Theses and Dissertations

8-2014

Transitioning to Writing about Writing: A Consideration of the Metawriting Teaching Approach at the University of Arkansas

Katie Michelle Smith
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Recommended Citation

Smith, Katie Michelle, "Transitioning to Writing about Writing: A Consideration of the Metawriting Teaching Approach at the University of Arkansas" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2197.
http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2197

Transitioning to Writing about Writing: A Consideration of the
Metawriting Teaching Approach at the University of Arkansas

Transitioning to Writing about Writing: A Consideration of the
Metawriting Teaching Approach at the University of Arkansas

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Arts in English

by

Katie M. Smith
Liberty University
Bachelor of Arts in English, 2012

August 2014
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council

_____
Dr. Elias Dominguez-Barajas
Thesis Director

_____   _____
Dr. David Jolliffe   Dr. Patrick Slattery
Committee Member   Committee Member

Abstract

This thesis uses case studies of six Teaching Assistants and Instructors to analyze the curricular and pedagogical shift from a writing-through-literature model to the Composition II course to a metawriting approach during the 2014 spring semester at the University of Arkansas. The administrative decision from the Program in Rhetoric and Composition to make this transition came in response to the 2007 article by Elizabeth Wardle and Douglas Downs in *College Composition and Communication* outlining a "Writing about Writing" approach to teaching composition.

Acknowledgements

      I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Elias Dominguez-Barajas for the numerous hours you spent reading and reviewing numerous drafts as well as helping me focus and fine-tune this project. Thank you for your patience, your thoroughness, and your invaluable advice. Thank you to Dr. David Jolliffe for your input on pedagogy and the perspective you have shared about the use of personal essays in Composition courses. Thank you also to Dr. Patrick Slattery for your guidance and advice on the administrative side of this endeavor.

      Finally, thank you to the TAs and Instructor who made this project possible. Thank you for giving me access to your classes, your course documents, and your perspectives on the Composition II course.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my past, present, and future students.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Literature Review

Introduction

The decision of the University of Arkansas' Program in Rhetoric and Composition to adopt a Writing about Writing (WaW) approach to teaching Composition II occurred in response to some of the same concerns raised by Downs and Wardle in the 2007 article that arguably acted as the catalyst for the acceptance of the approach, "Teaching about Writing: (Re)envisioning First-Year Composition as Introduction to Writing Studies." The writing-about-literature approach that the program previously implemented had the advantage of working with most of the instructors' area of expertise, but it had the overwhelming disadvantages of underemphasizing writing as an area of study and neglecting the kinds of writing that most students are likely to encounter beyond English and composition classes.

This thesis is concerned with both theory and practice and the ways in which one informs the other, or, more succinctly, with matters of praxis in the First-Year Composition classroom. Its aim is to explore the effects of time and instructor preparation (theoretical priming as well as prior teaching experience) involved in successfully implementing a WaW approach. Accordingly, this thesis explores the following questions: How did the exposure to the Downs and Wardle 2007 article more than a year prior to teaching the WaW class for one group and only weeks before for another group make a difference in the teaching assistants' (TAs) understanding and implementation of the approach? Since TAs are still developing their personal pedagogies, what effect does teaching two different approaches within a year have on that process? These and related questions have garnered little attention in the disciplinary literature, but since the graduate teaching forces at schools like the University of Arkansas comprise the majority of the English departments' contact with first-year student populations, they deserve

careful consideration. A large portion of this thesis is also devoted to analyzing the assignment prompts, and selected student essays responding to those prompts, in order to evaluate their effectiveness in accomplishing the goals of the course.

The case for the Writing about Writing approach, as outlined in Wardle and Downs' 2010 textbook, positions the curriculum in terms of its utility to students. According to the authors, WaW "engages students in a relevant subject," "engages students' own areas of expertise," and "helps students transfer what they learn" ("Preface for Instructors" v). This third goal, the ostensible purpose of First-Year Composition (FYC), engages the issue of whether students transfer the writing skills acquired in FYC to the writing situations they encounter in other contexts and academic disciplines beyond English. Downs and Wardle's 2007 article was the first publication to make the case for WaW on the basis of research that shows a lack of "a unified academic discourse" that characterizes all academic disciplines and further questions "what students can and do transfer from one context to another" (552). For years, FYC programs have assumed that the lessons in their classrooms about paragraph construction, thesis statements, diction, and syntax provided students with a guide to follow for the remainder of their collegiate and professional careers. One major problem with this approach is that it undermines writing studies' assertion that it is a field of academic inquiry, and thus continues to operate in line with the assumption that many outside of writing programs hold: that writing is, essentially, a basic skill that can be learned within the span of one semester. The other problem with this assumption is its denial that the many contexts in which students write often involve entirely distinct discourse communities, with values, goals, and audiences that differ from those in the FYC classroom, making transfer more of a coincidence than a guarantee. This latter problem is much more significant for students, but may be one that Composition Studies has

created for itself. It may be assumed that the FYC course is where students learn how to effectively communicate in various academic situations, but Downs and Wardle note that "asking teachers to teach 'academic writing' begs the question: *which* academic writing—what content, what genre, for what activity, context, and audience?" (556, emphasis in the original). In recognizing this "distant" or far-reaching transfer as improbable, Downs and Wardle propose an alternative approach that "seeks instead to improve students' understanding of writing, rhetoric, language, and literacy in a course that is topically oriented to reading and writing as scholarly inquiry and encouraging more realistic understanding of writing" (553). The metawriting approach, then, does not aim at teaching students specific conventions to transfer, but rather positions student authorial agency as the primary goal of first-year composition and solution to the problem of transfer.

The goals of a metawriting approach, which are concerned with students understanding writing as a contextually and rhetorically-situated social process and themselves as writers who are formed by those situations, seek to cultivate in students a greater sense of themselves as metadiscursively aware agents. In order to achieve the vision of self-directed transfer that Wardle suggests ("Mutt Genres"), students must be able to make conscious decisions about the kinds of writing that they need to engage in. These decisions comprise the bulk of the work of metawriting. For students to make rhetorically effective decisions requires awareness of language as malleable and constructed and of the self as actively responsible for linguistic choices. Therefore, rhetorical effectiveness when given options is the evidence of metadiscursive awareness. So if transfer is the central problem of FYC, and student authorial agency is the solution, then metadiscursive awareness is the method.

Agency is an invaluable part of this latter process because the typical writing instructor, English teaching assistant or lecturer, rarely possesses a useful amount of knowledge about writing in fields such as engineering, political science, or biology, and is therefore ill-equipped to teach students how to write in these disciplines' genres without the necessary context. Wardle also points out how most genres are only "stable for now" and are continually evolving, making context-evacuated instruction that much more ineffective ("Mutt Genres" 768). The issue of genres across academic disciplines brings up the much-discussed but rarely conclusively answered question of academic transfer. Wardle refers to cognitive psychology in an attempt to explain the difficulty of transfer from the FYC class to other courses within the university and beyond. She argues:

> If students are taught decontextualized skills or rigid formulas rather than general and flexible principles about writing, and if instructors in all classes do not explicitly discuss similarities between new and previous writing assignments, it stands to reason that students will not see similarities between disparate writing situations or will apply rigid writing rules inappropriately. ("Mutt Genres" 770)

Part of the problem with transfer is the lack of overt attention to it in the class, as evidenced by Wardle's discovery that FYC students did not perceive the composition class as a "boundary practice," but as system within itself. This perception is undoubtedly influenced by the presence of assignments such as a "position paper" or the "informative paper," which have almost no existence outside the FYC class ("Mutt Genres" 777). The advantage that the WaW class has over other forms of FYC is its overt attention to an assignment's usefulness. With nearly every reading and assignment, an instructor may ask students: "What is the purpose of you reading/writing this text?" In my experience, student responses, though belabored at first, eventually reveal pedagogical awareness in the form of "to help us understand how our literacy sponsors affect our literacy practices and assumptions" or "to get us to compare our acquisition

of literacy to others." Having students articulate for themselves the goals of assignments, especially as they relate to transfer, will make students more mindful of their participation in class and better equip them to notice commonalities between and across writing contexts they will encounter.

Background of WaW

While Downs and Wardle's 2007 proposal was the first to explicitly argue for an FYC course that introduces students to scholarship in the field of writing studies, the WaW approach builds on an existing line of thought in Composition Studies. In his 2005 *CCC* article "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century," Richard Fulkerson traces and compares three major categories of approaches to FYC: critical cultural studies, expressivism, and rhetorical approaches. The rhetorical approaches as outlined by Fulkerson "share an axiological commitment to judging writing by suitability to the context ('situation and audience'), including concern for classical issues of *pathos, ethos, and logos*" (671, emphasis in the original). In their posture, rhetorical approaches can be unremarkably traditional, but they may represent Composition Studies coming full circle: "Epistemologically, adherents of this view believe that values and decisions are reached through dialectic, but they do not take a radical antifoundational view. For example, rhetorical teachers would generally not be comfortable with the claim that 'all truth [reality] is a social construct'" (671). Rhetorical approaches to composition do not necessitate any distinct course content and can be used to address themes or genres. WaW approaches, in allowing for epistemological diversity depending on the teacher's personalization of the method, could incorporate hallmarks of critical cultural studies or expressivism. However, the orientation toward Writing about Writing that the University of Arkansas' program has

adopted concerns itself mostly with overt awareness of writing as both the form and the content

of the class, as opposed to emphasizing writing as a means for engaging in cultural critique or

self-discovery. This orientation, then, is primarily rhetorical because of its consistent emphasis

on writing as a context-dependent means for communicating effectively in a variety of situations.

Fulkerson divides the rhetorical approaches as he sees them into three emphases: "composition

as argumentation, genre-based composition, and composition as introduction to an academic

discourse community" (671). Nevertheless, it is possible for an FYC course to incorporate

aspects of all three emphases. For example, one standard assignment in the U of A's WaW

course ask students to investigate the genres of a particular discourse community, and two other

required assignments ask them to make arguments in the form of an literacy study and a literacy

critique.

Fulkerson's account of the genre-based approach to composition relies heavily on

speech-rhetoric scholarship, which generally accepts Carolyn Miller's argument that "a

rhetorical genre exists when common subject matter plus a common provocative exigence leads

to discourses manifesting 'a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members'" (qtd. in

Fulkerson 674). While the WaW curriculum that the U of A has adopted is not consistently

concerned with genres, one could implement an approach within Downs and Wardle's vision that

was genre-based. Fulkerson looks to Ken Hyland's article "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social

Response to Process," in which he argues that "genre pedagogies assume that writing instruction

will be more successful if students are aware of what target discourses look like" (675). The

challenge of a genre-based approach is in selecting *which* genres to focus on. Fulkerson notes:

> Outside of ESL contexts, genre-based composition is now likely to be found
> either in courses devoted to argument genres or in technical writing, where the
> idea of learning quite specific, even discipline-specific, writing genres has been
> entrenched and is largely without controversy. (676)

The advantage of a broader metawriting approach is that its concern with discursive analysis allows it to equip students to investigate the conventions of any genre and then participate in those genres as their situations require, a practice that in itself promotes the authorial agency as well as metadiscursive and metawriting awareness that WaW purports to target.

In 2003, Anis Bawarshi proposed a vision of FYC that looks remarkably similar to Downs and Wardle's, but places genre at the center of the course. He argues "that repeated social situations give rise to genres[1] (including the first-year writing syllabus) and that generic features guide the 'invention of the writer' in both senses of that phrase"; he goes on to conclude that in FYC courses "we should have students actually investigate and write about genres as the essence of the class" (Fulkerson 676). This vision of groups of students engaged in semester-long discourse analyses that are "in search of field-specific academic genres" (Fulkerson 676) relies on some of the important principles of WaW; Bawarshi says that his "students still write arguments, but these arguments are *about* writing, about the rhetorical choices writers make and how their genred positions of articulation organize and elicit these choices" (qtd. in Fulkerson 163). Here, we have the unity of Fulkerson's three emphases: the students are making *arguments* about *genres* found in specific *discursive communities*. This approach resembles the U of A's newly implemented curriculum if the final assignment were expanded to guide the entire course.

In his explanation of the discourse community approach to "procedural rhetorical" pedagogy, Fulkerson takes the conversation to David Bartholomae's foundational article "Inventing the University." Fulkerson notes:

> The discourse community approach assumes that most college writing responds to other texts, that it relies on close reading, that the student text will present an interpretive argument, that the preferred method of reasoning is citing textual

---

[1] In *Genre and the Invention of the Writer,* Bawarshi credits Carolyn Miller (1984) with the conception of genres "as typified rhetorical ways of acting in recurring situations" (7).

evidence for one's position, while also indicating an awareness of alternative positions, and that students must learn to take on vocabulary and some syntactic and organizational features of academic discourse[s]." (678)

One of Bartholomae's central claims (also affirmed by Patricia Bizell, Janice Lauer, Myra Kogen to name a few) is that FYC students are unfamiliar with academic discourses. This issue of speaking/writing within discourses that exclude them has become one of the major accepted issues in Composition Studies. Keeping in mind the message Bartholomae conveys in "Inventing the University," an analysis of students' attempts to assert authority in the WaW classroom is presented later in this thesis. Bartholomae's work and related scholarship concerned with rhetorical approaches to composition inform the recent codification of WaW, which contends that the study of discourses should be expanded beyond the academy to equip students to communicate in a wider variety of genres. However, here we have a tension between the genres we ask students to write in and the audiences we ask them to write for. The prompts for the standard assignments in the U of A WaW course ask students to write to imaginary audiences (a high school teacher, blog readers, or their classmates) in an attempt to expand their sense of audience so that the latter goes beyond their writing instructor. Modifying Flowers's distinction between "writer-based" and "reader-based prose," Bartholomae suggests that FYC students are aware of the privileged discourses of the academy, but are unable to approximate them convincingly because they must write from a position of authority that they do not in actuality inhabit (9). But the process of textually transforming that political and social relationship requires the years of study and writing that students invest in their academy trajectory—it cannot be the task of FYC alone. Bartholomae further argues that having students write from the position of "outsiders" (i.e. anyone other than the academic discourse community they find themselves in) ignores the "central problem of academic writing, where students must assume

the right of speaking to someone who knows [the subject matter] better than they do, a reader for whom the general commonplaces and the readily available utterances [...] are inadequate" (10). Getting students to see the need for familiarity with genres and conventions and to reach beyond the readily available utterances is another way of viewing the purpose of the FYC courses. As students are learning to approximate academic discourses (and in WaW, other discourses as well), the process remains just that—approximate. The metawriting approach that Downs and Wardle propose and the University of Arkansas has implemented certainly takes this into account. Through positioning the course as an introduction to metawriting, in which students cultivate agency through metadiscursive awareness, the problem of distant transfer is addressed by overtly setting the goal of getting students to think of writing as a practice that will continue beyond the immediate classroom and, indeed, beyond the academy itself.

Since most of the research considered here pertains to the implementation of WaW in the classroom, the scholarship referenced in the ensuing chapters is aimed at answering questions about TA development in conjunction with the implementation of that approach. Correspondingly, one major component of the data collected and analyzed is TA interviews about their personal pedagogies and first-hand classroom observations of their praxis. Tori Haring-Smith argues that exposing TAs to theoretical texts equips them to better understand their students, to "offer students truly different approaches to their writing problems," and to "engage in effective self-reflection and self-evaluation without a sense of despair" (35). Haring-Smith proposes a teaching-assistant training course similar to that of ENGL 5003 Composition Pedagogy at the U of A, and I compare some of her findings about the effects of this type of course with my own.

Similarly, in her book-length qualitative evaluation of the role of writing in the development of TAs' pedagogies, Sally Barr Ebest argues:

> Too many TAs exit their pedagogy seminar without fully developing an understanding of their writing or their teaching. For many of these students, composition studies remains a boring, blurry subdiscipline. Such results are not only a disservice to these future professors and their future students but also to composition studies, for our pedagogical theory and practice answer the calls for change in higher education. (5)

With these arguments' as the backdrop, the subsequent chapters attempt to discern the efficacy of the Composition Pedagogy class on the TAs' implementation of the WaW approach.

In the exchanges published in *CCC* between Downs and Wardle, Libby Miles, et al., and Barbara Bird, many of the critiques leveled against the WaW approach involve the position of the FYC course within a Writing Studies major in the academy, with Miles et al. proposing a "vertical curriculum." While I am not expressly concerned with this aspect of Downs and Wardle's proposal, some critiques are relevant. Miles et al. argue that it is unnecessary to "mir[e] all students in the specialized discourse of an advanced discipline (504). Bird makes a strong case for the difficulty of immersing FYC students in scholarly articles, but notes that this requires consistent scaffolding for students to be successful—a recommendation that the U of A's Program in Rhetoric and Composition made to TAs as well. Miles et al. also critique this metawriting approach for being too concerned with a single genre—that of the scholarly article. The approach's focus on academic writing in the form of scholarly articles will be explored as one of the challenges to implementing a metawriting approach in the Composition II course.

Methodology

The case study participants for this thesis were selected according to the length of their teaching experience in the University of Arkansas' English department, their differentiation from

each other, and their willingness to participate. The first year TAs, here referred to by the pseudonyms Susan and Lindsey, both taught Composition I in the fall semester and the WaW approach to Composition II in the spring. Lindsey is pursuing an M.A. in literature, and Susan is in the Ph.D. program, focusing in Composition and Rhetoric. However, Susan had not taken any graduate-level courses in Composition prior to attending the University of Arkansas. This was Lindsey's first year of teaching anywhere, but Susan had two years of experience teaching while she earned her M.A. from another, smaller public university. Lindsey earned her B.S. in business and worked outside of the academy for several years before returning to higher education. The second-year TAs, referred to as Courtney and Neli, are both pursuing doctoral degrees in literature. Courtney is working toward a secondary emphasis in Composition and Rhetoric. Neli is an international student, so her background outside the American education system presented another interesting variable. Both taught one semester of the writing-through-literature approach to Composition II in the spring of 2013. Courtney also taught one semester of Advanced Composition, which is focused on business and professional communication. The participants who have been in the department for longer than two years will be referred to as Lisa and John. Lisa earned an M.F.A. at the University of Arkansas before becoming an instructor and John worked in journalism for a number of years before pursuing his Ph.D. in Composition and Rhetoric. The disproportionate number of participants who are pursuing degrees or secondary emphasis in Composition and Rhetoric was unavoidable due to the reluctance of many TAs with literary analysis foci to participate. Further, TAs specializing in literary studies rarely teach FYC beyond their second year.

Since the WaW approach is still recent, very little scholarship exists with the aim of examining its practical implications in the classroom. This project helps to answer some of the

questions about what happens when new and experienced TAs are asked to adopt the WaW approach. Looking at more than simply the TAs implementation of curriculum, I rely on education theorist Roger Simon's definition of pedagogy as "referring to the integration in practice of particular curriculum content and design, classroom strategies and techniques, a time and space for the practice of those strategies and techniques, and evaluation purposes and methods" (371). This multifaceted conceptualization of pedagogy necessitates various forms of data to evaluate. A large portion of the data for this thesis involves the major writing assignment prompts and examples of student writing, as these present some of the primary discursive interactions of the course. I collected each TA's versions of the major assignment prompts: the literacy critique, literacy study, rhetorical analysis, and discourse analysis. In these texts, I looked for how the students are moving toward the goals of the course and what expectations or misunderstandings may be hindering that progress. In assignment prompts, I analyzed the degree to which TAs modified the template prompts and the reasons for those changes. I also evaluated how effective those alterations were in accomplishing the goals of the assignment and course. In the examples of student work, which I also collected for every assignment, I analyzed the genres that the students chose to participate in and the subjective positions that they wrote for themselves in those genres. The student writing samples were chosen as generally successful but not exceptional representations of student work. My analysis is aimed toward evaluating the pursuit of agency through metadiscursive awareness of rhetorical situations and conventions.

In the course syllabi, I examine policies that set up the political structure of the course and the authority TAs claimed for themselves as they wrote the policy portions of their syllabi. I compare these discursive authority structures to the enacted authority observed in the classroom. In her examination of student resistance to the FYC course and the negotiation of identities that

is involved in the approximation of various genres, Melanie Kill offers some insight into the politics of periods of classroom transition: "It is because of our reliance on relational stability that challenges to traditional relationships and divisions of power in the classroom provoke resistance in defense of the stability of all identities involved" (232). Kill presents the term "flexible subjectivities" as being crucial to negotiating change and generic adaptation. This thesis contributes to the research concerned with TAs' professional development by examining the identities performed in the WaW classroom. During class observations, I also looked for how the students engaged with the course, material, and TA, as well as how the course goals were pursued through in-class activities and discussion and how TAs prompted and facilitated student reading across the intended versus actual audience gap in the textbook.

In course schedules, I noted the readings that TAs incorporated and the pacing of assignments to look for personalization of the course and different emphases for the assignments. In the personal interviews, which were conducted after classes and later via email,[2] TAs answered questions about the rationale of their course documents, in-class activities, and the development of their personal pedagogy. Analysis of TAs' course decisions focus on the perceived benefits of the Composition Pedagogy course and the degree to which it has influenced their teaching and as well as their understanding of the reasons for the switch to a metawriting approach and perspectives on its successes and challenges.

TAs were interviewed a total of four times throughout the semester: once during the selection process, lasting approximately forty-five minutes, and then for approximately ten to fifteen minutes after each class observation. These interviews were conducted in-person either in the TA's office or in the classroom. Handwritten notes were transcribed from each interview.

