of texts and artifacts that reach back to her early childhood, the analysis traces the participant’s laminated history of acting with tables across a number of engagements, including scheduling daily activities, solving puzzles, inventing and arranging fan novels, and playing video games. In addition to illuminating the “laminated assemblage” (Prior & Schaffner, 2011) of textual activities that come to shape the participant’s use of tables as an engineer in-the-making, the analysis also makes visible the crucial role laminated trajectories play in the ongoing production of literate practices and identities.

The Ultimate Method Triangulation: Writer-Teacher-Researcher,
Christine Rosalia
Hunter College, USA

In this presentation I want to draw attention to (1) Teacher Education at the K-12 level for multilingual English language learners and through this context, show (2) how practicing the research methods from three fields (a) linguistic analysis from Second Language Acquisition, (b) rhetorical and genre analysis from Composition, and (c) video
analysis of writing conferences from Writing Center Theory revealed to how triangulation is needed to investigate the complex question of how writing instruction should work best.

The data I bring are from 50 teachers who performed the 3 analyses described above to focus on writing instruction for a sixth grade Spanish English language learner. Reminded of the research methods from each field, before being asked to do each kind of analysis, teachers also were given guided questions to support analysis. Finally teachers were asked to reflect on sequence of analysis (a-c) and if the triangulation of methods helped them to consider the quality of instruction for this learner with more insights and, as teacher-researchers, questions.

Preliminary qualitative analysis of teacher responses indicate that teachers appreciated linguistic analysis (this led a majority of them to prepare written feedback which addressed the most frequent error type), and writing conferences as means to test and inform written corrective feedback. However when describing rationales for feedback or critique of the writing conference, teachers rarely cited the developmental studies of language acquisition they had been reading for class, and they did not critique the prescriptive teaching given in the conference about how to write a memoir (this is important because the prescription went against the ways the model memoirs given to the six grader were written). Fewer still mentioned resources used to check their language or rhetorical knowledge. Pedagogical implications from this work point to the need to give novice teachers more support in analyzing (1) the texts their students read as models for the writing they expect their students to write, and (2) stages of second language development. If teachers are the “instruments” of writing instruction, I question how multiple methods of investigation might trigger their own teacher-research.

Writing as Orchestration
Catherine Schryer
Ryerson University, Canada

This presentation investigates the changing role of writing in professional communication. Specifically the presentation explores the role that writing played in enacting a local genre – a knowledge mobilization video instituted by the Canadian government to promote research. A class of professional communication students adopted/adapted this genre. This presentation analyses the roles that writing and genre played as students accomplished this project, the type of project that is now required in many professional organizations. In this case the students profited from a well-articulated model (genre) to follow as it provided them with a structure in which to innovate and improvise. Writing assumed two roles: organizational and creative. However, writing always appeared in concert with other visual and aural modes. This research supports the position that writing is not an isolated mode. The changing media landscape is creating new, more fluid multi-modal genres—writing is becoming one (admittedly one of the most important) of the modes orchestrated by these genres.
History as an imaginative methodology for researching writing in 'academic' contexts
Mary Scott
University College London, UK

In considering mobility and diversity in relation to 'academic literacies', Blommaert (in press) emphasises the importance of imagination on the part of writers and readers as researchers. Taking that as its starting point, this talk considers history as a research methodology in relation to three examples of writing, which are used to identify a tension between dominant norms of 'academic' writing in Education, including medical education, and the ways in which the examples might be read differently, i.e. imaginatively but within 'complexities of tension'(Law 1997). To that end this talk presents three readings, with separate but potentially interactive focuses:

1. Internalised histories in examples of how students referred to their own countries when instructed to do so in an essay. 2. Ideological histories in relation to academic writing about colonialism, with particular reference to the 'Rhodes must fall' campaign in the universities of Cape Town and Oxford. 3. A history in the form of a novel entitled "Embroidered Minds of the Morris Women". The women referred to are the wife of William Morris (1834-1896) and especially his epileptic daughter, Jenny. The novel is located in the nineteenth-century "National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic", and is exceptional in medical research in the UK, even in the developing field of 'critical medical humanities', in that it represents a collaboration of novelists, historians, artists, neurological scientists and practising medical doctors in a text in which the focus is not on medical treatment or medicine as a hard science but rather on an imaginative meaning-making in which 'findings' are approached as hypotheses. Currently this seems widely relevant to education in the UK where teaching is being separated from research and reduced to meeting government-driven norms.