---

[2] Sample questions from interviews are included in Appendix A.

Follow-up questions were asked as needed during the writing process and were posed via email. Each TA's class was observed three times, with the exception of Lisa's class, which was observed twice due to scheduling conflicts. These observations occurred at rough intervals during the approximate beginning, middle and end of the semester. During class observations, I sat in a rear corner and transcribed handwritten notes. Susan, Lindsay, Courtney, and John announced my presence to their classes, but Neli and Lisa did not. I did not participate in class, but my presence was noticed by various students.

The methods of collecting course documents and samples of student work, observing classes, and interviewing TAs were chosen with the goal of determining TAs' self-awareness as teachers and the difference that awareness makes in the classroom and in student writing. This thesis relies on a qualitative approach because of the relatively small total number of TAs teaching Composition II and because of its compatibility with in-depth and nuanced analysis. I wanted to let the specifics speak to the broader implications and to look carefully at what needs to be done for the WaW approach to successfully accomplish the goals of the course instead of collecting data that would paint with broad strokes.

Chapter Previews

The focus of the chapters that follow this introduction moves from TAs with the least experience teaching at the University of Arkansas to those with the most. Similarly, the middle chapters also progress chronologically through the Composition II assignments, with the added exception of interesting or unusual approaches to other assignments. Chapter two presents the case studies of Susan and Lindsey, first-year TAs at the University of Arkansas. Since Susan and Lindsey are the only TAs who did not teach the writing through literature approach that the

program previously employed, I focus on the role that the Composition Pedagogy course had in preparing them to implement the WaW approach. This chapter highlights the first-year TAs' modification of syllabi, course schedules, and analyzes student texts from the first major writing assignment, the Literacy Critique.

The Literacy Critique aims to move students toward self-awareness and, as Wardle and Downs phrase it, a "more realistic understanding" of writing by having them challenge and explore a construct about writing ("Teaching about Writing" 558). This "more realistic understanding" first entails that students unlearn—or recontexualize—many of their assumptions about writing, and thus engage in metawriting. Students need to acquire a different "narrative" about writing (558). False rules like "all good writing must include a thesis, clearly stated in the introduction" (558) and the necessary exclusion of the first-person pronoun must be dismantled because the students' old view of writing is not compatible with the broader, nuanced, contextualized view WaW aims to instill.

Chapter three profiles Courtney and Neli, the second-year TAs, by attending to the impact of two factors—the theoretical priming provided by Composition Pedagogy course and the experience of having taught the writing-through-literature approach during the previous spring semester—on the TAs' reception of the WaW approach. This chapter looks at the increased autonomy that second-year TAs are likely to exercise over their classes its effect on student writing. The student texts in this chapter are from the second major writing assignment: the Literacy Study. In this chapter, I investigate the degree to which the second major assignment moves students toward fuller conceptions of themselves as writers and writing as a discursive act.

The fourth chapter follows Lisa and John, who both have multiple years of teaching experience in the U of A's English Department. They both previously taught the writing-through-literature approach to Composition II as well as various other composition and literature courses, including WaW in the fall 2013 semester. However, they did not have the theoretical priming of the previous groups because their time in the Composition Pedagogy course predates the course's inclusion of the 2007 Downs and Wardle article. I analyze the effects of these two factors on their implementation of WaW.

The fifth chapter will focus on the incorporation of private genres—personal essays and autoethnographies—into the WaW course. Autobiographical and autoethnographical writing, by having students reflect and critique their own experiences, sets them up to accomplish the other goals of the WaW course: to examine generic conventions in discourse communities they hope to join. After acquiring some degree of agency by writing about subjects of which they are the experts, students are then in a better position to do more investigative and data-driven work that is still concerned with the trajectory of their lives and personal goals. This chapter will also present the idea of writing *around* writing and suggest that students may benefit more from reflecting on writing that they have done than writing about writing concepts.

The epilogue offers the overall conclusions of the study and the recommendations for how the University of Arkansas's approach to Writing about Writing could be improved. These recommendations focus on TA training and development as well as modifications to assignment prompts. and the extent to which the personal genres discussed in chapter five may be implemented in FYC courses.

Chapter 2: First-Year TAs: Lindsey and Susan

Introduction

At the University of Arkansas, all first-year TAs teach Composition I in the fall semester and Composition II in the spring. During the fall, they also take ENGL 5003 Composition Pedagogy, which is an introduction to major movements in the field of composition studies over the past century, with the majority of the emphasis on the past forty years. In this course, TAs have the opportunity to discuss the assignments and goals of Composition I. They reflect on personal teaching philosophies and the effectiveness of their strategies and assignments in the classroom and observe the classes of two fellow first-year TAs. As some first-years have no prior teaching experience, this course seeks to cultivate in the TAs self-awareness of themselves as teachers. This increased sense of self-awareness should produce an increased degree of authorial agency over the course documents and interactions with the curriculum. Pedagogical autonomy can be evidenced by TAs modifying and personalizing course documents and incorporating supplementary material as well as articulating their reasons for these decisions.

The following analysis of Susan and Lindsey's course documents and classroom interactions focuses on their exhibition of authorial agency and execution of general teaching practices. For TAs, exercising authorial agency is often the result of internalizing the goals of the composition course in general and the WaW approach in particular. Once this internalization has occurred, TAs are more likely to adjust the WaW methods to accomplish the same objectives. The goal of this chapter is to document the professional development of two first-year TAs in the University of Arkansas' Program in Composition as they teach the WaW approach for the first time during the spring semester of 2014. Through analyzing course documents and examples of student writing, observing classes, and interviewing TAs, I study how the Composition

Pedagogy course influences TAs' pedagogies and how the decisions they make about the course affect the WaW goal of increasing the authorial agency of first-year student writers by promoting their metadiscursive awareness.

One of the first-year case studies, Susan, had two semesters of teaching experience at another university where she completed her M.A. degree. The composition courses she taught at the other university were based on the modes approach. During the first semester of the FYC course at the other university, students wrote a narrative, a compare/contrast essay, an analysis, and a persuasive essay. During the second semester, the entire course was built on developing a 10–15 page research paper. Susan is a first-year doctoral student focusing on Rhetoric and Composition, who will have taken four courses in this field by the end of the spring 2014 semester. Given her academic interests, it is no surprise that Susan admits to agreeing with the WaW approach. But some of her early reflections revealed that she is concerned her students are only focused on their writing assignments and do not seem to care about the larger goals of the course. She said that "It's all about the big picture [in WaW], so if they don't get that, then it doesn't work." When asked about her personal teaching philosophy and goals, Susan answered that she "really want[s] them to connect to something, to find it valuable." She stated that she thinks the last assignment (the discourse analysis) is key to finding the course valuable because it is the most connected to their individual academic and career goals. The prevailing assumption for both students and teachers is that the composition course is valuable according to its perceived usefulness in helping students to attain goals located outside of the course itself. This assumption has been codified as the goal of transfer across the academy. Downs and Wardle have repeatedly critiqued this assumption for its suggestion that the FYC course's value has little to do with writing itself, thus undermining the disciplinary claims of Composition Studies

scholars. Having recently encountered Downs and Wardle's 2007 article, Susan picked up on this issue of the FYC course's value. But the absence of cognitive dissonance in her answer may be the result of the U of A's approach not attempting to renegotiate the value of the course for students. Locating the course's value in its utility to students may frustrate composition scholars, but it remains the primary reason why the course exists as a general education requirement. Further, WaW, by cultivating metadiscursive awareness in students, seeks to help them attain those writing-related goals through transfer, which is one of the main advantages of WaW over other approaches.

The other first-year case study, Lindsey, had no teaching experience prior to fall 2012. She is pursuing a Master of Arts degree in literature and has returned to the academy after several years in corporate business and as a stay-at-home mom. When asked about her personal pedagogical approach, Lindsey reported that she sees her primary goal as "help[ing] students to become better writers." This simple statement of the FYC objective is still compatible with the WaW approach, if "better" is defined as more rhetorically and metadiscursively aware than they were before. However, as Downs and Wardle warned, WaW may not actually lead to more elegant prose. From the beginning of the semester, Lindsey found the WaW approach more useful to the students than the writing-through-literature approach, but had less of an understanding than Susan about how the individual assignments and readings help students to become better writers. She described her exposure to Composition Studies as a "crash course" but says that the understanding she gained in Composition Pedagogy was "sufficient" for her to teach FYC. Nevertheless, Lindsey reported feeling lost and intimidated in the Composition Pedagogy course and wished that more of the instruction had focused on the pragmatics of

teaching such as lesson planning and helpful grammar reviews. With no prior teaching experience, these responsibilities were challenging and time-consuming during the first semester.

The Composition Pedagogy course, while offering a "crash course" in the research of the field, may not equip TAs with an in-depth understanding of the administrative decision to implement the WaW approach at the University of Arkansas. Revealing her familiarity with Downs and Wardle's 2007 article, Susan said that she "[didn't] really know" why this decision had been made, but referenced the approach's newness and the possibility of a step toward a writing studies major. Lindsey, on the other hand, reported that the WaW approach was implemented "as an attempt to make Comp. II more relevant to a larger number of freshman students." Both first-year TAs support the movement away from the literature-based model and are in favor of the WaW approach. However, if they had a greater understanding of the rationale and objectives of the approach, they may exhibit greater authorial agency and autonomy as teachers and be able to offer a clearer articulation of the course to students. Though they agree with the decision to adopt a WaW approach, Susan and Lindsey's remaining ambivalence stems from their relative discomfort with the material. It is no secret that most English graduate students are enrolled in the program because of their interest in literature, which dominates most of the courses they take during undergraduate studies. WaW requires that they approach the courses they teach from the position of a Writing Studies scholar, not as the literature analysts they enter graduate school as. Unfortunately, assenting to the value of WaW for students does not automatically alter the TAs' familiarity or comfort with the course.

In the WaW approach, connecting the abstract concepts from the composition studies articles to the students' own experiences is a central concern and necessity for the course's objectives. The students cannot make their own decisions about their writing situations unless

they understand themselves as agents who both possess personal exigencies and enact exigencies on behalf of their situated environments. The Downs and Wardle textbook (*Writing About Writing: A College Reader, 1st ed.*) provides guidance for making these connections through the inclusion of questions before and after the articles as well as the "Framing the Reading" sections. This connection is necessary for several reasons. Engaging in metawriting depends on the application and personalization of composition studies' concepts in their own situated positions. Further, students' unfamiliarity with the genre of scholarly articles in Composition Studies and their own position outside the original intended audience produces a gap across which they must read. This gap is helpfully minimized in the more narrative texts (such as Sherman Alexie's "The Joy of Reading and Writing: Superman and Me"). Nevertheless, the teacher must facilitate the connections between the narrative essays and the critical essays in the WaW book in order to help students apply the Composition Studies concepts to their literacy experiences and gain metadiscursive awareness as they move toward authorial agency.

To this end of establishing contextualized and personalized understanding of concepts, Lindsey and Susan both asked students to write in-class reflections about their experiences learning to read, an activity that nearly all TAs used to some extent. In a class meeting during the second unit, Lindsey modeled the application of Deborah Brandt's concept of literacy sponsors[3] to her own experiences learning to read as a child. After she modeled the application of the theoretical tool, several students chimed in with similar and contrasting experiences. Although the majority of her students simply mimicked her application to their own (similar) situations, such application is a crucial step to having students grasp the terms that give a foundation to the more critical inquiries that ideally will appear in their writing assignments. Students in the FYC

---

[3] From their assigned reading for that day: Brandt, Deborah "Literacy Sponsors." *Writing about Writing.* Eds. Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2011. Print.

course are rarely able to critique or further complicate the concepts and arguments offered in the WaW articles, a shortcoming that Wardle and Downs acknowledge in the "Preface for Instructors" (vii). If the WaW course operates as an *Introduction* to Writing Studies, then, as in any other introductory course, students are expected to become familiar with the concepts and discourse of the discipline; they may not be able to challenge and critique those concepts. However, as the course progresses and students become more familiar with the Writing Studies discourse, they should begin to interact more critically with the WaW concepts. To this end, TAs should lead students toward this critical engagement by leading discussion toward this goal and modeling when necessary.

Textual and Enacted Authority

To examine degrees of authorial agency, I compared Susan's and Lindsey's course syllabi with the performed authority positions in the classroom. As Mühlhäusler and Harré, as well as Bawarshi, argue, the syllabus as a genre provides a textured site where multiple subject positions are enacted in the FYC class. These scholars argue for the importance of pronouns in communicating subjectivities, activities, and demands. The tension in pronoun use in the syllabus is "between establishing solidarity with students and demarcating lines of authority" (Bawarshi 122). The use of first-person plural pronouns positions the students and teacher as co-members of a group pursuing mutually beneficial goals, whereas the use of the second-person pronoun invariably leads to syntactic constructions that are read as imperative (i.e. "You will" statements). Statements that erase both the student and the teacher as subjects and appear in the passive voice suggest the imposition of a universal or outside policy rather than the instructor's personal preference. In the sections of the syllabus that the TAs adapted (attendance policy,

assignment submission, classroom conduct, and homework policies) the ways in which the teacher and students are positioned are indicated by pronoun use. For instance, Susan's syllabus includes extensive details about what exactly is expected of students and how she, as the instructor, will respond to given situations. Susan's textual references to herself are unusually numerous in her policies: "For each absence after the ninth, I will deduct 5 points per day off your final grade" (Appendix E).

While Susan's syllabus relies heavily on personal authority, Lindsey's syllabus employs almost no first-person pronouns (Appendix D). Hers relies primarily on passive voice, which locates the authority outside of her persona as the teacher: "After five unexcused absences, your final grade will drop by five points." Although Lindsey is removed from the position of agency in this policy, the student reader remains grammatically present. Structuring course-specific policies in the passive voice is more standard for the genre, but it is still noteworthy for the power dynamic that it suggests. This construction displaces the authority over the attendance syllabus from the TA to the unnamed powers beyond her. The personal pronouns in Susan's course policies may suggest a higher degree authorial agency over the syllabus, or they may indicate a lack of rhetorical awareness since this construction also puts the TA in an oppositional relationship with the students instead of a cooperative one. The veiled authority that results from the absence of the first-person singular pronoun in Lindsey's text may be more effective in the classroom as it suggests the policies are less arbitrary. Indeed, as confirmed by direct classroom observation, Lindsey's classes were more focused on her and less interactive with each other than Susan's students, a dynamic that she reinforced by cold calling. Susan's enacted authority was, interestingly, much more casual, as she crowd-sourced the attendance question for the day and did not call out disengaged students. If a TA positions herself as the sole arbiter of policies

and then allows her teaching persona to become less formal over the course of the semester, she may have a harder time enforcing the policy over time. Of course it cannot be proven that the political structure of the class is caused by the grammatical constructions in course-policy statements; nevertheless, syllabi set the expectations and initial structure of a course and should be an accurate reflection of what students can expect.

During interviews, Susan and Lindsey revealed similar perspectives on classroom political structure, with both trying to avoid acting too overbearing or tolerant toward their students. However, the positions of relative authority that they wrote for themselves in their syllabi and the authority positions that they enacted in the classroom diverged, but not along the lines I expected. Susan discussed the connection between her doctoral focus in Composition and Rhetoric and the WaW course, stating that even if she had not read some of the textbook's articles before teaching WaW, her familiarity with Composition Studies prepared her to help her students interact with the research-intensive texts. This increased sense of self-efficacy contrasts sharply with Lindsey's perception that she has to work harder to "make sure [she's] not missing anything" before she explains the articles' arguments in class. Lindsey assumed that her background in business and literature positioned her at a disadvantage relative to the other first-year TAs. However, according to classroom observations, there was no significant difference in classroom performance, suggesting that Lindsey may have worked harder to prepare lessons and familiarize herself with the curriculum than Susan. Therefore, previous teaching experience for these first-year TAs did have noticeable effects, but not in the ways I expected for textual and enacted classroom political structures. Even though they had similar policies and visions of class authority structures, Susan assumed a more overt and direct authority position in her syllabus, but performed a more casual persona in the classroom by allowing some students to remain

disengaged and making a few jokes. In the syllabus, Lindsey adhered more closely to generic conventions of policies and rules and communicated more authority while teaching through cold calling and moving around the classroom, in spite of her lesser degree of self-efficacy about her teaching abilities during interviews. Lindsey points to her experience as a parent as contributing to her classroom management because she is used to occupying a position of authority. She also surmises that the greater age difference between her and her students is helpful as a first-year TA.

In deciding how to teach WaW, both Lindsey and Susan regularly incorporated outside videos to supplement textbook material and use in class activities. On one day, Susan had her class practice rhetorical analysis with a controversial Super Bowl commercial. Lindsey used relevant videos about education on Native American reservations and Malcolm X to provide visual support to the contrast presented in their literacy narratives, which had been assigned as homework. The supplemental materials that Lindsey incorporated helped her students to see the connections between literacy, culture, and identity and helped to complicate their understanding of literacy sponsors as being potentially less benevolent than their own parents likely were. Susan said she has found that using videos can help improve student engagement for in-class activities by incorporating more learning styles. Further, Susan's video activity allowed students to see how the skills they are acquiring in the course can be used to analyze and participate in public sociopolitical discourses.

For first-year TAs, negotiating authority in the FYC classroom is a complex task affected by a host of factors. In the WaW class, authority positions are particularly affected by the TA's familiarity with the content and objectives of the course, which may be the biggest barriers to their internalizations of the WaW approach and their performances of authorial agency.

The Literacy Critique: Prompt and Student Writing Excerpts

Modifying assignment prompts is one of the most accessible and beneficial ways for TAs to personalize the course and assume authorial agency. TAs alter the standard assignment prompt for three reasons: they don't fully understand it in its original form, they think its original form is inaccessible to students, or they expect students to be bored or uninterested, so they attempt to make the assignment more engaging. In discussing writing prompts, Bawarshi argues that "the prompt situates student writers within a genred site of action in which students acquire and negotiate desires, subjectivities, commitments, and regulations before they begin to write" (127). By modifying prompts, TAs are attempting to make these desires and subjectivities align more closely with those that the students are being asked to assume in class. My concern in analyzing the modified and standard writing prompts is to look at what subject positions students are asked to perform in these rhetorical situations. Referring to Bartholomae, I consider how much authority or authorial agency students are expected to enact. What positions are they supposed to take toward writing and literacy and their own experiences? What assumptions are they operating under or questioning?

The first major assignment in the recommended progression is the literacy critique. This assignment asks students to "take a construct or conception about writing and analyze it [themselves]" (Appendix C). I accurately predicted that first-year TAs would make only the most minor alterations to the assignments recommended by the Program in Composition. Except for adding information about a peer-review day involving rough drafts and a reminder of the late assignment policy, Lindsey and Susan made few content changes to the Literacy Critique prompt.[4] Their reluctance to alter the assignment prompts may be attributed to the newness of the course, and/or the fear of being reprimanded that Susan vocalized. The writing prompt is

---

[4] Originally titled "Considering Constructs about Writing" in *Writing about Writing* pp. 167-9.

perceived by first-year TAs to be authoritative. It becomes not simply a matrix for students to learn about and practice writing in, but a mandatory policy for the TAs to carry out, in spite of the label of "template prompt." This perception in turn limits the authorial agency of the TAs and suggests a lack of personalization and internalization of the prompt's goals: to move students toward a nuanced, navigable, and situated view of writing as a complex practice.

Susan expressed the desire to "be more creative with the prompts in the future," but said, "I feel like if I don't do what they tell us to do, I'm going to get in trouble." A lack of clarity about administrative oversight and fear of potential repercussions prevents Susan from exercising more authorial agency and autonomy as a teacher in spite of her additional teaching experience. Since the recommended assignments come from the Downs and Wardle textbook, their execution has been tested thoroughly according to the authors' appeal in the "Preface for Instructors" (vi) and includes an annotated example of student writing for several of the recommended assignments, the "Literacy Critique" included. Nevertheless, as I witnessed firsthand during the fall semester, these assignments certainly come with their own challenges and pitfalls. Students seem most uncomfortable with the socio-political positions they occupy in relation to their audiences and the kinds of nuanced conclusions the prompt expects them to draw about writing constructs. As will be discussed in reference to specific student examples, one of the main challenges for students in this first assignment is avoiding simple and absolute conclusions about writing constructs that do not move their thinking toward a more context-dependent, relative view. The difficulties they encounter in reading the scholarly articles in the WaW textbook likely transfer to difficulties in arriving at relative views of writing.

In analyzing the writing prompt, the content and form of the prompt will be considered, as form also contributes to the meaning of the assignment. In its *organization* section, the template prompt states:

> Take some time to plan what you will write and how you will write it. By now you should realize that texts take shape differently depending on their rhetorical situations and purposes. Think and talk with your classmates and me about those with whom you want to share your reflections and research, and what the most appropriate forms (genres) are for reaching that audience. Here are some possibilities:
> - Do you want to tell your high school teacher about your new understanding of "good writing"? If so, how could you best communicate with her? Via letter? If so, what are the characteristics of a formal letter?
> - Do you want to write a news article to share your findings with a broader audience? If so, for what media outlet? Who are the readers of that publication? What is their prior knowledge? What is their attention span? How do they expect sources to be used?

The suggestions of writing the assignment as a letter or a newspaper article (obviously unacademic genres) presents the advantage of allowing students explore the WaW concepts in a form that seems more accessible. They can explore the potentially disorienting concepts by testing them in light of their own literacy experiences by engaging in metawriting. However, many students are dismayed by this first assignment because they have internalized a false dichotomy between academic writing and personal writing that is concerned with their own experiences. For some students, writing about their own experiences seems risky to students. From the instructor's perspective, the literacy critique is not particularly a formal genre, but its position as the first major grade automatically categorizes it as academic for the FYC student.

The generic component of this first assignment requires students to make decisions about their writing. The student considers the options she has been presented with, textually in the prompt, and orally through class discussion. Then, she must decide which genre she can most successfully write in to achieve her desired grade. Forcing students to make decisions about their

writing in the WaW course is pedagogically useful for the pursuit of authorial agency. In considering the rhetorical situation of the course—themselves as authors, their TAs as actual audiences and whoever else as ideal audiences, and critiquing writing constructs as the subject matter—students make the generic decision about how they can communicate and fulfill the expectations of the prompt most successfully. Students who feel more comfortable with forms and content of academic discourses can use this assignment as an opportunity to move further into that community. Students who are less confident in their academic writing can address the WaW concepts they have been introduced to in a less formal genre, demonstrating their understanding of the course up to that point without being assessed on formal academic conventions. However, these generic options may create the potential for confusion because the options show how writing in the FYC course can be quite different from writing in most other contexts. The generic options of a letter to a former teacher or writing to fellow students present students with hypothetical rhetorical situations that differ from the real one they inhabit. Therefore, this prompt asks students to inhabit a subjectivity that is participating in two rhetorical situations at once—situations with different exigencies and audiences with contradicting values, assumptions, and authority positions. It may be possible that addressing these potentially conflicting expectations in class could help students navigate this tension; but this degree of meta-analysis may also be overwhelming so early in the semester. In order to write in the chosen genre, students must make rhetorical decisions that make the genres evident to their teachers. The writer is at once the student and the reporter/columnist, or the student and the alumna, or the student and the academic expert. The challenge for most students in navigating this situation is in staying consistent with their reasoning and tone. As Bartholomae argues, students learning to approximate academic discourse will sometimes shift in and out of the

subject positions required by academic genres. Occupying these subject positions requires students to "imagine and write from a position of privilege. They must, that is, see themselves within a privileged discourse, one that already includes and excludes groups of readers" (9). Imagining privilege is a task that requires students to exercise metadiscursive awareness in order to recognize their current un-privileged positions. To then occupy that imagined position of privilege demands authorial agency because of the discursive manipulation and decisions involved. The challenge for TAs in assignments with generic options is in deciding how to respond to the various genres students decide to write in.

To give students another generic option, Lindsey added "Academic Essay for a Scholarly Journal" to her bulleted list. In spite of this genre's obvious relevance to the project of introducing students to academic discourses, its position as the first assignment would seem to isolate all but the most advanced FYC students, who would need to feel comfortable approximating academic discourses prior to entering the Composition II course. Otherwise, FYC students are hardly prepared to answer the guiding questions: "For what academic audience are you writing? In other words, with what academic field is your audience concerned? What type of reader subscribes to it? How might your story appeal to them?" Though Lindsey's expectations for this genre are obviously adjusted for the FYC course, it might be expect that the task would isolate and intimidate most students, given their exclusion from academic discourse. Nevertheless, about a fifth of Lindsey's students opted to attempt this genre, suggesting either a lack of understanding of just how far outside that particular genre they are or an awareness that such a project, though difficult, would be the most beneficial learning experience. Lindsey reported privileging content over form in her evaluation of the first paper. She said she tried to evaluate all papers according to the same criteria—clarity, organization, and the quality of ideas

presented—instead of how well each was responding to the rhetorical situation that the student had created. However, this neglect of the rhetorical situations undermines the rhetorical nature of the WaW course and makes their decisions about their constructed situations seem arbitrary.

One student who chose to write in the scholarly essay genre addressed the idea that a text has one stable meaning. Through using what amounts to reader-response methods, she presented her interviewees with a Bible verse from the book of Proverbs and asked them to interpret it for her. She seems aware of many conventions of academic writing, but her attempts to mimic them fluctuate in style and content. After awkwardly quoting Wardle and Downs' introduction to the construct that a text could have a single and stable meaning regardless of audience, the student writes:

> Although I agree that some writing will have the same meaning to all readers, I must also say that I believe that there are times when writing will not always produce the same meaning. I find such a time when reading the Bible. Yes, the Bible is meant for people to grasp the meaning of what is written and to understand it and it is not intended to be difficult. But there are places in the Bible where people struggle more than others. At the end of this journal, I hope to have informed my readers of my opinion on this topic. From this, I propose that not all writing will have the same meaning to different readers. (Appendix F)

This student's qualified claim demonstrates her awareness of complexity's value in academic arguments. However, she then moves the discussion into a highly subjective space with the phrases "I believe" and "I find." These moves indicate her stepping back from that authoritative position that she started to occupy, but also suggest an attempt at authorial agency over her goals for the essay. Her use of the Bible as a text to challenge assumptions about textual stability is well placed, given the far-reaching social, cultural, political, and religious effects of interpreting biblical passages, even if her assumptions and tone shift in and out of successfully approximating academic discourse. Her sentence beginning "Yes," contains an unexplored assumption about the authorial nature of biblical texts, and the addressing of the reader indicates that she takes this

assumption to be a shared position of common knowledge for her audience as well. This student is, nevertheless, effectively using metacommentary to make clear her intentions and position and successfully applying the textbook's challenge to textual meaning in a situation that is relevant to her.

In the rest of the paper, this student deftly describes her interviewees, sets up her paper as an investigation of a "hypothesis" (her agreement with Wardle and Downs), and divides it up into sections using bold headings. In choosing the people to participate in her study, she demonstrates an understanding of relevant variables by choosing people with various degrees of biblical literacy. Though the student does not explicitly recognize this differentiation as contributing to the diverse interpretations she receives, she still successfully explores a WaW concept by applying it to her experiences in a way that moves toward fluency in academic writing conventions. In dividing her paper into sections labeled "*Abstract*," "*Introduction*," "*Research*," "*Discussion*," and "*Acknowledgements*," the student indicates an awareness of academic forms. Lindsey did not specifically address subheadings in class, but she did encourage students to pay attention to the form and structure of academic articles if they chose to write in that genre. Therefore, this student's inclusion of such a distinct formal convention indicates both an awareness of form and a commendable effort at exercising authorial agency.

In evaluating the first paper, Susan reported she was expecting to see students examining the construct carefully and thoughtfully and did not stake much of the grade on successfully navigating the chosen genre. One of her students' papers was written for the hypothetical audience of high school students, in the intended form of a formal letter. This student chose the topic of the ostensibly forbidden second-person pronoun as his topic. One of the challenges in this first assignment is getting students to arrive at a complicated and relative view of the writing

construct instead of converting to the opposite, equally simplified perspective: the second-person

pronoun is *always* effective and permissible. His introduction reads:

> Dear Professors,
> Examine the following two sentences. Close your eyes and imagine relaxing on the beach with sand in between your toes; how do you feel? Tourists normally feel stress free when they are relaxing on the beach. Which one sounds better? After surveying numerous students that attend University of Arkansas, I can assume that most students would agree with the first sentence. 95% of the University of Arkansas students that I surveyed said they thought the sentence involving "you" made them imagine being at the beach, while the sentence involving "tourists" sounded more like a fact. The one student out of the twenty students I asked said they thought the second sentence sounded more professional, making them pick that choice. Teachers throughout high school teach students to avoid using the term "you." My previous professors have informed students that using the word "you" is informal and unprofessional. I disagree with those professors because I think using the word "you" in essays make the writing more personal and relatable and broadens the audience.

This student's opening sentence places him in the position of the teacher with the command

"Examine." He is addressing the prompt by approximating a considerable degree of authority,

which is a crucial rhetorical move in academic writing. His reliance on quantitative evidence and

explicit disagreement with his "previous professors" demonstrates confidence in pursuing his

critique. He has successfully recontextualized the prompt's desire to critique a writing construct

as his own, but his general address to "Professors" and the references to both "high school

teachers" and "previous professors" make the boundary lines of his hypothetical audience

unclear. He demonstrates awareness that the formerly forbidden second-person pronoun can be

rhetorically effective, but stops short of recognizing its limits and potential confusion that it can

cause. The student's struggle to address his hypothetical audience is further demonstrated in the

lack of explicit addresses until the concluding paragraph. He refers to "teachers" as "they,"

undermining his argument and calling attention to the confusion caused by arguing for frequent

second-person pronouns in academic writing. This inconsistency suggests that the student is

cognitively struggling to grasp his own argument and the uncertain referents are indicative of the student's further struggle to occupy the subjectivity required by his genre, which results in multiple subjectivities as his proximity to his audiences fluctuates throughout the paper. This student, apparently unintentionally, provides evidence for the preferred conclusion for the WaW approach—that the use of second-person pronouns in academic writing should be employed carefully and sparingly. Helping students to arrive at nuanced and contextualized views of these writing constructs is the central struggle and tension of the first assignment. While a small proportion of FYC students may be hesitant to embrace the counter-intuitive thinking encouraged in the first unit, most seem eager to embrace a view that first appears to them wildly liberating and lacking the chastisement of the rules-based approach of high school English and even Composition I. However, as I learned during my first semester teaching WaW, students can easily misinterpret the rules' contextual dependence as the rules being entirely unnecessary oppression, stifling their voices for teachers' masochistic enjoyment. TAs who enjoy the outside-the-box (for students) thinking in the first few weeks run the risk of overselling these critiques as dismissals.

Susan's response to this paper focused on helping the student see where he was becoming repetitive and could have pulled in specific outside examples. Both Susan and Lindsey downplayed the importance of the students' chosen genre and audience. The emphasis on content that both TAs demonstrated toward evaluating this first assignment could be putting the goals of the assignment at odds with the goals of the course. The purpose of the literacy critique is to have students carefully analyze an assumption or rule they had adopted about writing. Two of the specific goals of the Composition II course are for students to "analyze rhetorical situations" and to "recognize the demands that particular audiences place on written communication" (Appendix

B). Although these goals are pursued more intently in the latter half of the course, TAs can help to prepare students to fully engage in these objectives and become more familiar with metawriting by making students aware of where their addressing of a specific (though imagined) audience is inconsistent.

Personal Pedagogies

Both Lindsey and Susan express the desire to deepen their awareness of, and to develop, their personal pedagogies and increase their repertoire of strategies for implementing that pedagogy. Both also expressed appreciation of the Composition Pedagogy course for providing a foundation of understanding of various approaches to composition. However, for Lindsey, who had no prior teaching experience, the pedagogy course's utility only became apparent after the end of the fall semester. She indicated feeling like she was frequently changing her approach to discussion and feedback based on the article she was reading for the pedagogy course. Lindsey also could not see the utility of understanding the different approaches until the spring semester. Although she thought that learning about the different pedagogies was interesting, Lindsey did not see how she was supposed to be using the awareness in her classes and was distracted by her unfamiliarity with concrete tasks like lesson planning. Her teaching philosophy written at the end of the fall semester focused on the practical aspects of teaching: detailed lesson plans, engaging students in class, and committing to her work as a teacher. She mentioned attempting to negotiate a space between current-traditional approaches to composition and process pedagogy— while eschewing the overt ideological goals of critical pedagogy—but this positioning lacked much specificity or nuance. In her analysis of pedagogical training for TAs, Sally Barr Ebest argues:

> When graduate students are introduced to pedagogical theory, the vast majority find themselves on unfamiliar ground. Paradoxically, graduate student may flounder in pedagogy workshops not because they are poor students, but because they have always excelled. Because they succeeded in every academic context, graduate students are generally unaware of how they were taught. As a result, they lack the sufficient background knowledge to easily comprehend pedagogical theory, and they find the teaching strategies they are supposed to practice alien. (43)

In order to overcome this disorienting exposure to pedagogy, Ebest recommends having students keep teaching journals and often write reflectively about the strategies and activities that they practice. This is generally the goal of the teaching portfolio assignments in the Composition Pedagogy seminar, but requiring first-year TAs to keep more reflections and then to discuss them in a small group setting may be even more effective at minimizing resistance and cultivating self-awareness.

In the spring semester, Lindsey viewed the mentoring group as the space where she can ask questions in a less intimidating environment and gain tangible strategies for implementing curriculum and guiding students. She thinks that a mentoring group in the fall semester would have helped her to feel less disoriented while teaching Composition I. She recognized that the new TAs with teaching experience seemed to adjust easily, but suggested TAs with no prior experience would benefit from a mentoring group in the fall semester as well as the spring. Aware of her relatively low-status position as a TA, Lindsey prefers to learn and discuss pedagogy and praxis in light of the external departmental goals for the composition course rather than her personal goals for the course and expressed a desire to receive more feedback and tips about teaching methods. The practical aspects of teaching are what often go undeveloped in higher education because few people teaching classes have actually received training as teachers.

With her previous teaching experience, Susan was more comfortable discussing the theories of teaching composition and did recognize their immediate usefulness. She seemed at

ease implementing the WaW approach but is generally open to trying other approaches as well. She says, "I think this is a good way to do it; I'm not sure it's the best way, but I get what it's trying to do and it makes sense to me." This optimism, more cautious than Lindsey's, likely results from Susan's experiential awareness that there are many approaches to teaching FYC courses.

In considering the transition from teaching Composition I in the fall to Composition II in the spring, Lindsey noted that one of her biggest challenges during the fall was how to teach grammatical conventions since her background was not in English, but business. In the spring, she has felt a tension between incorporating traditional writing skills instruction (i.e. paragraphing, word choice, etc.) and asking students to challenge the assumptions that this instruction usually creates. Because the articles contain so much information and the course is designed to challenge students not to blindly follow writing rules, Lindsey did not include any grammar or punctuation activities or lessons during the first half of the course. But then she started noticing that some students were still struggling with avoiding comma splices and understanding what a thesis or an essay map is supposed to do. In discussing these issues with her students she discovered that they wanted "the traditional lessons." Lindsey made a illuminating point in stating, "It's still a writing class. We still want them to leave as better writers. If we just teach the articles [i.e., topical content about writing rather than formal features of writing], we end up with the same kind of class as the lit-based [approach]." On one hand, Lindsey is right: if we neglect to reinforce what certain examples of good writing look and sound like and fail to connect the WaW concepts to the kinds of writing the students are doing, then they will likely leave the course with no more control over diction, syntax, and tone than they had when they arrived. However, the problem here is in the dichotomy that Lindsey sets up, in

spite of her apparent cognitive dissonance. In her training as a TA, Lindsey has misunderstood the goals of the WaW approach as excluding instruction on formal features. Lindsey, in scheduling two articles from the textbook per week, found that she had little class time left to discuss formal features and writing conventions. Further, with a background outside of the study of English, Lindsey felt intimidated by the prospect of offering instruction on formal features. What Lindsey failed to recognize was that although Downs and Wardle admit that WaW may not improve students' writing ("Teaching" 576), the U of A's Composition Program preserves improvement of formal features, including "clear organization, . . . awareness of writing conventions, and mastery of standard linguistic forms" (Appendix B) as part of the overall purpose of the course. Joshua Kutney has criticized Downs and Wardle's proposal for their claim that awareness of writing will transfer to improved writing performance. Relying on a study by Bruce Herzberg about the efficacy of a community service course, Kutney suggests that mere awareness about writing will not produce better writers (277). If the awareness that students gain through metawriting is limited to self-awareness of their deficiencies or rhetorical awareness of the influence of audience and context, then the WaW course may not solve the problem of academic transfer. Transfer depends on metadiscursive awareness of the distance between students' current writing and the writing expected in the discourses they want to participate in *and* an understanding of what is required to breach that distance. Students must also internalize the goal of transfer in order to pursue it actively.

Conclusion

For first-year TAs, the WaW approach to teaching composition can be challenging, especially if they have no prior experience with Composition Studies. As Downs and Wardle point out, WaW's assertion of Writing Studies disciplinary status demands that the instructors be knowledgeable about the content of the course. This means that the TAs have to be more than effective writers themselves; they need to possess a substantial degree of metadiscursive and rhetorical awareness about their own writing and they need to be familiar with the discourses and concepts of Writing Studies. Obviously, pragmatic concerns would prevent requiring all new TAs to have a background in Writing Studies, and the material in the Composition Pedagogy course does overlap with WaW articles, but increasing TAs' familiarity with the content of WaW prior to the start of the semester would likely help their perceived self-efficacy and comfort with the aims and means of the course. One of the major challenges of the metawriting pproach for first-year TAs is getting students to understand the usefulness of the course and its broad vision for diverse writing situations.

Chapter 3: Second-year TAs: Courtney and Neli

Introduction

The TAs who started teaching at the University of Arkansas in the fall of 2012 were the last group to teach under the writing-about-literature model and the first to be introduced to Downs and Wardle's proposal in the Composition Pedagogy course. My prediction was that this participation in both sides of the transition to WaW would result in some resistance but also a better understanding of the reasons for the transition than that of the first-years.

Like Susan, Courtney also began teaching composition at another university, making the spring of 2014 her sixth semester teaching. Courtney has also taken another graduate course focused on Rhetoric and Composition theory, especially issues of literacy development, giving her additional familiarity with scholars such as Deborah Brandt and Shirley Brice Heath. Courtney has incorporated some of the material and research she explored during the other seminar into her Composition II courses. She altered the first assignment (the literacy critique) by shortening the required length and requiring a rewrite at the end of the semester. She also switched the order of the second and third papers and edited all the prompts to make them shorter in hopes of allowing students to be included in the process of determining the rhetorical situations and specific expectations of each assignment.

Neli started in the fall of 2012 without previous experience teaching composition, however she had taught English and literature courses in her home country. She thinks that her students were more engaged with the material and discussions in the writing-about-literature model, but she agrees that the new approach is more "challenging" and "thought-provoking." Neli perceives that her students have difficulty transitioning from the readings to the writing assignments, possibly because they are no longer being asked to write *about* the readings in the

same ways they did in high school English assignments and Composition I. To help combat this challenge, Neli has students regularly engaging in the writing process in class so that she can provide them with assistance and opportunities for collaboration.

Courtney and Neli agree with the first-year TAs that the readings in the Wardle and Downs textbook present one of the most substantial challenges for FYC students because of their unfamiliarity with academic discourse in general and Writing Studies in particular. The book's "Framing the Reading" introductions to each of the articles acquaint students with the main ideas of the arguments, alert them to challenges they may encounter, and fill in missing context, providing support to help students overcome the audience gap across which they must read. Regardless, the transition from the essays in the *They Say, I Say* reader that is used in the Composition I course is a dramatic one. The difficulty here is not that students are incapable of understanding the articles; as far as academic writing goes, these articles are quite accessible. Rather, students often have little patience and will give up if they do not immediately understand the article. Further, if instructors do the heavy lifting of explaining the articles in class and no grade-altering accountability is implemented, students have little incentive to complete the reading assignments. Neli provided accountability to her students in the form of brief writing assignments about the reading homework at the beginning of class, but she still estimated that only about half of the students regularly completed the readings, so she compensated by explaining the articles in class as a preface to class discussion. Courtney used reading quizzes for accountability. The syllabus template provided by the Program in Rhetoric and Composition recommends that instructors provide priming and scaffolding for the articles before students are supposed to read them in order to alert students to what the main concerns of the text are and how they can expect to engage with it. While Neli started the semester implementing this

practice, it trailed off as the semester progressed, which communicated a lessening significance for the articles as a core component of the course. Remaining consistent with this method and continuing to provide post-reading accountability would likely have improved students' engagement and led to more productive discussions. The reasons why instructors fail to consistently equip students to complete the readings have to do with running out of time in class or not planning lessons far enough in advance to preview the next reading assignment.

Textual and Enacted Authority

With more teaching experience than the first-year TAs, Courtney and Neli have developed policies for their syllabi that they transfer from one course to another, in order to set the tone for the classroom environment they hope to cultivate. Neli's syllabus contains a section that many TAs omit or mention only briefly: *Classroom Conduct*. This section communicates to the student the authority structure of the course:

> In order to facilitate learning, we all must cultivate an environment of mutual respect. To engage in a discussion, raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you. While working in groups, please show courtesy and helpfulness to others and stay on task. I expect you to be on-task, focused, and focused on our classwork. (Appendix G)

The explicit instructions here regarding the student's role and the teacher's role in the classroom are indicative of a traditional hierarchical structure, but observing her class revealed that this structure was not enacted as the text presented it. Because students were not eager to participate and Neli often had to ask them to respond and contribute, the policy set up with the purpose of controlling and managing the class was practically abandoned in hope of encouraging more participation. Neli also frequently decenters the class by having students work together in groups on aspects of their papers.