Finally, this being the 50th anniversary of the Dartmouth Conference, this talk hopes to serve as a reminder of the values which Britton, Martin, Meek and Rosen presented at the conference and to students and colleagues in London.

Bridging Micro and Macro Perspectives Through Critical Discourse Analysis of Written Texts
Shawna Shapiro
Middlebury College, USA

In this interactive presentation, I offer a rationale and toolkit for using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to approach written texts. Discourse analysis allows researchers to examine linguistic and rhetorical patterns at both micro and macro levels of analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis focuses not only on describing these patterns, but on considering the implications of language use in texts. CDA therefore offers a means for considering questions such as:

- What identities does this text construct for the author(s) and the audience?
- Who is included or excluded by this text?
- What narratives and ideologies does this text perpetuate or contradict?
- How does this text reflect tensions inherent to the topic or community at hand?

While CDA has received some attention from Composition scholars in recent years—the most notable example being a review article by Huckin, Andrus, & Clary-Lemon (2012), much of this work focuses more heavily on why, rather than the how of CDA. Moreover, much of the theoretical literature does not address questions about validity.
and rigor of research employing CDA methodology. In this workshop, I will introduce key concepts from CDA work by Ruth Wodak, Norman Fairclough, James Paul Gee, and others, and outline principles and strategies for the systematic analysis of written texts. Our analytical “toolkit” (Gee, 2014) will allow us to evaluate the effect of a variety of syntactic and rhetorical patterns, and to link those patterns to theoretical constructs such as intertextuality, agency, mystification, and reification. We will practice applying this toolkit to a variety of texts, including an excerpt from a student’s autobiography, a CCC position statement, and an article from the Chronicle of Higher Education. Time will be set aside near the end of the workshop for participants to share ideas for how they might use CDA in their own scholarly endeavors.

**Using Integrationism, System D and Spontaneous Orders to Frame Economies of Language: Implications on Language Planning**

Makoni Sinfree

*Pennsylvania State University, USA*

In this presentation, Integrationism is applied to language policies and planning. I look at (i) the economic costs of either a selection of, or absence of, language policies in Africa and (ii) the compatibility of metaphors from economics, ‘spontaneous orders’, and System D with Integrationism. There is tension between the philosophical understanding of language in Integrationism, and the economics of language that undergirds language planning. For language planning based on economics of language to occur, language has to be reified and framed as a fixed system, detached from context, users, and content. This decontextualization assumes an idealized version of writing that is in conflict with Integrationism.

In an economics of language, distinctions between first and second order have to be retained, while in Integrationism these distinctions are removed. Viewed through an Integrationism lens, the notion of a lay person (central to the economics view) is not a useful tool, but an obstruction because the concept is disembodied and ahistorical. In Integrationism, specifically when applying this lens in Africa, we shift from lay person to local expertise.

After laying this groundwork, I discuss the compatibility of Integrationism and analytical metaphors from economics, ‘spontaneous orders’ and System D. Both Integrationism and System D place a premium on social experiences and draw attention to the importance of abandoning the distinctions between first and second orders. System D and Integrationism are particularly compatible because in both, individuals are construed as able to solve problems in an economy of predation to sustain a living in a fend-for-yourself economy. The notion of lay expertise is relevant to writing research because it recognizes the importance of experience as a basis for writing, and for the development of writing itself as a contextual practice integrated into social and economic experience.
Using Embedded Portfolios to Assess Student Progression in Writing in the Disciplines: A Four-Year Panel Study
Kathleen Skubikowski & Adela Langrock
Middlebury College, USA

A premise of the WID movement is that one enters intellectual communities by acquiring their discourse conventions, a process crucial to the undergraduate experience. Using a four-year, embedded-portfolio assessment funded by the Teagle Foundation and collaborating with the NECASL panel study of the class of 2010 (Harvard UP, 2016), we examined the connections between writing and intellectual community membership at three junctures in the careers of 36 Middlebury students, class of 2010: transitioning from high school, entering a major, and pursuing senior capstone work.