In discussing the role of the teacher in the WaW course, Neli says, "I'm the one who brings the knowledge, who provides explanations, etc. They are waiting for me to give them something new." Neli positions herself as the content expert in the class, but having more experience with writing does not necessarily qualify her as an expert in *writing studies*. She vocalizes her support of the transition to WaW, noting that the metawriting approach is "more relevant and helpful to [the students]," but noted that she has to spend much more time preparing for class because explicating and discussing the Composition Studies articles is more demanding on the teacher than leading a discussion about a frequently anthologized short story or poem. Her lack of familiarity with writing studies is the underlying operative factor here. Courtney acknowledges that WaW sometimes seems less hierarchical because of the increased incorporation of students' perspectives and experiences in comparison to the writing-through-literature approach. However, she maintains that the challenge of the readings and the unfamiliarity of the assignments reinstates a traditional top-down authority structure. This articulation of the teacher needing to be the expert is one of the challenges of WaW that Downs and Wardle outlined in the "Teaching about Writing" article: "instructors must be knowledgeable about writing studies" (575). While this catch of the WaW approach has the advantage of dismantling the "cultural misconception that anyone can teach writing because there is nothing special to know about it" (474), this challenge prompts the questions: "How knowledgeable?" and "Does the Composition Pedagogy course sufficiently equip TAs who are studying literature or creative writing to teach a course about writing studies?" Obviously the University of Arkansas must offer many more sections of FYC than there are graduate students specializing in Rhetoric and Composition. Downs and Wardle envision this tension as facilitating a political change within the academy by establishing writing studies as a distinct discipline. Though the

political implications of an Introduction to Writing Studies course for the academy are not one of my primary concerns here, it does seem that the WaW approach demands more training for TAs than the Program in Rhetoric and Composition is currently providing. One possible option would be for the introduction to Composition Pedagogy to be condensed into a intensive course before the start of the fall semester, then to devote the semester to a more specific Writing Studies course with mentors for beginning teachers who could provide support for general tasks like lesson planning and more composition-specific tasks like holistic grading. Through a training program like this, TAs would have more familiarity with the conversations of Writing Studies scholars by the time they teach the WaW approach.

In class, Courtney employs a tactic that may be key for the WaW approach the U of A has adopted: framing and positioning the material and goals of the class by using metacommentary. This framing can range from a statement of the class's objectives ("today we will discuss Brandt's term 'literacy sponsor' and then apply it to our own literacy development") to the overall goals of the course ("applying this concept to your own experience is crucial for our class because you can't make your own decisions about writing if you don't understand these factors that determine what demands are on that writing") to stating the course's connections to the students' personal goals ("when you are looking for a job, recognizing the specifics of the rhetorical situation will help you to write the necessary materials"). This frequent framing may be useful in helping students to remember the broader goals of the course, minimizing resistance, and facilitating more personal investment from the students. Unlike the writing-through-literature approach, WaW relies on students' adoption of the goal of distant transfer in order to be effective. In order to exercise agency in other rhetorical situations, they must recognize the particulars of the rhetorical expectations in the composition class. While the incorporation of

lessons that discuss formal aspects of composition (such as paragraphing, organization, grammar, etc.) continues to occupy class time in the WaW course, these lessons are presented as less authoritative and dependent on rhetorical situations. Therefore, a discussion of appropriate paragraphing guidelines is more likely to occur within a discussion of the assignment at hand than as a decontextualized skill. With this situation, students may be less likely to realize the extent to which the technical lessons about writing *are* transferable and therefore need to be reminded of potential broad application.

The Literacy Study: Prompt and Student Writing Excerpts

While the Literacy Critique has students examining their own assumptions about writing, the second assignment—the Literacy Study—asks students to analyze the patterned ways they have acquired literacy and the factors affecting that process. This assignment is designed as a group paper to help students view their own experiences in light of others'. Writing the paper in collaboration with other students is an aspect of the assignment that Neli preserved and Courtney made optional. The summary of this prompt, as stated in the first paragraph is:

> Collaborate with your classmates on a formal research study of some theme that emerges when everyone's literacy experiences are compared. Use the following instructions to guide the writing of this kind of study, which lends itself to answering "bigger" questions or making larger points than a single literacy narrative does. (Appendix C)

The template prompt has the students answering the questions about literacy in groups and then writing the paper as a team of two. After introducing the prompt to their classes, Neli expressed discomfort with the idea of a group paper because of the questions it creates about calculating grades and monitoring students' individual investments. Courtney justified it to her classes on the basis of its utility in light of the frequency of collaborative writing in business and

professional settings. Her defense assumed student resistance before any comments or questions were shared, indicating her own uncertainty about how collaborative writing actually works in the FYC course. Indeed, many students are anxious or uncomfortable participating in collaborative writing and given the choice, most students in Courtney's classes opted to collaborate on ideas (as presented in Stage 1 of the prompt) but write the papers individually. Students exhibit this reluctance to write collaboratively for two reasons: because of the risk associated with allowing someone else's work to affect their grades and because they have internalized the *expressivist* assumption of an individual, inspired author. Discussing this latter problematic assumption in the "Collaborative Pedagogy" chapter of the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick *Guide to Composition Pedagogies*, Rebecca Moore Howard notes, "the figure of the solitary, autonomous genius who produces original works is associated with the Romantic literary theory of Wordsworth and Emerson [...] these precepts continue to exert a strong hold on our culture's perceptions of writing" (55). Moore Howard argues that "the collaborative writing assignment, in which students work together from start to finish, producing a single paper from the group [...] can enhance students' experience of writing classes" (55). But perhaps more importantly, it can be effective practice for many real-world writing situations. It is important to note the theoretical assumptions implicit in collaborative pedagogy. Moore Howard traces collaborative pedagogy's "roots to the social constructivist philosophy of Richard Rorty," for whom knowledge is not something to be "discovered by the persistent, gifted learner; rather, it is a socially justified belief, constructed in the community and acquired in interaction with that community" (56). This theoretical underpinning coincides nicely with the goals of this assignment. They are not tasked with discovering any objective factors of literacy development

or making broad sweeping claims; they are simply attempting to better understand the complexity of factors and processes involved in acquiring literacy.

One tangible way of minimizing students' resistance to collaborative work is to allow students to conduct parts of the process in class (avoiding scheduling difficulties), to voice their concerns to the teacher and each other, and to participate in deciding how groups will be configured and how grades will be calculated. Courtney employed all of these strategies and added the collaborative construction of a grading rubric for the finished paper. Allowing students to participate in these aspects of the group assignment can help to disarm any reservations they may hold as a result of negative group experiences in the past. Involving students in these decisions is also crucial, according to Moore Howard, for committing to collaboration. If students feel as though they are participating in a project and abiding by policies that they helped to create, then they are less likely to perceive the assignment as being unfair. Moore Howard also offers many recommendations for teachers implementing collaborative writing assignments, including waiting until "a substantial portion of the term has elapsed" until beginning collaborative writing and making sure that "the collaborative writing assignment [...] is best accomplished by a group rather than an individual; otherwise, the task is artificial, leading to students' frustration and irritation" (62). With regard to the first guideline, the literacy study is better accomplished by multiple writers because it requires synthesis—"tasks that demand that divergent perspectives be brought together into a solution acceptable to the whole group or an outside group" (Lunsford and Ede qtd. in Moore Howard 63). The prompt requires that students "look for common themes, recurring trends, or unique experiences and determine which of these might be the most interesting to further research and write about," the process of finding a research focus must be dialogic in order for students to see exactly how their experiences align

with or differ from those of other students. The degree to which the writing itself needs to be collaborative in order to best fulfill the goals of the course and assignment will be discussed in the next section by analyzing specific examples of student work. Using Bawarshi's definition of "double agency," through which writers act on behalf of both their individual desires and the collective desires of a group, the analysis demonstrates how students move toward authorial agency while participating in collaborative writing, during which they must inevitably focus on collective agency. A literacy study from Neli's class will be compared to one written by a single student in Courtney's class, in order to determine the effects of requiring collaboration at the drafting stage on the cultivation of metalinguistic awareness and the pursuit of agency.

Another challenge that students encounter in combining narration and analysis to collaboratively discover meaningful observations regarding their ongoing literacy experiences involves gaining the distanced perspective necessary to write about their own experiences.[5] This point should be added to Downs and Wardle's explanation of one of the key challenges of implementing WaW: "students will produce imperfect work" ("Teaching about Writing" 575). Downs and Wardle locate most of the reasons for this challenge outside of the students: "students' research plans, library research, primary methods, and results are limited because of short time, lack of funding, and inexperience" (575). We could also add to this list unfamiliarity with the genres of the assignments and inexperience critically engaging with concepts in order to gain a different understanding of themselves as writers and readers. Downs and Wardle argue that "accepting imperfect work recognizes important truths about all researched writing: it takes a long time, is inevitably imperfect, and requires extensive revision" (575). My concern with this

---

[5] Though some students choose to write about aspects of literacy that do not directly affect them, (e.g., emergent literacy; adult illiteracy) most choose to focus the study on literacy matters that concern them.

assignment is that the examples of imperfect work may be built upon the central flaw of failing to engage in analysis or to go beyond a claim that is too obvious to result in any progress in students' understanding of writing and literacy, such as "children whose parents read to them typically become stronger readers."

Like the first assignment, the literacy study also asks students to determine their own audience and genre for the paper. They are encouraged to ask themselves: "Who should be the audience for what you write? How can you best reach them?" (Appendix C). Since the responses to these questions are merely supposed to be discussed and not written, students are unlikely to come up with anything more specific than "people who have had different or the same literacy experiences that we have." The next guiding bullet point reads: "How would you like to write about your findings? In a somewhat formal, scholarly way? In a more storytelling, narrative way?" Most students, feeling excluded from the university's discourse communities, will opt for the less formal, more narrative style because they perceive that it carries with it less risk. Indeed, when asking them to write about their own experiences, even if they need to use third-person pronouns to avoid confusion, they are essentially telling their stories. Setting up "formal, scholarly" writing and "storytelling, narrative" writing as a dichotomy suggests that by choosing the un-scholarly option, they get to opt out of the requirement of writing analytically about their own experiences. As Janice Lauer demonstrates through analysis of her students' writing using the rhetorical approach, analytical and narrative writing are not mutually exclusive. She presents an example of a student examining a lost friendship and that friend's later suicide from three different perspectives: static, dynamic, and relative (57). Equipping students with a heuristic like this one and the guiding questions in the prompt should keep students from simply recalling a

literacy experience, but alerting students to this as a potential pitfall that misses the assignment's aim is nevertheless a helpful clarification.

One of the common difficulties that students encounter in this assignment is achieving a consistent and unified voice. Since most groups' collaborative process has each member contributing a section of the paper, often more than one student will employ first-person pronouns, creating confusion about whose voice is present at any given time. This assignment provides a pertinent opportunity to discuss with students the context-specific nature of many writing conventions. Whereas many students arrive at the University of Arkansas with an assumption that rules about writing are either Platonic or arbitrary, the first unit aims to teach students that the rules about writing are not universal, and the literacy study provides a perfect example of a writing situation in which the rule about the first-person pronoun has a strong and reasonable basis in the rhetorical situation of the assignment.

Several groups from Neli's class wrote about the effects of social media on students' writing. Each group proceeds by describing the communicative functions of Facebook and Twitter and attempts to make claims about the impact of the latter on writing in other situations. However, while their descriptions are usually thorough, they often struggle with their claims and analyses. One group, in avoiding a simplistic claim about social media improving or damaging users' writing, ends up so mired in complexity that they fail to make any claim at all:

> Some may ask then: How does Twitter affect our writing skills if we are only given 140 characters to say what we want to say? The answer may not always be defined as 'good' or 'bad,' but rather a multitude of answers that depend on many different factors. These factors can include what the person's message is, how long that message is, and who the person is. (Appendix I)

Though the students go on to provide examples of a business using Twitter as a marketing platform, student communicating to his friends, and descriptions of the functions of hashtags,

they often struggle to offer any coherent claims about social media's effects on writing. Several groups end up with conclusions similar to "How you use social media can affect the way you write, think, and act, as well as, how others view you based off of [sic] your writing," without providing specifics about what these effects may be or why they are important. These instances demonstrate students' attempt to occupy an authoritative academic subject position through their appropriation of the prompt's desire that they make argumentative claims. Their discomfort in such a subject position results in the clumsiness with which they neglect to follow through on those claims. Nevertheless, such clumsiness is a necessary part of the process of being enculturated into academic discourses. The major issue in papers like this one is not the clumsiness of their execution but their failure to make claims that are relevant to the assignment.

Some groups grasped at claims that were not entirely relevant to the assignment, such as arguing that older generations should do more to embrace new technology "in order to keep up with the younger generation." Another group offered claims that they seem to assume are expected instead of forming a claim based on observable experiences or data. They argued that "we are slowly forgetting the proper way to use our grammar in everything we do" and also suggested that we may "never speak face to face or even speak with one another" because of technology. These irrelevant or outlandish claims indicate students' awareness that their argument should be relevant and important, but show their struggle to consistently engage in metawriting and maintain a focus on literacy and language.

Courtney's students focused their literacy studies on the more traditional definition of literacy as an alphabetic practice. Many of these students chose to write their literacy studies individually after collaborating with other students during the data collection stage. These students obviously avoided the pronoun confusion in many of the group papers and had more

unified papers overall. One student wrote about how the Montessori method affects children's

literacies. She gives a detailed account of learning to read and write at a Montessori school and

explains how that method involves the sense of touch and kinesthetic learning to reinforce the

sound and feel of a given letter. After comparing her experience to how her father acquired

literacy through more mainstream methods, she concludes:

> The Montessori method is an innovative and effective approach to learning. The learning environment [is] tailored to the child, along with teaching practices such as the sandpaper letters and the movable alphabet, allow [sic] children to learn in the way that naturally comes to them. Because they are so engaged in their own education, the children develop a love of learning that they wouldn't elsewhere.

On her own, this student wrote a more specific and interesting paper that was also more directly

concerned with literacy than many of the group papers from Neli's class. She moves beyond

claiming that the Montessori method is superior and explains how and why its differences are

significant. She relies on both first and second-hand experience and incorporates secondary

textual research as well. This student, along with similar ones from Courtney's class, better

accomplishes the goals of the literacy study assignment, but how well do the goals of this

assignment align with the goals of the WaW course?

The literacy study's primary objective is to help students gain a better understanding of

their literacy experiences and the complexity of literacy more generally. This increased

awareness may or may not have a direct and explicit focus on metadiscursivity but the process of

writing the paper collaboratively should further the cultivation of agency by forcing students to

alternately verbalize and write their contributions to the assignment. One of the strengths of this

assignment is its inherent privileging of the writing process. Successful papers for this

assignment do not write backwards from a conclusive thesis but rather make claims in light of

the students' experiences or data. Writing collaboratively, whether students do so in the same

room or via a program like Google Docs, requires students to negotiate double agency as they must write to earn their desired grade but must do so while meeting the writing goals of their group. If accountability is in place for group participation and no singular student is allowed to dominate the assignment, then students must talk about their writing goals in ways they are not normally required to do. Further, the people they discuss their own goals with have their own goals for the paper, which may or may not align. This process, with the right framing from the teacher, can foster students' awareness of their double agency as authors through verbal and written articulation. However, when students are given the opportunity to write this paper as individuals, the pursuit of agency becomes less clear because it is the process itself instead of the content of the assignment that truly furthers the goals of the WaW course. When students draft and revise as individuals, they are not forced to negotiate their personal authorial agency with anyone else's, thereby forfeiting students' awareness of their collective agency.

Rhetorical Analysis: Prompt and Student Writing Excerpts

The major assignment adjustment that Courtney made to her course was to switch the order of the second and third papers (Appendix H). She reported making this decision because the rhetorical analysis seemed more foundational to the course and more important for the final paper (the discourse analysis), so she wanted students to spend more time over the course of the semester practicing aspects of rhetorical analysis.

Her prompt keeps the major points of the assignment the same, but adds extra guidelines for locating the articles and explicitly directs with regard to style, telling students, "your paper should be a straightforward, academic comparison-contrast paper." The prompt maintains this clear and direct language by using the metacommentary that Courtney brings into her lessons.

She clarifies: "So I am asking you to break down the *rhetorical,* or *persuasive,* parts of the articles and how they are used to reach their audiences." It also includes definitions of the terms "rhetorical" and "analysis," but most interesting is Courtney's insertion of herself into the prompt as the operating agent who sets and clarifies expectations (Appendix H).

Students responded in kind to the metacommentary that Courtney utilized in the prompt. One student recontextualized the desires of the prompt through inserting herself into her thesis statement:

> I plan to highlight the differences between, and reasons for, the logos based appeal of MD Mounsey with Heller's more pathos based appeals. Both articles deliver a very similar message, but bases [sic] the delivery on their respective target audiences, resulting in different but equally effective appeals to their cause.

This student follows through with her awareness of divergent appeals and their relationship to the audience throughout her paper. She correctly characterizes the academic article as relying on "numbers and medical jargon" as well as a "very structured organization" that includes an introduction, an "illustrative case," and a "study summary," all of which contribute to the article's reliance on logical appeals. She then goes on to point out the main distinguishing features of the popular article:

> He begins with a question "Quick—what comes to mind when you hear 'Mediterranean diet'?" then provides the answer he believes his audience would give: a few examples of specific foods such as olive oil and feta cheese. Clearly, he doesn't expect his audience to know much about the Mediterranean diet. This article is much less formal and much more conversational, including many instances of the word "you" and "your". Rather than providing research studies and raw data, he simply reports the gist of what was learned in the study.

She points out assumptions regarding the audience, pronoun usage and authoritative perspective (advice), grammatical forms, and how the author communicates the findings of the accommodated study.

As Courtney's prompt suggests, the rhetorical analysis is the most straightforward assignment in the current conception of the University of Arkansas' approach to WaW. However, it is also the one that least allows for creative thought and ingenuity. Because all students are comparing a scholarly article with a popular article, the rhetorical situations for each are very similar. Few students are familiar enough with the discourses of their academic field to be able to pick out rhetorical features that are specific to the discipline. However, if students move from a vague awareness that writing for scholarly audiences is somehow different to a concrete understanding that it is different with regard to the kinds of appeals that are made, the types of evidence that are accepted, and what the audience already knows about the text, then this movement is certainly progress. Most students, if given the chance, will be able to pick out the differences between a scholarly article written for the humanities and one written for the physical sciences, but distinguishing between two articles written in different fields within the humanities is beyond the grasp of most students. It is important to note the limits of these assignments so that instructors' expectations are reasonable for a freshman-level course.

The challenges of this assignment are concerned with the research component and leaving the content generation for the students. This assignment is most useful for the students if they use a scholarly article from their intended academic field. However, since the scholarly article has to be coupled with a text that has been accommodated for a general audience, certain fields lend themselves to this assignment more easily than others. The kinds of academic articles that become accommodated are typically in the physical sciences, detailing a discovery or new research results. For this reason and their inexperience and discomfort using scholarly research portals, students pursuing other academic fields are likely to settle for a physical science article because they are easier to find and trace back from the popular source. The other primary

challenge of this assignment for the instructor is stopping short of generating the content of the paper for the students. Because the rhetorical situations of the students' articles are similar, it can be tempting to do rhetorical analyses of scholarly and popular articles during class time but this sets the students up to merely fill in the blanks with examples from their own texts and can limit the kinds of observations they make. In attempting to avoid making the paper an automated assignment, Courtney practiced rhetorical analysis on other kinds of texts in class, such as commercials and blog-style personal essays.

Personal Pedagogies

As the only case studies to have both theoretical priming for the WaW approach and experience teaching the writing about literature approach during the previous spring, Courtney and Neli both expressed understanding of the administrative decision to make the switch. They both cited the limited utility of having students write about symbols and characterization and rhyme schemes and noted WaW's increased utility for students and the unity of form and content that WaW provides. However, though they are more comfortable in the position of teacher than the first-year TAs, Courtney and Neli both reported feeling underqualified to teach a course about Writing Studies. If TAs perceived themselves as more qualified to teach a Writing Studies course, their increased sense of self-efficacy would likely produce more pedagogical autonomy.

Ebest highlights the academy's low prioritizing of teaching and argues that in order to "reconceptualize and respect teaching" and ultimately improve education, "graduate students must recognize it as an intellectually challenging, complex endeavor. To do so requires [first] that they—and their professors—be introduced to the theories behind the practice" (42). What second-year TAs still need in terms of teaching support is continued productive feedback and

collaborative attempts to refine their pedagogical awareness and improve praxis. When asked

practical questions about how they attempt to reach students with multiple intelligences or what

kind of factors affect what goes into their lesson plans, but Courtney and Neli struggled to come

up with pedagogical motivations, staking the lessons and methods on the curriculum instead.

Ebest points to education theorist Bandura in pointing out that "if not feedback is received, if it is

received only occasionally, or if there are no consequences for failing to learn, graduate

students—like their undergraduate counterparts—have little or no incentive to learn" (49).

Indeed, U of A TAs currently have only rare opportunities to have their teaching observed and to

write about their experiences in the classroom. Since most graduate students are not accustomed

to reflective writing, this kind of pedagogical awareness and evolution is unlikely to occur

outside of required contexts. Further, Ebest argues:

> The value of feedback is affected by 'temporal disparities.' Immediate feedback carries much more weight and influences self-efficacy more accurately than delayed or dated responses [...] [and] end-of-semester feedback will have little effect on TAs' learning or sense of self-efficacy. (49)

 Ebest positions the concept of self-efficacy as crucial to graduate students' success as teachers

because it determines the degree to which they can apply their knowledge and ability. If first and

second-year TAs had more mandatory opportunities for giving and receiving feedback and knew

that improving their teaching had real rewards and consequences, then they may be more apt to

invest time and energy into becoming more effective teachers. When asked, both Courtney and

Neli responded that they want to improve their teaching, but *how* to do that beyond general

practice eluded them. In reflecting back on their time in mentor groups the previous spring

semester, both TAs found the groups to be only marginally helpful. Courtney recalled, "The

feedback that I received was more encouraging than constructive. I don't remember getting any

helpful techniques or strategies." This desire for concrete strategies coincides with Ebest's

statement that "pedagogy seminars that engage graduate students in subskills such as forming small groups, designing group activities, or determining how to make each group accountable are essential to the development of a judicious sense of self-efficacy" (49). Many TAs learn these subskills through trial and error, but requiring first and second-year TAs to participate in teaching-focused workshops or individual mentorships led by experienced TAs or instructors with proven effectiveness may be a productive solution for improving TAs' praxes.

Conclusion

For second-year TAs, experience teaching the writing-through-literature approach and having theoretical priming for the WaW approach through the Composition Pedagogy course did lead to very little resistance to teaching WaW. Without leading, both Courtney and Neli articulated that WaW makes the Composition II course more relevant and useful for students who plan on entering a variety of academic and professional pursuits. However, they remain somewhat unclear about the specifics of why and how WaW is intended to accomplish the useful ideal. One reason for this may be that the priming they received in the Composition Pedagogy course was too far in advance of their teaching the WaW approach. Or, the WaW approach may not have had enough emphasis because the decision to implement it was yet to be finalized. Either way, these TAs would likely benefit from further exposure to Writing Studies in general as well as the theory behind the WaW approach, its challenges of potential inaccessibility, and its goals. An increased awareness of these and similar concerns would allow TAs to make more informed modifications to assignments and to exhibit greater senses of self-efficacy while covering the content of the course.

TAs may also benefit from discussions about how the literacy study and rhetorical analysis assignments further the goals of WaW. After students have critiqued various constructs about writing in the first assignment, they then write an analysis of an aspect of or trend related to literacy. The literacy study's strengths are its collaborative component, which forces students to discuss and negotiate their double agency as writers, and its potential to broaden students' perspectives of literacy experiences. Its weaknesses include the possibility of simply recounting narratives or irrelevant claims that do not foster metadiscursive awareness in the pursuit of agency. Of the four major assignments, the literacy study involves the most risk

The rhetorical analysis, though perhaps the least creative of the assignments, is directly and explicitly connected to the WaW goals. By reading rhetorically and commenting on two texts, students gain an increased awareness of the concerns of audiences and see how different rhetorical situations produce substantially different texts. This awareness ideally leads to students better approximating those genres. One of the main weaknesses of this assignment is that it makes few demands on students' agency. In their papers, many students tend toward generalizations and neglect to make any claims that are specific to the academic field. Finally, getting students to analyze texts that are relevant to their academic goals presents an additional challenge. While some students adopt the desires of the prompt and use texts relevant to the academic and professional goals, most will simply use texts that are easy to locate. The rhetorical analysis will be discussed further in the next chapter, where I analyze Lisa's decision to conform the assignment to a five-paragraph essay structure in light of the course goal of fostering students' authorial agency.

Chapter 4: Advanced TAs: Lisa and John

Introduction

As the most experienced TAs, Lisa and John have taught not only the writing-about-literature approach to Composition II, but also various other composition courses including Advanced Composition and Technical Writing. John has nearly completed the requirements for his doctorate in Rhetoric and Composition, an area of specialization chosen by the minority of doctoral students in the University of Arkansas' English Department. His chosen area of expertise makes him more likely to be teaching Composition II than would be his colleagues focusing on literary studies. Since all first-year TAs teach Composition I in the fall semester and Composition II in the spring, and many second-year TAs also teach Composition II, TAs with more experience typically choose to teach World Literature, Advanced Composition, or Technical Writing courses. Lisa was a TA while she completed the requirements for her M.F.A. in Creative Writing. She has been a fulltime instructor at the University of Arkansas for six semesters since completing her degree.

Often, the more experienced TAs who teach Composition II, like Lisa, are also playing the role of mentor for the first-years. To prepare for this role, Lisa also taught the WaW approach to Composition II in the fall 2013 semester. This added responsibility required Lisa to exercise an increased meta-awareness of her teaching techniques and goals. With a background in creative writing, Lisa enjoyed teaching the writing-through-literature approach more, but she believes that metawriting is a more useful and engaging approach for students. She implemented accountability activities for the readings by having students come up with questions about the article assigned as homework. She says that this activity helps students to complete the readings and contribute to class discussion better than they did in the literature-based approach. This is

likely due to the course's increased relevance to students' own experiences. Lisa also exhibited the highest degree of authorial agency and autonomy over her course documents. During the spring semester, she taught only one section of Composition II and one section of Advanced Composition. Lisa reported that teaching these two courses during the same semester has allowed her to see various connections between the goals of these two classes, which led her to use the third major writing assignment for WaW—the Rhetorical Analysis—in her Advanced Composition course.

During the spring of 2013, John taught a pilot version of the WaW course which was based on the elements of argument. He agreed with the administrative decision to adopt the Downs and Wardle version of WaW because he says the current version has broader applications and is more effective at promoting metadiscursive awareness among students than was the model that he piloted. John spent several years working in journalism before beginning his doctoral work. He says that this experience has shaped his composition pedagogy by privileging accessibility in his classes. One of the ways that John has sought to make his class accessible is by allowing his students to correct sentence-level mistakes in class to improve the overall grade of their papers. John reads through their submitted final drafts and uses a pencil to mark grammatical errors, including punctuation, diction and syntax issues. John developed this process-based approach to grading papers as a way to help students see the options they always have available to them in trying to convey an idea. Since these revisions are done in class, John is available to answer questions and give feedback on changes. He also has students frequently engaging in informal writing in class, which he sees as helping them develop a sensitive ear for language.

Textual and Enacted Authority and Expectations

The first change Lisa made to the template documents was to limit the number of articles covered in the WaW textbook. Lisa's experience teaching WaW during the fall allowed her to anticipate that many would significantly struggle to comprehend and apply the articles. To counteract this, she decided that her class would cover only one scholarly article per unit (Appendix J). This decision had several effects on Lisa's class and the WaW assignments. First, it eliminated the pool for students to draw from in writing their papers. For the first paper, instead of building on Murray's "All Writing is Autobiography," or Williams' "The Phenomenology of Error," or Porter's "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community," students were told to "take on one common conception about writing that Porter criticizes in his article and analyze it in terms of [their] own experience." This removal of ancillary choices in the assignment served to keep the students from becoming overwhelmed by writing a very different kind of paper than they had encountered before, but in limiting the number of decisions that students had to make, Lisa also decreased the extent to which students are forced to pursue authorial agency. Second, the limiting of the WaW articles created more time for Lisa to incorporate material from the *They Say, I Say* (Graff and Birkenstein) rhetoric textbook and the *St. Martin's Handbook,* which meant that her class had more of a focus on traditional writing instruction focused on grammar, clarity, argument, and paragraphing. Third, Lisa was able to have students consistently working on their papers in class, developing outlines, research plans, and locating sources, as well as participating in peer-review workshops. This made her class a more student-centered learning environment and provided greater accountability for students.

On the other end of the spectrum, John incorporated seven readings from the WaW textbook in the first unit and five, four, and five readings in units two, three, and four, respectively (Appendix K). John drafted and distributed the schedules for each of the units

separately as the semester progressed and limited the articles actually covered as became

necessary, typically cutting out or replacing 2 to 3 articles per unit. While adaptation of course

material over the span of the semester is often necessary due to inclement weather, the consistent

modification of unit schedules serves to undermine the documents, potentially obscuring

expectations for students. He devoted a significant amount of class time to having students read

the texts and identify arguments and supporting evidence in small groups.

The policies that Lisa and John wrote for their classes also differed dramatically. John

added very little to the template policies, filling in only instructions for assignment submission

and late work resulting from unexcused absences. Lisa, however, modified the attendance policy,

and added sections for *Classroom Discipline, Late Work, Peer Review Workshop and*

Conferences, and *Blackboard Policy* (Appendix K)*.* These more detailed policies communicate a

more stringent authority structure for Lisa's classes; however, in the cases of these instructors,

they do not necessarily indicate differing degrees of authorial agency, but different styles of

teaching. The detailed policies that Lisa incorporates into her syllabus suggest that she partially

locates her authority in the document operating as a contract for the course. John's syllabus acts

more like a set of guidelines, the authority of which is imposed by the broader institution instead

of the teacher.

The structuring of authority in Lisa's and John's classes was confirmed through

classroom observations. Lisa spent more time giving instructions for the in-class activity and had

prepared those instructions ahead of time, displaying them on the projector at the front of the

room. John gave all instructions for drafting a topic proposal orally and typed some supporting

thoughts in the form of organization guidelines (also displayed via projector) as he explained the

activity. This method corresponds to his conscious effort not to position himself as the "expert"

in the class by including students in the process of exploring the assignment instead of dictating the resulting expectations. He utilizes dialogue over lecture whenever possible, giving and asking for reactions to ideas or texts instead of trying to obtain correct answers.

The Rhetorical Analysis: Prompts and Student Writing Excerpts

Whereas Courtney trimmed the template prompt for the rhetorical analysis in order to make the establishment of expectations more collaborative, Lisa expanded the prompt to four pages, providing students with a detailed step-by-step process, including an outline for the paragraphs, which frames the paper as a "traditional five-paragraph essay" (Appendix J). She said that she has found detailed prompts to help prevent confusion about how to do the assignment for students who read the prompt carefully and continue to refer back to it during the writing process. In spite of her good intentions, Lisa's decision to privilege a form as static and restrictive as the five-paragraph essay undermines the WaW course's goal of fostering authorial agency and the creative adaptation of the form to the specific task. While guidelines regarding form can help to focus authorial agency, the use of this structure (which students should have mastered by the time they graduated high school) reduces the decisions they have to make as authorial agents to selecting examples and limits the degree to which they may adapt the form to fit their particular sources. For example, if a student's articles do not represent a direct accommodation but present disagreeing arguments, then it may be beneficial for the student to use a brief paragraph to explain the differing conclusions before closely examining the rhetorical features of the texts, thus disrupting the expected form.

Apart from these concerns about too-restrictive formal guidelines, one of the major challenges that many students face with the rhetorical analysis assignment is locating scholarly

articles that have been accommodated. Without direct and guided library research portal assistance, most students will avoid using library databases in favor of Google Scholar or general search-engine results. The wide variety of results that they receive from these searches makes the research component of this assignment more difficult than necessary. To this end, Lisa scheduled a "library day" where the students found their scholarly articles with the help of a U of A research librarian. The librarian was able to point them to the major journals for their academic field. This guided practice helped to alleviate anxiety FYC students often feel at having to obtain scholarly sources.

Ideally, this assignment provides a foundation for the final assignment, the discourse analysis, introducing students to the discourse community of their chosen academic field. However, the template prompt specifies that the scholarly article students obtain be "scientific," and neither Lisa nor John altered this aspect of the prompt. The reasoning for this specification is likely connected to the rarity with which an academic article from outside the sciences is accommodated for a general audience. All students end up writing their rhetorical analyses about either physical or social science articles, but a large proportion of students are pursuing other disciplines, in business or the humanities. While rhetorically analyzing a scholarly article from outside their chosen area of study still acquaints them with differences of audience, authorial credibility, and language involved in the two texts, students not pursuing the sciences remain unfamiliar with the kinds of evidence, reasoning, and conventions that are specific to their discipline that would otherwise better equip them to write the discourse analysis.

The other consequence of students writing very similar papers is the few creative options available to them. In order to help students compare their sources, Lisa included some guiding questions:

> Which article names more scientists, research, and studies than the other when integrating sources? Does the mass media article go beyond the published research to include interviews or quotations from the scientists? Do these interviews or quotes include observations and conclusions not found in the science report? Are any major findings left out of the mass media article? Why? Are unsupported claims included in the mass media article? If so, what effect does this have on how your view of the author's authority? (Appendix J)

What these questions do well is provide scaffolding to reduce uncertainty about what kinds of comparisons they are supposed to make between the articles. However, the yes-or-no structure of many of these questions limit the number of decisions that students have to make about the content of their papers. By carefully reading the prompt, students can derive all their topic sentences and templates for analysis/explanatory sentences from the guidelines, filling in with specific examples from their articles. This limitation of choices that students are left with does not seem to push them toward exercising much authorial agency. If authorial agency is the end goal of the course, then the assignments' effectiveness at cultivating metadiscursive awareness should be taken into account. By this standard, the rhetorical analysis assignment in its standard conception succeeds, but these modifications fail to accomplish the goals of the course.

Not allowing instructors to make form and content modifications to the assignment prompts would compromise the goal of pedagogical autonomy; alternately, if teachers' modifications compromise the overall goals of the course, then students will not achieve the metadiscursive awareness that the WaW approach's success depends upon. The only way to cultivate pedagogical autonomy, which indicates self-efficacy, without risking compromising objectives and confusing students, is to improve teachers' understanding of the WaW approach. If TAs internalize the goals and methods of the course, then they would be better equipped to make modifications to the assignment prompts that do not compromise the course's objectives.

John's version of the rhetorical analysis prompt retained the generic options of the template prompt, allowing students to write their papers in either a "fairly formal and traditional research paper" or "in a less formal way, perhaps as a magazine article [...] or as an interactive website" (Appendix C). Once again these generic options between academic and nonacademic writing place students in an awkward position. One of the assumptions about FYC is that it exists to prepare students to write in the academy. However, the WaW approach concedes this ground—based on the problem of transfer discussed in chapter one—in order to teach students to think for themselves and actualize authorial agency in writing that they do both inside and outside the academy. By this point in the semester students should recognize their distance outside most academic writing; therefore the "less formal" option seems safer and is the more frequent choice. But being given the choice to opt out of academic styles of writing may be sending the wrong message to students, considering that this choice rarely exists in any other academic courses. The option of a "less formal" style prompts the question "how informal is too informal?" Teachers can save their own annoyance and students' frustration by setting clear guidelines for this kind of option, such as whether second-person pronouns and asides are allowed, what the expectations are for punctuation, and how less formal papers should be formatted. Not addressing these (perhaps unspoken) questions and clearly communicating their relationship to the assignment's grade ahead of time creates the potential for cognitive dissonance for the TA when calculating the grade. Many students fail to realize that most magazine and other feature writing, though more accessible, remain carefully and tightly crafted, relying on strong verbiage instead of direct addresses of the reader.

One of the potential weaknesses of the rhetorical analysis is the low degree of creativity involved. Between the in-depth guidance of the writing prompt and in-class discussion of the

assignment, students may be left with little to do besides fill in appropriate examples and form

the predetermined ideas and topics into sentences. For most students, even the explanations for

why the rhetorical differences occur will be essentially the same. The goal of the rhetorical

analysis assignment is to get students to understand how writing for academic audiences differs

from writing for popular audiences, but how well does this goal align with WaW's goal of

cultivating authorial agency? And how can TAs continue to pursue this goal through a less

creative assignment? Though students have to make fewer choices about this assignment

(especially if their teacher provides an outline like Lisa did), they do still have to narrow down

which aspects of the rhetorical situations and which of the articles' rhetorical moves to focus on.

In light of few creative options with regard to the content of the paper, some students

appear to compensate with the tone they employ in this assignment. For FYC students, an

informal tone is almost always conveyed through the use of personal pronouns, which positions

the student in various subject positions. The beginning of the first body paragraph of this

student's paper reads:

> Take the announcement of new scientific discoveries for example. You can often
> find both "popular" reports and the initial scientific articles that deal with these
> discoveries. We'll be comparing how two of these articles that both deal with
> announcing the discovery of a new blood test used to predict the early onset of
> Alzheimer's appeal to three of the aforementioned rhetorical elements to get their
> points across. (Appendix L)

Once again, this excerpt shows the student shifting between taking an authoritative position in

the first sentence, then reducing that proximity in the second sentence and collapsing it in the

third. This shifting is suggestive of uncertain subject positions, indicating an attempt to negotiate

multiple subjectivities.

While little creative demands were made on Lisa's students in this assignment in terms of

what each paragraph should be about and how many paragraphs the paper ought to employ, some

of the successful papers in her class did exhibit greater specificity in their analyses. Since Lisa

suggested that one of the body paragraphs should analyze the what the claims of each article

were and how much each claim was explained (Appendix J), her students were forced to discuss

an important element that many students who were given more creative license opted to avoid.

For example, this paragraph from a paper that focused on articles discussing medical uses for 3D

printing explored how the articles differed in their claims about how much of a difference 3D

printing internal organs may make and how soon:

> In Craig's magazine article, you see that, though he has to explain that 3D organ printing has much more development that has to happen before we can use the tool, he is still bringing much hope to his audience by explaining the progress that they have had with the experiments thus far. He approaches the subject almost as if he is so delicately talking to a crowd that has lost all hope for everyone in need of an organ transplant getting treated [...] The scholarly article on the other hand goes about their approach in a different manner. Ozbolot and Chen are very clearly writing to an audience who was previously educated on 3D printing, so they focus more on jumping straight into educating the audience on the organ printing process, rather than having to explain 3D printing altogether. There is less talk of hope, and more talk about facts.

This student, guided by the specific focus on claims provided by the prompt, directly or

indirectly discusses several key aspects of the rhetorical analysis assignment, indicating the

relationships between the tone, the audience's expectations and prior knowledge, the information

included in each text, and the commentary provided about that information. In identifying the

assumptions that the authors were making when writing their respective articles, this student

exhibits a high degree of metadiscursive awareness, accomplishing the assignment's main goal

and arriving at a useful conclusion of what is being valued by each discourse community—hope

or facts.

The rhetorical analysis assignment presents an important aspect of the WaW curriculum

and approach: students should be able to identify and explain the reasons for the differences

between writing for academic and general audiences. Where it may fail to live up to its potential

lies in the lack of creative decisions that force students to exercise authorial agency. The

difficulty of finding an accommodated article outside of the hard or social sciences brings the

added possibility of students settling for accessible articles instead of locating ones inside their

prospective majors. One way to solve this problem and possibly make the assignment more

creative would be to remove the preference that the articles be a direct accommodation. Some

students get distracted by the assumption that the articles are "saying the same thing, they're just

saying it differently" and neglect to notice how the texts vary in content as well as form. Further,

being able to identify which article is written in a more formal and sophisticated tone does not

directly translate to students' ability to approximate that scholarly tone. Forcing students to

closely analyze more specific discursive decisions like verb use, syntax, and how an article

reasons from point A to point B may set them up to engage in more specific, more thoughtful,

and more beneficial rhetorical analyses. Because this depth of rhetorical analysis will likely be

unfamiliar to students, it may be necessary to model interactions with the texts in class. This

modeling should be specific and local enough that the observations and claims cannot be applied

to every student's paper without significant adjustment. In order to limit the transferability of the

in-class modeling, it may be beneficial to conduct this activity on texts that would not be

compatible with the rhetorical analysis assignment.

The Discourse Analysis: Prompts and Student Writing Excerpts

The final major writing assignment represents the culmination of the WaW objectives.

For this paper, students must collect various forms of data from a discourse community that they

would like to join. The intent of this assignment is to have students investigating the discourse of

their chosen academic major or career field. By analyzing the discursive features of various texts and discussing aspects of interpersonal communication and values with an interviewee who is already a member of the desired discourse community, students should be able to better understand what is required of them to gain membership. Building on the rhetorical analysis of a scholarly article (ideally) from their field, students then extend their understanding of effective writing in a given discourse community to a wider variety of texts and a better grasp of what James Paul Gee refers to as Discourse, which is the "saying-writing-doing-being-valuing-believing combinations" (484). This assignment is designed not merely to measure students' comprehension of some of the course's key concepts, but also to allow them the opportunity to demonstrate metadiscursive awareness and exercise the authorial agency that is the course's ultimate goal. That this assignment has students analyzing discourses that they hope to join has the added benefit of being immediately and obviously relevant to each student's personal goals. Even if a student did not end up pursuing the discourse that he analyzed in the WaW course, he would still have gained the tools necessary for him to prepare for his entrance into another discourse of his choosing.

The WaW goal of authorial agency takes a prominent position in this final assignment, which positions students as the double agents that Bawarshi argues for. To successfully complete the assignment, students must act on behalf of their own personal academic or career goals and on behalf of the discourse community they hope to join by gaining what resembles an insider's perspective of the chosen discourse community. While most students are able to grasp that someone's success or failure in a discourse community depends on his or her ability to conform to the expectations and conventions of that community, the students' specificity about how that happens in their chosen community generally determines the success of failure of the paper.

Some of the main concerns that instructors encountered with this assignment had to do with the timeframe in which the assignment needed to be completed, students' struggle to identify and select an expert for their interview, and, for some students, accessing texts from the career field. Some of the students who did not focus much of their rhetorical analysis papers on issues pertaining to language also struggled with analyzing the discourse in the final assignment. In class observations, some students also seemed uncomfortable with this assignment's progression of conducting primary research as a way to explore a research question instead of pursuing a conclusive thesis. The multiple stages of this assignment are best approached partially during class time to guard against students' procrastination.