In the first year we asked, “Is there significant growth during students’ first semester in their writing-intensive FYS?” In years two through four we asked if growth continued, if progression showed plateauing or decline, and how students progressed as disciplinary writers. Some of these questions revisited, fifty years later, the Kitzhaber “Dartmouth Study” of 1963 (McGraw-Hill). Our goals in studying the class of 2010 were to understand how writing works to invite students into the discourse of intellectual communities; to establish a useful tool, the embedded writing portfolio, for faculty teaching development; and to create a faculty-centered climate of assessment.

Twenty-four faculty, representing diverse disciplines, developed a general writing rubric, disciplinary-specific rubrics, and a composite rubric combining general and disciplinary features. Faculty used the rubrics to score four years of writing (first-semester college essays, sophomore and junior samples, and senior projects), all embedded within student self-reported data from interviews, surveys, and course selection patterns to more fully understand what happens as students “progress” as writers. Writing scores were analyzed using repeated measure ANOVAs to discern patterns of change at the identified junctures. In the end, the study offered individual snapshots and discernible patterns in the 36 students’ progression as writers within Middlebury’s writing curriculum.

What’s Wrong with CHAT?
Clay Spinuzzi
University of Texas at Austin, USA

Over the last 20-plus years, cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) has provided a framework for research in writing studies, widely used in professional communication research (including field research in workplaces, classrooms, and other sites of writing). CHAT made inroads in the mid 1990s precisely because it offered an answer to a methodological problem. ~Twenty years later, the methodological problems that CHAT solved are no longer current, and CHAT’s own methodological problems are becoming more obvious. Can we adapt CHAT to address our current methodological problems in writing studies?
“Critical Hip Hop Rhetoric Pedagogy at an Historically Black University: A Pilot Study”
Shawanda Stewart
*Huston-Tillotson University, USA*

At Huston-Tillotson University (HT), an historically black university in central Texas, English colleagues are currently researching the effectiveness of a pilot freshman composition curriculum based on what we call Critical Hip Hop Rhetoric Pedagogies (CHHRPs). During my presentation, I will present a brief overview of CHHRP and discuss our methods for data gathering and analysis.

**An Ethnographic Investigation of Faculty Perspectives and Attitudes in Writing Instruction in Pakistan**
Brian Stone
*Huston-Tillotson University, USA*

In this talk, I will present the findings of ethnographic research that investigates faculty perceptions and attitudes toward writing and writing instruction carried out while conducting faculty development at the Art and Cultural Studies Workshop at the Indus Valley School for Art and Architecture in Karachi, Pakistan. In addition to investigation of the types of writing assignments art faculty give students and the theories that inform them, I will discuss translanguaging, faculty perceptions of global Englishes and the power structures that support them, as well as their thoughts on the influences of social media and the advance of communicative technology on student writing. Importantly, this talk will be situated in a history of writing in Pakistan, including political and cultural dynamics of written Urdu, calligraphy and artistic uses of Urdu in art, and the relationship between classroom practices and these rich traditions.