As with the rest of the major assignments, John left the discourse analysis in its template state with the exception of reformatting the document. The prompt requires students to collect three forms of data for this paper: observing members of the discourse community interacting, obtain texts in various genres, and interview a member of the discourse community. These three forms allow students to gain exposure to enacted interpersonal communication, written communication, and an introduction to how metadiscursively aware members of a given discourse community are when it comes to the discursive conventions they employ everyday as well as how Discourse functions as an "identity kit" and "way of being in the world" (Gee 484). When he presented the final paper prompt in class, John admitted that he would not have included the interview as a required form of data collection, but that he had not designed the assignment. When asked about why he would have excluded it, John replied that he thought three forms of data collection may be difficult for students to obtain given the time restrictions of the end of the semester. Nevertheless, John left the requirement in the prompt experimentally, to see how well students did with this aspect of the assignment, thinking that it may be helpful for

some students who may have trouble collecting one of the other two forms. In class, John emphasized direct observation of the discourse community in action, suggesting that students watch and listen to communication exchanges while attempting to answer the questions they would also pose in an interview.

While several students chose to write about discourse communities that they are already familiar with such as sporting or religious groups, some still opted for the more useful and challenging discourse community of their intended career. One student shadowed and interviewed a pediatric surgeon at Arkansas Children's Hospital. Like many students, he used Swales' "Characteristics of a Discourse Community" as the guiding lens and organizational structure of his analysis.

> In the more specific realm of communication between surgeons lies the lexis and genres of their profession. The daily written world of surgery involve patient's charts, reports, case notes, and other collections of what would seem like nothing more than random collections of scribbles and numbers to the untrained eye. However these forms contain the vast majority of information about each patient a surgeon sees and tells them everything from what's wrong and how it would be best to try and help. Away from the everyday genres lies the more occasional meeting and conference between surgical staff that often address issues that go beyond simple patient to patient basis.

Though his discussion of written texts was scant, this student identifies jargon and differences in how pediatric surgeons speak to each other and to patients and patients' families, as well as focuses on how doctors use humorous language with each other to diffuse the tension inherent in their work. He comments on a variety of rhetorical situations and engages in metawriting by noticing how language is used differently in each context, which indicates metadiscursive awareness.

Requiring students to analyze the discourse of their intended careers can create challenges related to access for some students who do not know anyone in their chosen field, and

have not yet had classes in their major course of study. But, by giving students options to analyze other discourses, we avoid staking the assignment on students' privilege of access. Allowing students to choose the discourse community they want to analyze (especially if they are permitted to choose one that is neither career-oriented nor academic) operates on the assumption that the skills acquired through this assignment transfer to students' attempts to participate in other discourses.

As with the other assignments, Lisa significantly expanded the prompt for the discourse analysis from the template's two pages to nearly five. The added guidelines included three options for the discourse communities students could choose, specific questions to ask in their interviews, and a detailed outline for the final paper. Some of these modifications aid students in the pursuit of the course's goals while others detract or limit those pursuits. In dividing the potential discourse communities into undergraduate, graduate, or professional aspects of the students' chosen fields of study, Lisa helped students to think about their proximity to the discourse and how far outside they currently are. The options of an undergraduate or graduate focus help to differentiate between academic discourses, which is helpful for students who have already begun classes in their chosen field.

Under the *Data Collection* heading of the assignment, Lisa modified the template prompt by removing the requirement that students gather examples of textual genres from their chosen discourse community. This change is significant for several reasons. First, it avoids the challenge that some students have in obtaining these documents, which may increase the accessibility of the assignment. However, it also places the interviewee as the only point of data collection. And finally, this change risks shifting the focus of the assignment from "how does one write and communicate effectively in this discourse community?" to "how does this discourse community

work?" To guide students' interviews, Lisa included six detailed questions, half of which had two or more sub-points, which relieved much of the creative burden from the assignment and helped to guide students toward thorough interviews, preventing the necessity of follow-up interviews. These questions provide helpful scaffolding for students who likely have never conducted this kind of interview before.

By providing students with a detailed outline for the assignment, Lisa once again made the discourse analysis less challenging by leaving less room for interpretation, but also made the assignment less demanding of students' agency by reducing the number of choices they have to make about the content and organization of their papers. Each paragraph should be devoted to "the interviewee's answer to questions 3-6" (Appendix J, provided in the prompt. This issue of providing templates in WaW prompts the question of whether, or to what degree, templates foster or inhibit authorial agency. The rhetoric textbook used in Composition I and Composition II (*They Say, I Say)* makes sentence-level templates a central component of the curriculum. However, there is a difference in providing many possible templates for the sentence level and providing one for global organization. The options provided in *They Say, I Say* are categorized based on the kind of claim the writer is trying to make. These templates make student writers aware of the various relationships between ideas and serve as scaffolding to limit the number of options and help students to express their ideas clearly. Templates like "Ultimately, then, my goal is to demonstrate that _____" (Graff 132) allow the experience of writing in academic discourse before students are able to do so entirely on their own. Instead of trying to cultivate authority in students exclusively on a theoretical level, these templates aim to introduce students to the sound and structure of authorial agency and maintain various options for articulation. However, providing one template outline for how a paper should be organized eliminates choices

altogether instead of making students aware of the options available to them. Further, there is a

difference in collaboratively creating a *possible* outline in class and including an outline as part

of the assignment requirements on the prompt. Asking students to participate in creating an

outline that would work for the assignment presents two advantages. First, it makes students

active learners in the process by requiring their contribution. Second, it makes the assignment

more logical and less arbitrary by allowing the teacher the opportunity to guide and offer

correction and explanation for why one form of organization may be superior to another.

Students who focused on their chosen or potential academic major gain an understanding

of what it means for their identity and writing to belong to that discourse community. One of

Lisa's students analyzed the discursive conventions of English majors and identified the

preference for active voice, the necessity of basing arguments in some aspect of a literary text,

and the importance of understanding and implementing professors' comments on papers. This

paper reads:

> One of the most notable one is the tone of the writing, which often new comers
> are more informal and passive, rather than formal and active. Most English
> professors expect the students to write in the active voice instead of the passive
> voice simply because in the passive voice it is not necessary to include the one
> who is preforming [sic] the action, while in active voice it is mandatory. For
> instance, if there was the passive voice, "the boy was chased" it is not necessary
> to include "by the dog" in order to make it a complete sentence; however, if we
> changed the sentence to active voice, we could not have a complete sentence
> without "the dog" as the subject, for instance: "the dog chased the boy." The
> active voice is very important for upperclassmen and for grad students, because it
> helps the paper be more direct. (Appendix M)

While the preference for active instead of passive is an important convention for this

student to be aware of, her reliance on elementary examples instead of referring to an actual text

is a missed opportunity. Because the prompt did not require that she look at textual examples,

this student relies on the interviewee at the expense of neglecting the main form of writing that

indicates an English major's membership in the discourse community. Instead, this student focuses on informal mechanisms of communication, especially Facebook and email. While it may be socially useful for this student to gain some exposure to how the mechanisms of Facebook and email function within this discourse community, few of her observations seem specific to the English department and her focus on these forms prevent her from learning what it is English majors are expected to do when they analyze literature and culture. In cases such as this one, students are not engaging in the kind of analysis that the WaW approach postulates will solve the problem of transfer with authorial agency. Even detailed interview questions cannot replace engagement with examples of texts. By relying entirely on the interview, students are, to some extent, dependent on the meta-awareness of the interviewee and may become distracted by insignificant or shallow aspects of the discourse community. With the guidance of her interviewee, this student does offer the comment that "new English majors tend to try to argue for something that really isn't supported by the text, which makes the paper very weak." This observation is crucial to successful writing in this discourse community, but without any textual examples, it is likely difficult for this freshman student to grasp what this distinction looks like.

Though the prompt suggests that students select a discourse community that either represents their area of academic study or their prospective profession, some students bridged this distinction and ended up exploring the relationship between the two. This approach to the assignment is both noteworthy and useful for students. By analyzing both discourses, FYC students should gain a better understanding of what is required of them to pass through one discourse community in order to gain membership in the other. This approach was most commonly used by students who hope to pursue a major that leads directly to a specific career, such as nursing or teaching.

The less successful papers for this assignment lacked specifics about the discourses, values, and various rhetorical situations. These students may not have collected sufficient data to make noteworthy claims about their chosen discourse community. Students who chose to write about discourse communities of which they were already a part seemed to have more difficulty with the discourse analysis. This is likely because it is easier to recognize the characteristics of a discourse from which one is excluded than a discourse that has already been internalized.

Personal Pedagogy

With their backgrounds in creative writing and journalism respectively, Lisa and John bring different perspectives to teaching the WaW approach, but the differences in their methods diverge along other lines. Lisa, making considerable changes to the template course documents, exhibited a high degree of pedagogical autonomy in her course, opting for detailed prompts and fewer creative options for students. John left template documents intact and encouraged students to think more creatively about their assignments. Both had students writing often in class. As I have suggested, limiting the choices that students have to make about assignments may compromise the end goal of authorial agency for the course. As Downs and Wardle argue, "students will produce imperfect work" in WaW (575). Allowing for awkwardness as students approximate academic genres and privileging the cultivation of metadiscursive awareness is more in line with the WaW pedagogy than adapting assignments to be more restrictive, thus limiting rather than fostering students' agency. While in WaW it is not possible to pursue authorial agency without cultivating metadiscursive awareness, it is possible to cultivate metadiscursive awareness without pursuing authorial agency. However, John's decision to permit students to write about topics and discourse communities that are not related to their

personal or academic goals may make the assignments easier, but also decreases the relevance and utility of the course—two of its primary advantages over other approaches.

In discussing the transition to WaW, John exhibited a clear understanding of the reasons for the decision, citing the writing-through-literature approach's lack of connection to the discourses that are more relevant to most students and the distraction of the literary texts. Similarly, Lisa admitted to enjoying the writing-through-literature approach more, but agreed that students' utilitarian view positions them to better appreciate WaW's increased relevance and incorporation of their own perspectives. Since both Lisa and John have multiple years of teaching experience, the WaW approach had less of an effect on their personal pedagogy and methods, which have gradually evolved over the years. Their individual approaches exhibited marks of collaborative pedagogy, with John privileging process pedagogy and Lisa relying on aspects of the current-traditional model through her emphasis on correctness. They both opted for more in-class work on aspects of the major assignments and less time lecturing. They both also saw the readings in the textbook as the main challenge of the course, which many students failed to complete without consistent accountability due to the perceived difficulty of the texts. Lisa and John implemented different approaches to address this issue: Lisa focused on fewer than the recommended number of texts and revisited them repeatedly, while John incorporated more in hopes that each student may connect with one during each unit.

In reflecting on the semester, Lisa perceived a disconnection between the readings for the course and the objectives. The extent to which the readings are a necessary part of the course is an important question. If instructors can simply present the arguments of the articles and engage the class in a discussion, then the texts themselves become somewhat obsolete. However, as Lisa noted, the engagement with academic discourse through these readings is irreplaceable by class

discussion. The textbook's scaffolding and discussion questions, which focus on both comprehension and application provide much more support than students will encounter for similar texts during other courses. Even if students remain feeling excluded from the articles' audiences throughout the semester, the process of engaging with these academic texts and becoming familiar with the forms, organization, interpretation of data, and explanation of the purpose and significance of the research is still useful for moving toward academic discourses. Further, positioning the Writing Studies articles as a central component of the course has the double advantage of reinforcing Writing Studies as an academic field and acculturating students into the academy.

When asked about what they perceive as the primary goals of the WaW approach, Lisa's and John's answers proved illuminating for how they conducted their classes. Lisa answered that a more complex view of writing and increased rhetorical sensitivity through writing are the primary concerns of the course. Though a more complex view of the writing process might be undermined by her linear and detailed assignment prompts, these answers are similar to Downs and Wardle's proposal and my own analysis which privileges authorial agency through metadiscursive awareness. John answered that he sees critical reading, critical thinking, and rhetorical awareness as the course's central objectives. What is interesting about John's answers is that none of them are explicitly writing-focused. While much composition pedagogy and possibly even WaW relies on theory that displaces writing improvement from its central concerns, the other teachers interviewed still regard writing itself as the core of the course. However, John views these objectives as inseparable from writing as a complex and discursive act. Careful and engaged reading and critical thinking are crucial for articulating complex

responses and interactions with texts of all kinds. Rhetorical awareness will equip students to craft texts that are appropriate for a given audience.

John's answers also hearken back to one of the criticisms of WaW that Downs and Wardle anticipated from the beginning: "teaching about writing may not improve students' writing" ("Teaching" 276). They admit that those looking for "general writing improvement" will be inevitably disappointed in WaW pedagogy. However, by equipping students with skills to engage in discursive analysis, WaW seeks to improve students' understanding of themselves as authors, and of writing as a discursive act. WaW's focus on metadiscursive awareness decreases the likelihood of quantifiable improvement in student writing during a single semester. But, ideally, students' altered understanding and potentially increased confidence through writing about topics that are personally and academically relevant to them will produce agency as they engage in the complex and messy process of improving their writing, which extends far beyond the composition classroom.

Experienced teachers should not be excluded from admonitions to engage further with pedagogical awareness. As Stenberg and Lee point out in their article, "Developing Pedagogies: Learning the Teaching of English," the academy assumes that content expertise should be an ongoing process but pedagogy is rarely emphasized beyond the first couple of years or, at the latest, the completion of a terminal degree. Stenberg and Lee suggest using "process accounts" to get teachers to articulate their reasoning behind decisions about lesson plans and assignments along with varied groups where teachers collaborate and discuss their ongoing teaching much like they would in a seminar (343). These groups sound similar to the mentor groups that the U of A's Program in Rhetoric and Composition currently implements for TAs during their second semester teaching. However, Stenberg and Lee emphasize disrupting the hierarchy of one mentor

and several mentees by including teachers with various levels of experience. If Lisa had been involved in a group like this during her first year teaching the metawriting approach, she may have realized the potential confusion and compromise of goals that her detailed outlines risk.

Conclusion

Although the more-experienced TA and instructor showed less discomfort with the WaW approach and exhibited greater senses of self-efficacy than their less-experienced peers, they are not necessarily any more likely to individualize or modify the course. They did anticipate that the WaW approach would be more challenging for FYC students than the writing-through-literature approach, which led Lisa to provide greater support in the prompts and both of them to move several of the assignments' stages to in-class activities. John and Lisa also used more materials from outside the WaW textbook than the other case study participants did. They both made greater use of the *They Say, I Say* rhetoric textbook, but Lisa included instruction from the *St. Martin's Handbook* and John incorporated writing-related articles from the Internet. In this divergence, Lisa's focus returns to traditional writing instruction whereas John's focuses on current conversations about writing and language, which is more in keeping with the WaW approach.

In the future, John indicated that he would consider making the discourse analysis a greater focus throughout the course to increase the time students could devote to the assignment and potentially diversify their data collection, making their analyses more substantial. To make this schedule change, John suggested possibly excluding the literacy study and have students put together a portfolio with reflective components at the end of the semester. Lisa indicated that she would continue providing the detailed support she added to her assignment prompts, which suggests a privileging of comprehension over exploration and of certainty over agency. Just as

the first and second-year TAs would benefit from greater familiarity with the field, the department's more seasoned veterans would also gain an increased understanding of the WaW goals by gaining more exposure to Writing Studies conversations, which may lead to more options for major assignments and would allow instructors to compile collections of relevant supplemental materials that could then be shared with colleagues.

The final two major assignments, the rhetorical analysis and discourse analysis, directly address several of the course's specific goals, including "recogniz[ing] the demands that particular audiences place on written communication," "analyz[ing] rhetorical situations," and "identify[ing] authoritative sources in their discipline[s]." Ideally, discourse analysis builds on the rhetorical analysis by focusing on the same or a similar discourse community. If students analyze a scholarly article from their chosen field of study and subsequently analyze other genres from the same academic field or its professional counterpart, they will gain an advantageous understanding of the writing and communication that they will need to participate in to accomplish their academic and professional goals. Since many FYC students have yet to decide on a major course of study, analyzing communication relating to their goals presents a challenge when they lack direction. However, instructors can encourage students to use the assignments as opportunities to see whether they might want to pursue a given major or profession. As long as students choose an academic or professional discourse community for the final assignment (as opposed to a sports team or fraternity chapter), there should be some degree of transfer as they practice the skill of discourse analysis.

In the final chapter, I explore the incorporation of personal genres during the first half of the WaW course as a means for both, fostering stronger connections between the WaW concepts

and students' experiences, and exploring the idea of writing *around* writing as a precursor to

writing *about* writing.

Chapter 5: Personal Genres

Introduction

While many critics have decried the relegation of the personal essay to FYC classrooms—and I certainly agree that the personal essay deserves a more influential position in literature curricula—my aim here is to demonstrate the importance of its continual presence in metawriting-based composition instruction. In removing the literary triumvirate, as the University of Arkansas has done, from the FYC curriculum, the Program in Rhetoric and Composition should resist the temptation to allow the pendulum to swing too far, thereby banishing all literary texts in favor of solely expository and analytical articles. Rather than defending the personal essay on the assumption that it is both useful and good literature, my argument relies on scholarly considerations of the personal essay as an intellectually and artistically significant genre. My concern, as a teacher of composition, is with the personal essay's pedagogical usefulness in the recent turn to WaW. The personal essay and closely related genres, such as travel writing and memoir, are uniquely equipped to demonstrate the insufficiency of high school writing rules in examples of aesthetically good writing.

In his argument for the importance of the essay in teaching writing (in the composition classroom and beyond), Spellmeyer expounds on the ways in which the personal essay is inherently instructive with regard to the writing process, meaning making, and issues of authority and individualism. Returning to, of course, Montaigne, Spellmeyer notes that the father of the essay's "real concern is not with knowledge proper, but the relationship between individuals and the conventions by which their experience is defined and contained" ("A Common" 263). This priority fits comfortably with the goals of the WaW curriculum. The text of the personal essay acts not to disseminate information as much as it attempts to explore the significance of

information and the experiences implicated in that process. Though the genre is not academic, if used briefly at the beginning of the semester, it can provide a helpful stepping-stone and point of contrast for ventures into academic writing. The shift that occurred with Montaigne brought us a central "author-as-speaker, at once subject and object in discourse" (263). Nevertheless, the role of the Montaigneian speaker is not one of "narcissistic introspection," but rather a "personal outwardness" (263) that allows for the understanding of the author's situatedness but avoids material determinism. This personal outwardness is an ideal goal for students in the FYC class: to understand the necessity of their personal involvement in texts and how that involvement is negotiated with and mediated by external structures such as audience expectations and discourse communities.

In his defense of creative writing (by which he means creative nonfiction) in the composition classroom, Douglas Hesse argues that having students engage in creative genres does not counter the goals of composition. Hesse frames one of FYC's major goals as "to inculcate broad rhetorical and critical facilities, advancing the civic and social good" (47). In light of the massive shift in literacy, writing, readership, and publishing that Web 2.0 and social media have brought about, students are writing more and reaching larger readerships than ever before. Hesse points out that this shift has resulted in students' "experiencing a quite different textual world where knowledge and belief are shaped less by special isolated rhetorical acts than by countless encounters with any manner of texts, as if belief were a massive wiki, some of its revisions overtly rhetorical and others not apparently so" (48). This involvement in self-sponsored writing and reading opens up the opportunity to engage students with texts similar to those in which they discursively define and redefine their identities online. Hesse quotes James Porter's assertion that "people write because they want to interact, to share, to play, to learn, to

feel valued, and to help others" (Porter qtd. in Hesse 47). All of these self-sponsored motivations can be juxtaposed in personal essay writing. Hesse notes, "the aesthetic has a rhetorical force even as the belletristic can carry information and ideas" (48). We can focus on form and craft and alert students to rhetorical subtleties in personal essay writing as they make WaW content applications concerned with literacy and identity, thus facilitating metadisursive awareness. Allowing students to make meaningful connections in the first unit of the WaW course by tapping into those self-sponsored motivations may also improve their conscious engagement in the course, which is crucial for achieving transfer through metadiscursive awareness and authorial agency.

Jane Danielewicz, in her analysis of personal writing in FYC classes, argues that having students write in personal genres is the best way to help them cultivate their public voices. Most students come into the FYC classroom having had their personal involvement in texts all but beaten out of them. They eschew the first-person pronoun not because they think it is rhetorically ineffective but because they have learned to denigrate all personal perspective in favor of "fact." This mechanical and identity-evacuated view of writing about anything other than summer vacations in a classroom setting is problematic because it contributes to students' misunderstanding of authority as disconnected from the writer himself. We can help students understand the roles of perspective and authority in writing by first making them metadiscursively aware of their own perspectives as such and then practicing multiple perspectives. Danielewicz proposes that assigning prompts that ask students to analyze their own experiences in the forms of autobiography, autoethnography, and personal essay, is more pedagogically effective at facilitating critical thinking than the typical stock topics that require little involvement from the student (i.e. gun control or the legalization of marijuana) and rarely

prompt any reconsideration of perspectives or conclusions. These often go-to topics for FYC courses are not incapable of improving students writing, but they are incompatible with the goals of WaW because they do not necessarily require students to focus on writing or the factors that affect the formation of a text.[6] But looking critically at their own experiences places students in a middle space between identity-evacuated prose and navel-gazing reports and sets them up to apply their increased metadiscursive awareness to more critical academic genres. Personal genres can be used in a WaW course with the greatest effectiveness if they are topically oriented toward literacy themes and events and their connections to students' identity.