**Neuroplasticity-based cognitive and linguistic skills training improves reading and writing skills in college students**
Paula Tallal
*University of California San Diego, USA*

An evaluation of the effect of computer-based cognitive and linguistic training on college students’ reading and writing skills will be reported. The computer-based training (Fast ForWord®) strengthen students’ foundational cognitive skills (memory, attention span, processing speed, and sequencing) in the context of listening and higher level reading tasks. Twenty five college students (12 native English language; 13 English Second Language), who demonstrated poor writing skills, participated in the training group. The training group received eleven weeks of daily training during the spring college semester with the Fast ForWord Literacy® and upper levels of the Fast ForWord Reading® series (Levels 3–5). The comparison group (n=28) selected from the general college population at the same university did not receive training. All students took the Gates MacGinitie ReadingTest (GMRT) and the Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS) Written Expression Scale at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of the spring college semester. Results from this study showed that the training group made a statistically greater improvement from Time 1 to Time 2 in both their reading skills and their writing skills than the comparison group. The group who received Fast ForWord® training began with statistically lower writing skills before training, but exceeded the writing skills of the comparison group after training.
An Analysis of Similarities in Academic Writing
Teresa Thonney
Columbia Basin College, USA

I will share results from an analysis of 1000 scholarly articles. Across the 10 disciplines represented in the corpus, writers present themselves as trustworthy, competent, original, and cautious. Their writing is heavily signposted and frequently supplemented with visual elements. Awareness of these shared linguistic features is of value to first-year students learning how to write academic papers and to those of us who teach them.

Composition and Computation Converge at Dartmouth in 1966
Annette Vee
University of Pittsburgh, USA

In 1966, mere yards away from where 50 English teachers were meeting in Sanborn Hall, Dartmouth math professors John Kemeny and Thomas Kurtz were two years into an NSF-funded project to introduce computer programming to undergraduates. The Dartmouth computing initiative produced the novice-friendly BASIC computer language and the Dartmouth Time-Sharing System (DTSS), and together, BASIC and DTSS made expensive computational resources significantly more accessible to Dartmouth undergraduates and faculty; BASIC and DTSS later supported the accessibility of computers and programming across the US.

While it’s unclear if the computing and English initiatives were aware of each other, they emerged from the same moment. Both were supported by post-Sputnik funding and focused on communication in a politically dangerous world. They both proposed to answer basic questions about an emerging academic discipline that was under increasing pressure from government, business and society generally. At the same time, they idealistically argued that the process of writing in English or in BASIC could contribute to a student’s personal intellectual growth, their facility with logic and communication, and their ability to construct their own worlds through a form of language. Moreover, both initiatives implied that this personal growth and hands-on practice with language should be available to all students. Students who struggled with expression in English were a central concern for the English teachers at Dartmouth. And Kemeny and Kurtz imagined that all Dartmouth freshmen, including liberal arts students, could benefit from the kind of thinking that computer programming allowed them to do.

Using archival resources from Dartmouth libraries, NCTE, Carnegie Corp and the NSF, this presentation connects two seemingly disparate initiatives happening on the Dartmouth College campus in the mid-1960s through their funding streams, ideological underpinnings and results for teaching. I then bring these connections forward to contemporary rhetoric that links programming and writing education. I argue that while we consider a greater influence of multimodality on our composition pedagogy in the 21st century, contemplating our shared origins with BASIC programming in the 1960s can be illuminative to our continued project of teaching novice writers.
The Possibilities of Interactive Interviews for Composition and Literacy Research
Sara Webb-Sunderhaus
Indiana University - Purdue University, Fort Wayne, USA

This talk will address the benefits interactive interviewing and tellability offer to composition research. Interactive interviewing, a method most often used by communication scholars, gives us another approach for gathering data and facilitates the co-construction of knowledge with our participants. As a methodological framework, tellability—a concept drawn from folklore studies—is a lens for evaluating which narratives our participants find worth telling and for further assessing who can tell which narratives in what contests.

The Media Ecology Project: New Scholarship and New Value(s) in Media Historiography
Mark Williams
Dartmouth College, USA

The Media Ecology Project is building a dynamic environment where researchers digitally access archival moving image collections and contribute back to the archival and research communities through the fluid contribution of metadata and new scholarship. Our moving image heritage is at enormous risk. But essential "preservation" efforts will require a better sense of the historical value of these materials. New knowledge production is required, and this presentation will detail how MEP is working to produce cooperation and efficiency in relation to motivated engagement with academic communities.