In the movement toward discourse-oriented writing instruction, theorists have at times neglected some of the principles that remain true across genre and community. Spellmeyer is useful again here in noting that while community and genre may to some degree determine what one writes, any student will attest that "there is no way to allow conventions of discourse to guide the hand that holds the pen" (270). Writing always involves the making of decisions, and with the countless decisions involved in the formation of any text, writers experience the uncertainty that serves to differentiate the essay as such. In modeling the uncertainty associated with writing, the personal essay is once again in a unique position to dismantle student assumptions about texts as relaying or communicating knowledge/information rather than discovering knowledge. Through acknowledging the ways authority is negotiated in a text, the essay allows students to see the process that most genres edit out. Therefore, if we really want to continue affirming the validity of process-oriented instruction, we need to offer some texts that actually communicate the process as such.

---

[6] As Downs and Wardle note, WaW can be implemented with a variety of different angles or focuses, including attention to social issues such as these ("Continuing" 176). However, it may be difficult for students to engage in metawriting when the texts discuss such polarizing topics.

Spellmeyer makes an important point of connection to Bakhtin that WaW theorists and instructors should not overlook: the "heteroglossia" of every discourse (266). We should recognize and teach to the differences that always exist within discourse communities and make apparent "those points of commonality that expose the alien within the familiar, the familiar within the alien" ("A Common" 266). Having students write about their own experiences as they pertain to the gaining of understanding and knowledge, the development of literacy, and their roles in communities, is a necessary prerequisite for them to write themselves into new experiences and discourse communities. While this is also the justification of the first two standard Composition II assignments, the personal essay and autoethnography differ through the second assignment's dependence on the first, therefore requiring students to consider the importance and influence of intertextuality in some of their own work. Spellmeyer argues that allowing students to see the points of connection between their current and intended discourse communities creates easier points of entry than framing those discourses as static and monolithic. When discourses are understood as open and synthetic, student writers have more opportunities to write themselves into those communities than they do when they assume the discursive system is closed and *stable*.

When students move from Composition I to Composition II at the University of Arkansas, they encounter a significant shift in curriculum. The primary texts that form the foundation of the course move from essays and articles written for a general audience to scholarly articles written for a specialized academic audience. While one of the bases of the WaW approach is that the course is less centered on the course readings than a literature-based approach, the scholarly articles in the WaW textbook remain a core component of the pedagogy. What I propose after having presented several case studies of teaching assistants dealing with the

demands of the course is that having students read and write in personal genres as part of WaW can facilitate the pursuit of agency through metadiscursive awareness. The personal essay, with a thematic focus on literacy, helps students to locate themselves as writers and identify some of their key literacy experiences. The autoethnography allows students to practice critical analysis of those literacy experiences, thus managing multiple subjectivities and engaging in multiple perspectives.

As discussed in chapter one, I have been relying on Bawarshi's conception of the writer as a "double agent, one who is both an agent *of* his or her desires and actions and *on behalf of* already existing desires and action" located in the existent rhetorical situations (50). Though agency is always enacted by the individual person, it does not begin and end with personal autonomy. Writing is a discursive act that always embeds writers in rhetorical situations that precede them and involve implicit standards about appropriate communication. As Bawarshi points out, "when composition pedagogies position writers as the primary or originating agents of invention, they deny writers access to the agency in which they necessarily participate" (54). Students struggle to recognize and act on behalf of collective agency when it is not foregrounded in the FYC class. Recognizing this aspect of authorial agency is a key component of metadiscursive awareness. Limiting agency to the role of the individual perpetuates the problematic model of the writer as an autonomous inspired being, but broadening agency to encompass both the personal and the social recognizes the necessary limits that rhetorical situations place on individual autonomy. Bawarshi's view of double agency, which I will continue to explore in this chapter, demands that we pay attention to the rhetorical situations of the WaW classroom because students must be aware of the situatedness of the writing they do in Composition II in order to exercise authorial agency in other contexts.

By starting the assignments in Composition II with the most personal genre—the personal essay—and one with which some students would already be familiar, I sought to cultivate a sense of textual authority over the subject matter. This personal essay, by virtue of its un-academic status, presents some unique challenges and risks in being incorporated into the FYC course. Karen Surman Paley addresses "the tension that necessarily arises when people in authority ask those beneath them in an institutional hierarchy to write narratives about their personal lives" (199). Assigning personal writing is problematic for students if they are even tacitly asked to address traumatic or painful experiences and then present the reflections on those experiences for a grade. Michelle Gibson points out that "students in the throes of revealing and coping with personal traumas cannot be expected to believe our assertions that we criticize their writing rather than their experiences or their emotions" (qtd. in Surman Paley 200). Assigning this kind of paper also presents the challenge for teachers of knowing how to respond to this kind of essay. We want to avoid grading their handling of personal situations or reappropriating how students view themselves. To this end, Surman Paley suggests that we "can respond to personal essays with compassion, with a discussion of a larger culture, and with revision help" (17). By discussing these risks, helping students to find safe topics, and clarifying how the grades will be determined, teachers can help to assuage student anxiety. In discussing this assignment in my classes, I suggested that they should choose topics that they felt comfortable sharing with their classmates. I showed examples of successful personal essays that did not have overtly serious topics, in hopes of preventing the misunderstanding that light subjects would not be welcomed. However, after several students expressed desire to write about more personal topics that they were not comfortable sharing, I opted for conferencing with students instead of having them

engage in peer review. This allowed them more agency over their topics without compromising the safe space of the classroom.

In spite of these risks and challenges, there remain strong reasons for including personal genres in FYC courses. As Peter Elbow argues, FYC students need to write about something on which they are the experts. Otherwise, they are writing not as a writer, but as a "test-taker" (Elbow 81). Elbow contends that there is a conflict between "the role of the writer" and "the role of the academic" and that moving FYC students toward one role may exclude the other. This contention aimed at Bartholomae about authority in academic writing bears some teasing out. Elbow sees the authority of academic texts as residing in the audience because of the academy's commitment to peer-review and validation. Bartholomae argues that inhabiting a subject position of privilege is a hallmark of academic discourses. Regardless of whether academic texts exhibit greater or lesser authority than other professional texts, most writing by FYC students demonstrates a significant lack of authorial agency and linguistic control over a text. Elbow remarks that this authority problem is compounded when students are given writing prompts that position them not as authors but as test-takers. This dynamic occurs when the claims students are supposed to make are essentially a foregone conclusion of the course, similar to the way a student is graded on a lab report in an introduction to Biology course. As test-takers, students have little opportunity to exercise authorial agency because they are not creating anything, but demonstrating their ability to apply a concept to examples. The literacy critique assignment has the potential to become merely an assessment tool by having students demonstrate that they can apply the WaW ways of thinking to some of their own writing situations. Though the WaW approach does posit a more complex, rhetorical, and nuanced view of writing as its primary

conclusion and the literacy critique can be effective at moving students in this trajectory of the course, the incorporation of more personal genres can also facilitate this movement.

Writing about Writing, in asking students to analyze and critique issues surrounding literacy and discourses, demands that students inhabit new genres and new positions of subjectivity. Bawarshi's work is particularly illuminating on the relationship between genres and subjectivity. He envisions genres as sites "which produce subjects who desire to act in certain ideological and discursive ways" (78). Transitioning from writing summaries and comparisons to literacy critiques and rhetorical analyses is not simply a demand for more critical thinking and understanding of subtleties; it is a demand that the student inhabit a different subjective position in relation to the text and the subject matter. This subjectivity requires a metadiscursively aware language-user who has access to a "secondary discourse" with which to critique her primary one (Gee 485). By starting with a personal essay and then progressing to an autoethnography, students can move incrementally from their primary discourse to a secondary analytical discourse, learning to position themselves differently based on the genre through in-class comparisons of generic expectations and conventions.

My motivation for incorporating personal genres in the WaW class is also related to Bawarshi's conception of double agency and Eileen Schell's argument about the first person pronoun. Schell states, "in the autobiographical tradition, there is a double referent in the 'I' who writes—the 'I' who is constructed as the Subject in the current narration of events, and the 'I' who remembers the past events and reconstructs them" (172). This double 'I' exists in autobiographical texts whether the writer is aware of its presence or not. All student statements about how they felt or viewed a past situation are necessarily reconstructions. The "what happened?" and "why does it matter?" questions that guided the personal essay assignment

correspond to these two referents. The personal essay also provides a starting point for the second, more critical, assignment—the autoethnography. Here, students have to return to what they have already written to generate a research question about themselves that is worth investigating. Bawarshi's concept of double agency takes on a prominent position in this assignment. By analyzing their experience in light of cultural factors in their communities, students must operate as personal agents and agents on behalf of their cultural contexts. Candace Spigelman notes that autoethnography "insists that the narrative of an individual's life is both the product and process of surrounding social and educational narratives" (65). The autoethnography, by asking students to inhabit a liminal space that is at once reflective and critical and wholly neither, is unfamiliar to most of them, but provides a genre in which they must inhabit subjectivities that require the application of many WaW concepts, such as discourse communities, literacy sponsors, and rhetorical situations.

After noticing very little creativity or original thought in the literacy critique assignment during the fall semester and coming across Jane Danielewicz's work on using personal genres to cultivate authorial agency, I decided to try incorporating one reflective paper into the WaW approach. I moved the content of the literacy critique assignment to in-class discussions and class activities and we discussed how to apply some of those concepts to their writing of a personal essay, which was used as the first major assignment. The personal essay assignment and its subsequent reflection, then, became a way for students to cultivate authorial agency by recognizing their goals as writers ("what am I trying to communicate about myself in this essay?") and the rhetorical moves they were using to achieve those goals ("how am I communicating this about myself?"). Though all texts are arguably reflections of their authors, starting with assignments that have students explicitly writing about their own experiences and

moving into critical discussion through the autoethnography helps students to better see how the author-text relationship manifests in their own work.

Assignment One: Personal Essay

Since autobiographical essays are often assigned at the high school level,[7] it is necessary to explain how this assignment should differ from similar essays students may have written in the past. The primary difference as I envisioned it was for students to locate their subject specifically. Instead of presenting narrative histories of their lives, students focused on one experience or label that affects how they inhabit the world. The readings that we covered before the fist paper was due were "All Writing is Personal essay" by Donald Murray, "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents" by Keith Grant-Davie, and "The Joy of Reading and Writing: Superman and Me" by Sherman Alexie. These texts introduced some of the central ideas of WaW: that every text is a representation of its author and corresponding beliefs and contexts, and that rhetorical situations shape discourse. We used the Alexie essay to explore identity by connecting it to literacy and spent a significant amount of class time detailing the rhetorical situations of their essays. Centering the discussion on a consideration of the voice the student wanted to project, the level of detail appropriate, the position of the audience, and the relationships between the ideas provided ample opportunity for the students to reflect critically on their writing from a comfortable position of remaining the experts on the subject of their text. They did not read many personal essays before writing this one because they would be rewriting it later in the semester, so I wanted their absorption of the personal essays over the length of the course to inform the later version of the assignment.

---

[7] According to the Common Core ELA literacy W.9-10.3 standard, students must "write narratives about real or imagined events using effective technique[s], well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences." http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/W/9-10/

Although the personal essay genre is broad enough to encompass a variety of texts, many students composed essays that clearly borrowed conventions and subjectivities from other genres. The personal testimony manifested itself in several essays from both of my sections. Kathleen Jamieson argues that writers, when faced with unfamiliar rhetorical situations, respond "*not merely from the situation* but also from antecedent rhetorical forms" or, as Bawarshi adds, genres (qtd. in Bawarshi 94; Jamieson's emphasis). Students who completed the personal essay assignment using the genre of the personal testimony wrote themselves into the subject position of the faithful believer/evangelist who has gained a metanarrative through which to understand their experiences and then seek to proselytize to others. This genre progresses from pre-conversion experience (negative in some way) to conversion, to post-conversion (improved experience). Her reliance on phrases and concepts central to the genre of personal testimony bore most of the weight of her reflection. Phrases like "personal relationship with the Lord," "belief in the power of prayer," and "felt the Lord's love come upon me" prevented the essays from including the degree of concrete detail that I encouraged, but demonstrated the students' insistence on writing from subject positions with which they were most comfortable. The testimony genre, in "maintain[ing] the motives that make intentions possible" (Bawarshi 94), provides not only a form that gives clarity and meaning to experience but also exhibits the student writer inhabiting a position of authority and attempting to persuade rather than simply to reflect. The introduction of one of these testimonial essays reads:

> When someone says "tell me about yourself" I am instantly filled with this strange feeling as though I don't know who I am at all. I usually reply with some benign answer like "my favorite color is teal and I like to eat." I walk away from that conversation, but the feeling of questioning what really defines me comes with me. It is safe to say that throughout each person's life, they are faced with choices and situations that could possibly change who they are and the way their life turns out forever. It is also safe to say that each person's situation is completely different from another's. Hearing someone's story and learning about

how they came to be whom [sic] they are is probably one of the most rewarding gifts someone can give you, in my opinion. The choice that I was faced with that was capable of completely altering my life forever was the choice of accepting Jesus Christ to be my Lord and Savior and surrender my life to Him.

This student, whom I will refer to as Candace, makes some illuminating rhetorical moves. She starts by distancing herself from the assignment by imagining the prompt's basic question as occurring in an event other than the text at hand. This displacement allows her to respond to the question as though it were occurring in a different rhetorical situation, that of a casual, friendly exchange instead of an assigned prompt in the FYC course. In the subsequent sentence, she expresses feelings of alienation in response to the task of defining and explaining herself, but the ease with which she appears to write the rest of the essay suggests that this expression of anxiety may be manifesting her uncertainty about using religious experience as the subject of her first major college writing assignment.[8] Her use of the phrase "it is safe to say" is an approximation of authority and creates further distance between her persona and her opinion. It also shows the reliance on common knowledge or opinions that FYC students often revert to. Her shifting pronoun usage in the following several sentences indicates her uncertainty the subject position she is articulating. Candace's articulation of self is interesting here for several reasons. First, she is not really identifying as a Christian for cultural or religious reasons, but as someone with an altered subjectivity: from angry, fatherless child to loving, spiritually adopted young believer. She also inhabits multiple subjectivities by responding to the prompt as one who is proselytizing but also sharing among friends (as in a church retreat or small group setting). She attempts to persuade with her experience, only indirectly mentioning the typical evangelizing points (God's

---

[8] Candace passed the AP English Language exam, which allowed her to be exempt from Composition I. It may be relevant to note that, in discussing this assignment, I revealed my similar conservative evangelical upbringing, implying that I would be neither disparaging nor hostile toward their religious narratives.

love, humanity's depravity, etc). Her attempt at persuasion indicates a degree of double agency in recontextualizing the prompt to serve the ideological functions of Evangelical Christianity.

Bawarshi notes that when writing essays, "students are expected to perform a discursive transaction in which they recontextualize the desires embedded in the writing prompt as their own self-sponsored desires in their essays" (115). This transaction requires students to inhabit a specific subjectivity based on the expectations of the assignment. The personal essay positions students as storytellers of their own experiences, but still demands a certain degree of critical distance, as Lauer explains in "The Rhetorical Approach" by looking at the work of a student who wrote about a former friend's suicide using three different perspectives. This student, through personal and eventually critical inquiry, ultimately arrived at a more self-aware and culturally aware understanding of the situation. Similarly, Phillip Lopate argues in his introduction to *The Art of the Personal Essay*:

> The personal essay is the reverse of that Chinese set of boxes that you keep opening, only to find smaller ones within. Here you start with the small [...] and suddenly find a slightly larger container, insinuated by the essay's successful articulation and the writer's self-knowledge. (xxviii)

It is this goal of self-knowledge that elevates the personal essay to the level of critical inquiry. By addressing the concerns of "why this event or situation matters" and "what effects this event or situation has created," students are forced to exercise critical distance from their experiences. As Eileen Schell notes, there is a double-I referent in personal writing necessitates this distance: "the 'I' who is constructed as the Subject in the current narration of events, and the 'I' who remembers the past events and reconstructs them" (qtd. in Bawarshi 98). Although the prompt prioritized the reflection aspect of the assignment, the most successful essays were already moving toward the kind of critical awareness that was the main objective of the

autoethnography—a discrepancy in expectations that I created and then noticed upon grading the assignments.

For many students like Candace, the prompt's desire to reflect on an aspect of one's identity manifests as a persuasive appeal for religious commitment or participation in some ongoing activity (such as exercise). While some students expressed the frustration and floundering that Candace's introduction hinted at, many others reported knowing exactly what they wanted to write about almost immediately. Because the first year in college is the time when students have to redefine themselves according to their new context, the questions about the kind of person they want to be are already at the forefront of their minds. We can capitalize on this introspection through the WaW approach. Though all students were not exactly writing *about* writing in this assignment, they were often writing *around* writing by locating and critiquing the factors that affect their discourses, such as institutions, family background, social relationships, and belief systems.

For this assignment, one student, whom I will call Alex, wrote about his identification as a gamer—someone who spends significant time playing first-person video games—and how that identification affects his interactions with people in person. His personal essay became an exploration of how communication in gaming is related to communication in person and how his fluency in the former affects his comfort with the latter. I have made this distinction of writing *around* writing because the students did not start their writing processes by addressing a literacy-related topic and directly engaging in metawriting, but rather started with identity. Identity, as a launching point, bolsters students' authorial agency. Then, through in-class activities and conferences, many students ended up investigating a literacy-related issue that has been central to how they define themselves. The justification for this distinction is found in the process

component of the concept. As students move toward and around the writing concerns in what may be thought of as a spiraling approach, they build more meaningful links between the literacy-related issues and their own experiences. Alex begins his paper: "My *true self* emerged when I decided to work together with a stranger in a fight of survivor [sic]. We are fighting our way to the other side of the jungle" (emphasis added). He goes on to give a detailed description of the game's objective. Later he describes his experiences with communication:

> I have trouble talking in public because I do not know what to say, but I can socialize quite well online. I can socialize easily when I play games with other players. I am not afraid to talk [to] a virtual person. I would usually only chat to [sic] friends online and not text them on the phone. It is very hard to tell how someone is feeling when they are talking through an online chat. The only facial expression used during the online chat is when someone makes a smiley face or sad face. People can hide their feelings pretty easily when they are chatting online with other people. I can hide my feelings too. I can just type "lol", which is just laugh out loud in text lingo, whenever I have nothing to say. It's hard to say nothing when someone is talking to me and it is very awkward if you just stand there while someone is waiting for a response.

We can see here the student's discomfort with communicating orally and, through the awkward syntax, in extended writing. But what is significant is the student, by addressing his identity, ends up discussing how this activity—and moreover the internalization of the activity as identity—affects his use of language. He did not originally set out to write an essay about his literacy experiences, but after I alerted him to the potential of expanding the portion of his rough draft that dealt with communication, he was able to make some insightful observations. This essay, though leaving much to be desired in terms of style and finesse, directly indicates the development of metadiscursive awareness. In reading this essay, I first thought that the difficulty in reading someone's emotions was a drawback to communication, but the student makes it clear that this obscuring of emotion and sincerity is, for him, a benefit. His "true self" is located within the game and it is a self that is in need of protection and the safety of composing communication

through a high degree of mediation. It's important to remember that the nature of the video game means he is interacting with other players online not as himself but as his avatar. The interesting aspect of this student's work is that he is analyzing the significant differences in communication occurring in different media. He attempts to answer *why* the communication is so different and connects that communication to his exploration of himself as a gamer: his identity is a gamer, therefore he fits the stereotype of gamers struggling to socially interact in person and this struggle is related to the dramatic differences between online communication and in-person conversation.

Assignment Two: Autoethnography

The logic of this assignment progression is to move students into academic discourses by degrees. The personal essay and autoethnography share some important characteristics with the currently recommended assignments of the literacy critique and the literacy study, which they replaced in my course sections. The personal essay and literacy critique both get students investigating how their identity affects their literacy, but the personal essay approaches literacy through the broader definition of fluency in a given practice, which is affected by ideology, epistemology, and membership in certain groups. The challenge of the literacy critique asking students to confront or deconstruct assumptions about literacy in the first four weeks of the course is also avoided.[9] The personal essay's potential pitfall is in allowing students to select topics that are not directly or indirectly related to writing. The autoethnography and the literacy study both ask students to analyze experiences and situations that they have encountered and place greater awareness of their situatedness as readers and writers as the ultimate goal. The

---

[9] I recommend bringing a version of the Literacy Critique assignment in at the end of the course, a change, which Neli did by requiring a rewrite of the assignment toward the end of the semester.

autoethnography is differentiated from the literacy study by its use of secondary instead of primary research and the goal of analyzing their own situations instead of, potentially, others'.

The weakness of these assignments is that some students' personal essays lacked a good setup for transition into the autoethnography, forcing them to find a new topic and start from scratch. This was the case for students who wrote about experiences that lacked broader significance or were harder to connect to literacy themes, for example working with a personal trainer or the death of a high school classmate. These essays revealed the problem with unbridled freedom to choose their topics: all students would not arrive at literacy-related topics without guidance. As Bawarshi's concept of "double agency" reminds us, as writers we never have infinite options available. Agency is only empowering as such when one recognizes the presence of limited options; to have too many options more often results in floundering and paralysis than decision. Therefore, if students were given more guidance in developing a literacy-related focus, the initial assignment would have more overtly accomplished the goals of the WaW approach and made the transition to the autoethnography easier. This modification would make the personal essay assignment more closely resemble the literacy study in the suggested assignment progression, with the exceptions of having a more creative and individual focus.