In praise of the reductive
Joanna Wolfe
Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Critiques of empirical research often dismiss such research on the grounds that it is "reductive." In this presentation, I attempt to reclaim the word reductive on the basis that language itself is reductive. Just as language allows us to communicate by reducing a range of phenomena into single word, so does empirical research allow us to reduce large amounts of information (say pages of transcripts) into a few key quantities. To reject the reductive is to reject a central form of human cognition and expression. Instead of debating whether a given method is reductive or not, researchers should instead ask whether the circumstances warrant a given level of reduction and whether the researcher has applied principled methods to achieve this level. I introduce Google Maps as a metaphor for exploring methodological choices. Sometimes in planning a trip we will want a zoomed-in, street-level view that can help us visualize a given point in our route. However, at other times, we will want a zoomed-out view that can help us plan which route to take. Likewise, in our research we will at times want to closely examine a single case study, and at other times, we will want to find ways to compare large groups of writers. Neither "view" is inherently superior; together, they allow us to see our terrain in complementary ways.
Writing Resources Deployed by Multilingual International Students in the Disciplines
Xiaoqiong You
University of New Hampshire, USA

Our field has the tradition of employing “difference-as-deficit” model to treat the struggles and frustration experienced by the multilingual international students in the U.S. This study, however, takes the “difference-as-resource” model (Canagarajah, 2002) and explores the resources and strengths these students bring to their disciplinary classes, such as their multicultural and multilingual experiences, identities, values, and ideologies in academic and non-academic writing.

Based on readings in the field (e.g. Leki, 1995) and my own previous pilot study of a single student, I first developed a theoretical and analytical framework before this study. This “nesting” framework defines and categorizes student sources mainly as follows: personal/cultural resources, instructional resources, institutional resources, and personal traits. My goal was to use the data from this study to further refine these categories and develop a deeper understanding of the following questions: a. How do students recognize and utilize literacy resources in the business school; and b. How do their uses of diverse resources influence their learning in the discipline?

To that end, I have conducted a qualitative study in a business school at a northeast university. This study covers a series of case studies of six undergraduate multilingual international students in three different recitation sessions of an entry level class—Introduction to Business, complemented by questionnaires (about their language use and literacy experiences), student interviews, instructor interviews, field observations, artifact collection, and an examination of student writing samples. Data collection will end by the end of May 2016.

These methods are basic classical ethnographic methods widely used in social sciences and humanities. Though I had developed an analytical framework before data collection, I still performed a bit as an ethnographer since I was hoping to not only refine the terms of resources but also watch and see how students DEPLOY them. With the interesting findings from this study, this presentation will be engaging to both specialists and non-specialists. For instance, “peers,” as one of the resources, can be further categorized into eight groups according to their field-specific intelligence, writing instructions, emotional influence, and nationality.

Understanding, Validating, and Reporting Writing Processes in Summative and Formative Assessment
Mo Zhang
Educational Testing Service, USA

Keystroke logs (KL) record the mechanical and temporal characteristics of text production. In the writing research literature, there is an extensive and growing literature on the use of keystroke logs (KLs) for various purposes, with particular emphasis on the development of theory. To our best knowledge, however, research on writing processes in the context of educational assessment is quite sparse. As the literature suggests, information recorded and extracted from KLs can nonetheless provide rich evidence on one’s writing practice and proficiency. The value of evaluating composition processes in summative and formative assessment could be considerable,
including providing evidence for the validity of an assessment, improving test security, giving teachers and students diagnostic feedback to improve writing practice, and characterizing differences among subpopulations beyond the quality of the final product. In this presentation, we share our research and findings directed at the evaluation of writing processes for summative and formative assessment, gathering validity evidence of a writing assessment using KLS, and extracting meaningful information from writing processes to provide actionable feedback that can be used to improve teaching and learning.