Candace, who adapted her personal essay into the genre of the spiritual autobiography, failed to adopt an analytical secondary discourse to analyze her situation in the second paper, in spite of warnings on the first paper and in class that she would need to do so. She also neglected to show up to our student-teacher conference, preventing the possibility of me helping her to see the issue at the rough draft stage. However, many students were able to access a secondary discourse for this second assignment. One such student, whom I will refer to as Lucy, wrote about her experiences being socially excluded and the quest for popularity in high school. Her

personal essay was largely an account of events and a reflection on how it made her feel. With this foundation, she sought out social psychology texts to move her into a critically aware analysis of how her high school experiences affected her view of herself, incorporating ideas such as phenomenology, the looking-glass self, and social capital. Using these terms as theoretical lenses, Lucy also engaged in an impressive amount of metacommentary:

> In my first paper, the autobiography, I described my experience in a first-person point of view. In this autoethnography, I interpreted my experiences and related to multiple theories, definitions, and references. Lastly, I analyzed the experience with the first paper and second paper in mind.

The mentioning of "first-person point of view" is noteworthy here because Lucy is recognizing that there is a difference in her perspective in the second paper even though she's still technically using first-person pronouns. This distinction indicates that she has grasped that analyzing one's own experience is actually a different kind of perspective than simply retelling experiences. This different perspective, as she notes, must take into account the perspectives of others, in this case social psychology theorists.

Although Lucy's autoethnography contained some awkward surface-level issues, she still successfully engages in meta-aware self-analysis. In analyzing why the senior class cheerleaders got away with being mean and bullying her, Lucy uses the concept of social capital to better understand her experience:

> The more people an individual knows and the tendency for those connections to work together raise the value of one's social capital. Since the upperclassmen had more social capital, they got what they wanted, which gave them power. Reed quotes that power is "the 'ability to provide rewards that are valuable because they are scarce'" (Wallace and Wolf qtd. in Reed 180). The more social capital, power, or dominance anyone had at my school enlisted either a fear or admiration from those who did not have those tools. As an underclassman, did not have a high social capital or high power. I had two choices: to either conform and do what they thought was "cool" and "acceptable" or take in the consequences of not admiring them.

Through viewing her social exclusion through the idea of social capital, Lucy gains an understanding of why high school society operates in the ways that it does. Incidentally, she also arrives at a position of increased self-acceptance, suggesting that her rejection had little to do with her inherent characteristics and much to do with her refusal to play by the social rules of her high school. In this paper, Lucy demonstrates an awareness of assignment expectations, nuanced perspectives, and the difference that acquiring a secondary discourse makes in how she interprets herself and her experiences as well as the difference it makes in writing about those experiences. It should be noted that Lucy is not an exceptional FYC writer; she does, however, exhibit an unusual degree of agency and ownership over her assignments by frequently communicating with me throughout her writing process and seeking out scholarly sources.

The autoethnography assignment could be improved from the version that I used through an explicit discussion of primary and secondary discourses (Gee 487). I taught this distinction to Lucy during our conference and it helped her to understand better the purpose of the assignment and how it was supposed to be different from the personal essay she had already written. It also communicated a more substantial degree of usefulness for the assignment and made the assignment more conceptually relevant to the course. Lucy located Gee's article and included the distinction between discourses into her paper, further contributing to the metadiscursive awareness of her analysis.

While Lucy, in adopting the concept of secondary discourse, was able to explicitly recognize her analysis as such, Alex who wrote about his identity as a gamer, made many discourse-related observations but did so with a lesser degree of metadiscursive awareness than Lucy. Alex showed more analysis of gaming discourse as well as recognition of the discourse community's boundaries in his autoethnography. Part of his paper reads:

> Communication in a game can be confusing to someone who has no experience with that certain game. For example, when I play League of Legends, there are different ways to communicate with my teammates. League of Legends is a strategy based game with a 5v5 match up [...] One player from the top lane or bottom lane is able to move into other lanes, which is also known as "roaming." Teammates can type "Gank" when a roaming teammate is hiding in between two lanes. The word "Gank" is a term used to ambush a player that is in the lane. The communication between teammate [sic] has to be very strong and clear for teams to "Gank" well to get the kill. People do not want to type "I am losing my lane, please help me ambush this player," because that would be too long to type and opening the chat box would disable the character's movements. Every game will have many different terms to use. Talking about a game in public while using the terms will just sound like gibberish to someone who has never played that game before.

Here, the student is not merely identifying the specialized lexicon in the discourse community, but commenting on why it is necessary in the given social situation. He demonstrates awareness that the language, once removed from the context, no longer makes any sense and that fluency in the gaming discourse is crucial for success in the game, revealing that the lexicon also serves a gatekeeping function for the discourse community. To use a more descriptive and less opaque utterance, as the student points out, would not only be tediously impractical, but also disrupt the discourse community's value of reacting and responding as their avatars in the game. While this student's analysis could have been well-served by incorporating John Swales' article "Six Characteristics of a Discourse Community" (included in the textbook), his paper still demonstrates an increased sense of metadiscursive awareness, an understanding of how language is shaped and manipulated by discourse communities and rhetorical situations, and the extent to which language in a given discourse community is or is not transferrable. In a latter part of his paper, he returns to the relationship between online gaming interaction and in-person peer interaction with fellow students on the University of Arkansas campus.

Conclusion

While some of the advantages of these assignments may be achievable through the consistent use of journal assignments, the personal genres put students in the habit of reflecting on the course and applying the concepts to their own work and experience. Extending that reflection to the texts that students compose for the WaW course further serves to solidify their understanding of writing as a complex discursive practice. As a culminating project, students put together a portfolio, for which they put together a combination of texts. The options included a significant rewrite of the autoethnography or rhetorical analysis and a justification of their revisions, aspects of the discourse analysis assignment, and reflections on their changed understanding of writing and revision. Through project and less substantial in-class prompts, students wrote about their own writing, which placed student texts more at the center of the course and allowed them personal, concrete examples of writing to which they could connect some of the course's key concepts.

One of the WaW approach's main objectives is to introduce students to the concepts of composition scholars in order to equip them to make conscious decisions about writing in various situations. By including personal genres in the assignment sequence and having students write *around* writing, we can move them toward academic discourses by degrees. However, for the personal genres to still be conceptually related to the WaW curriculum, they need to be topically limited to ensure that the assignments remain relevant to the course. This increased relevance could be achieved by making Gee's concepts of primary and secondary discourses a central component of the first two units of the course and prioritizing the focusing of rough drafts toward applying ideas in the WaW course can result in the cultivation of metadiscursive awareness and a broader understanding of their literacies. While I incorporated these personal genre assignments in the first half of the Composition II course, they may be useful in

Composition I as a relevant precursor to the WaW approach. Writing around writing is an inherently process-based concept, dependent on locating the WaW-related concept in the early stages of the students' work. By starting with a discussion of an event that occurred in high school or one's participation in first-person online video games, students can—with help from the instructor—zero in on the writing-related concerns of their topic. Writing around writing has the potential to organically get students to see the connections between the WaW concepts and their own experiences, which may ultimately lead to a greater sense of double agency and a deeper understanding of the significance of the course.

The personal genres discussed in this chapter provide an alternative route to accomplishing the WaW goals in the first half of the course. If used carefully and with the proper guidance, they can provide a more creative option for students to explore their literacy experiences and discuss how those experiences shape their identities. The primary challenge for these remains keeping them topically focused on WaW concerns, which is best accomplished through student-teacher conferences during the writing process.

Epilogue

The implementation of the WaW approach in the University of Arkansas' Program in Rhetoric and Composition has shifted the focus of the Composition II course to a greater concern with the kinds of writing that students will be engaging in beyond the FYC class. The WaW approach seeks to make students aware of themselves as authors and members and potential members of discourse communities, of the influence of rhetorical situations on all communicative exchanges, and of the conventions and expectations of academic writing. Through fostering metadiscursive awareness, the WaW course can facilitate greater authorial agency in students and equip them to understand the discursive markers that indicate membership in a given discourse community. To accomplish these goals more effectively, TAs need to receive more preparation, and students need to be made aware of the course and assignment goals in order to consciously internalize and pursue the WaW aims.

All TAs enroll in the Composition Pedagogy course during their first semester teaching, but this course is, for some, their first foray into formal pedagogy and the work of Composition Studies scholars. While the general foundation provided by the course is helpful for fostering understanding of the field and its evolution over the last fifty years, this introduction is currently insufficient for TAs to see themselves as Composition Studies scholars who possess the content knowledge needed to execute the metawriting approach. Because WaW asks TAs to teach different content and use different assignments than they have likely encountered before, they need greater familiarity with the scholars and conversations explicitly concerned with the field of Writing Studies. This could be achieved through several different avenues. First, as I suggested in chapter three, the current survey of the history of Composition Pedagogy could be covered in a summer intensive prior to the start of the TAs' first fall semester. Then, the fall course could be

used to focus more specifically on Writing Studies to ensure that TAs who may have only studied literature in their previous programs gain familiarity with the content of the course they will teach in the spring semester. As teachers gain a fuller understanding of the WaW approach and are encouraged to internalize its goals and methods, they will be better equipped to personalize and modify the major assignments. It does not seem that the TAs involved in these case studies intended to compromise the WaW goals with their assignment modifications; rather, they did not have a clear grasp of what the goals of authorial agency and metadiscursive awareness involve. This better understanding will then help to foster pedagogical autonomy and secure the WaW objectives in the daily goings-on of the course.

In order to better assist TAs without previous teaching experience, the Program in Rhetoric and Composition could assign each of them an experienced TA to mentor and serve as a resource and coach during the first fall semester. This would help to eliminate stress about some of the more practical concerns of new TAs, such as preparing lesson plans, grading fairly, and giving helpful feedback. It may be necessary to offer mentors some type of incentive for participation. Further, TAs (especially new TAs) should be given more frequent opportunities to write reflectively about their teaching experience in order to become more aware of and consciously develop their personal pedagogies. Pairing this approach with increased support and training for TAs can position the FYC course as an invaluable part of students' university experience. The increased emphasis on teaching and the pedagogical growth that would result would benefit not only TAs and instructors, but also FYC students, the Program in Rhetoric and Composition, and the University of Arkansas as a whole.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *Journal of Basic Writing* 5.1 (1986): 4-23. Print.

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

Bird, Barabara. "Writing about Writing as the Heart of a Writing Studies Approach to FYC: Response to Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle, "Teaching about Writing: Righting Misconceptions," and to Libby Miles et al, "Thinking Vertically." *College Composition and Communication* 60.1 (2008): 165-71. *JSTOR.* Web. 14 January 2014.

Danielewicz, Jane. "Personal Genres, Public Voices." *College Composition and Communication* 59.3 (2008): 420-50. *JSTOR.* Web. 5 Nov. 2013.

Downs, Douglas and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing: Righting Misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "First-Year Composition" as "Introduction to Writing Studies."" *College Composition and Communication* 58.4 (2007): 552-584. *JSTOR.* Web. 8 Sept. 2012.

Ebest, Sally Barr. *Changing the Way We Teach: Writing and Resistance in the Training of Teaching Assistants.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005. Print.

Elbow, Peter. "Being a Writer vs. Being an Academic: A Conflict in Goals." *College Composition and Communication* 46.1 (1995): 72-83. *JSTOR.* Web. 3 Dec. 2011.

Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century." *College Composition and Communciation* 56.4 (2005): 654-87. *JSTOR.* Web. 9 August 2012.

Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction." *Writing About Writing: A College Reader.* Eds. Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. Print.

Graff, Gerald and Cathy Birkenstein. *They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing.* New York: Norton, 2010. Print.

Haring-Smith, Tori. "The Importance of Theory in the Training of Teaching Assistants." *ADE Bulletin* 82 (Winter 1985): 33-39. Print.

Hesse, Douglas. "The Place of Creative Writing in Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication.* 62.1 (Sept. 2010) 31-52. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 May 2014.

Kill, Melanie. "Acknowledging the Rough Edges of Resistance." *College Composition and Communication* 58.2 (Dec. 2006): 213-235. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 January 2014.

Kogen, Myra. "The Conventions of Expository Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 5.1: 24-37.

Kutney, Joshua. "Will Writing Awareness Transfer to Writing Performance? Response to Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle, "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions." *College Composition and Communication* 59.2 (Dec. 2007): 276-9. *JSTOR.* Web. 4 May 2014.

Lauer, Janice. "The Rhetorical Approach: Stages of Writing and Strategies for Writers." *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition.* Ed. Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1980. Print.

Lopate, Philip, Ed. *The Art of the Personal Essay.* New York: Anchor Books, 1995. Print.

Miles, Libby et al. "Commenting on Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle's "Teaching about Writing: Righting Misconceptions." *College Composition and Communication* 59.3 (February 2008): 503-11. *JSTOR.* Web. 14 January 2014.

Moore Howard, Rebecca. "Collaborative Pedagogy." *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies.* Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, Kurt Schick, Eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.

Simon, Roger. "Empowerment as a Pedagogy of Possibility." *Language Arts* 64 (1998): 370-82. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Jan. 2014.

Spellmeyer, Kurt. "A Common Ground: The Essay in the Academy." *College English* 51.3 (1989): 262-76. *JSTOR.* Web. 30 Sept. 2013.

Spigelman, Candace. "Argument and Evidence in the Case of the Personal." *College English* 64.1 (2001): 63-87. *JSTOR.* Web. 4 May 2014.

Stenberg, Sheri and Amy Lee. "Developing Pedagogies: Learning the Teaching of English." *College English* 64.3 (January 2002): 326-47. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 January 2014.

Surman Paley, Karen. *I-Writing: The Politics and Practice of Teaching First-Person Writing.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2001. Print.

Wardle, Elizabeth and Doug Downs. *Writing about Writing: A College Reader.* New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. Print.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "Continuing the Dialogue: Follow-Up Comments on Writing about Writing: Righting Misconceptions." *College Composition and Communication* 60.1 (2008): 175-81. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Dec. 2013.

—. "'Mutt Genres' and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write in the Genres of the University." *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009): 765-89. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Dec. 2013.

Appendix A: Sample Interview Questions

Preliminary questions that posed to teaching assistants:
1. How long have you been teaching composition classes?
2. Please describe the extent of your exposure to current trends in composition pedagogy before teaching Composition II in the Spring of 2013.
3. Please describe your teaching philosophy prior to this semester.
4. Why do you think the shift to Writing About Writing was occurred in the University of Arkansas' composition program?
5. How would you describe the authority structure of your classroom?
6. What is the average engagement level of the students in your classes?
7. What factors do you attribute this engagement level to?

Questions for follow-up interview with case study participants:
8. Which aspects of Writing about Writing have your students appeared to enjoy most?
9. Which aspects of Writing about Writing have you most enjoyed teaching?
10. What aspects of Writing About Writing have your students seemed to struggle with the most?
11. Which assignment(s) seemed to be the most difficult for them to write?
12. Which assignments(s) were the most difficult for you to teach?
13. What do you think has been difficult about those assignments?
14. What methods do you most frequently use when teaching?
15. If you taught the old Composition II, what do you think are some of the most important differences about this approach?
16. What are your teaching goals?

Questions about Course Documents:
17. What kind of materials from outside the textbook are you using?
18. How did you decide which articles from the textbook to include in your course schedule?
19. What questions or confusions, if any, do you have about any of the recommended assignments for this course?
20. Which of the readings on your schedule do you think will be the most helpful for your students?

Questions for Post-Observation Interview:
21. What did you do to prepare for today's class?
22. What did the students seem to understand clearly?
23. What, if anything, do you think they were struggling to understand?

Appendix B: Syllabus Templates

ENGL 1023: Composition II
Section XXXXX
Term: Spring 2014

Instructor: XXXXXXXXXX
Office: XXXXXXX
Office Hours: XXXXXX
Telephone: XXXXXX
E-mail: XXXXXXX

Purpose: To continue to teach students the research and writing strategies and processes emphasized in Composition I but doing so through the analysis of the discursive and writing practices in their chosen fields of study. Students will reflect on writing as a communicative practice and will write critical essays that demonstrate sound argumentation, development of ideas, clear organization, effective analysis, awareness of writing conventions, and mastery of standard linguistic forms.

Specific Goals: In accordance with the stated purpose of the course, students will learn, among other things, how to
• analyze rhetorical situations;
• identify authoritative sources in their discipline;
• identify persuasive appeals in written and visual texts;
• evaluate and experiment with a variety of rhetorical strategies and genres;
• recognize the demands that particular audiences place on written communication;
• use electronic resources to support library research;
• synthesize a variety of sources in the development of critical essays;
• generate a set of principles that will guide their sense of effective writing practices; and
• practice academic integrity and ethical communicative aims.

Procedure: Discussions; workshops; lectures; formal and informal analytical writing; exercises and activities that promote metadiscursive awareness. The quality of writing will largely determine the final grade.

Required texts:
  • *Writing about Writing: A College Reader*, by E. Wardle & D. Downs. (Bedford/St. Martin's)
  • *The St. Martin's Handbook*, 7th ed., by A. Lunsford. (Bedford/St. Martin's)
  • *They Say / I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*, 2nd ed., by G. Graff & C. Birkenstein. (Norton)

Assignment Grade Distribution:

Major Writing Assignments:		Other Assignments:	
Literacy Critique	15%	[Annotated Bibliographies]	____%
Literacy Study	20%	[One-minute Reflection Papers]	____%

Rhetorical Analysis   <u>15%</u>   [Research Proposals]   <u>   </u>%
Disciplinary Analysis <u>20%</u>   [2Questions/2Comments Notecards] <u>   </u>%
                                                              TOTAL   100%

Course Grade Scale: A: 90-100; B: 80-89; C: 70-79; D: 60-69; F: 0-59
Disabilities: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal antidiscrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. Moreover, the University of Arkansas Academic Policy Series 1520.10 requires that students with disabilities are provided reasonable accommodations to ensure their equal access to course content. If you have a documented disability and require accommodations, please contact me privately at the beginning of the semester to make arrangements for necessary classroom adjustments. Please note, you must first verify your eligibility for these through the Center for Educational Access (contact 479–575–3104 or visit http://cea.uark.edu for more information on registration procedures).

Discrimination and Sexual Harassment: Anyone experiencing discrimination and/or sexual harassment while at the university may report it to a complaint officer appointed by the Chancellor. The complaint officer will discuss any situation or event that the complainant considers discriminatory or constitutive of sexual harassment. Reports may be made by the person experiencing the harassment or by a third party, such as a witness to the harassment or someone who is told of the harassment. For more information and to report allegations of discrimination and/or sexual harassment, contact the Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance, 346 N. West Avenue (West Avenue Annex), 479-575-4019 (voice) or 479-575-3646 (tdd).

Academic Integrity: "As a core part of its mission, the University of Arkansas provides students with the opportunity to further their educational goals through programs of study and research in an environment that promotes freedom of inquiry and academic responsibility. Accomplishing this mission is possible only when intellectual honesty and individual integrity prevail. Each University of Arkansas student is required to be familiar with, and abide by, the University's 'Academic Integrity Policy,' which may be found at http://provost.uark.edu/academicintegrity/245.php
Students with questions about how these policies apply to a particular course or assignment should immediately contact their instructor."

—   Office of the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Attendance: "Student absences resulting from illness, family crisis, University-sponsored activities involving scholarship or leadership/participation responsibilities, jury duty or subpoena for court appearance, military duty, and religious observances are excusable according to university rules. The instructor has the right to require that the student provide appropriate documentation for any absence for which the student wishes to be excused. Moreover, during the

first week of the semester, students must give to the instructor a list of the religious observances that will affect their attendance."

—Academic Regulations
University of Arkansas Catalog of Studies

[INSERT YOUR ATTENDANCE POLICY HERE]

Inclement Weather: When the university is closed, all classes are also cancelled. If a weather delay affects university operations, then class will be cancelled if it is scheduled before the university resumes operations.

Assignment Submission:

[INSERT YOUR ASSIGNMENT-SUBMISSION POLICY HERE—INCLUDE A STATEMENT ON LATE SUBMISSIONS]

Essay Formatting: All essays must be typed with black ink in Roman-based 11 or 12-point font. Lines should be double-spaced on single-sided 8.5x11 inch sheets of white paper. MLA documentation style will be used in this class. The following must appear on the top left corner of the first page of each essay: Student's name, Instructor's name, Course Identifier, Date. Page numbers must appear at the top right corner of each page.

Emergency Procedures
Many types of emergencies can occur on campus, so it is crucial that we be prepared to respond appropriately in the event of severe weather, armed assailants, or fire alarms. In keeping with the detailed instructions found at emergency.uark.edu, if a weather emergency occurs during our class:
- Always follow the directions of the instructor or emergency personnel.
- If told to evacuate, do so immediately.
- If told to shelter-in-place, find a room, in the center of the building with no windows, on the lower level of the building.
- If you cannot get to the lowest floor, pick a hallway in the center of the building.

In the event of armed assailants or physical attacks (CADD):
- CALL—9-1-1
- AVOID—If possible, self-evacuate to a safe area outside of the building.
- DENY—Barricade doors with desks, chairs, bookcases or similar objects. Move to a place inside the room where you are not visible. Turn off the lights and remain quiet until police arrive.
- DEFEND- Use chairs, desks, cell phones or whatever is immediately available to distract and/or defend yourself and others from attack.

Appendix C: Assignment Prompt Templates

COMPOSITION II
ENGL 1023
[Term]
[Instructor's Name]
Essay Assignment 1: Literacy Critique[10]

Many of our conceptions, or commonsense understandings, of writing are actually misconceptions that don't hold up under close scrutiny. In the first chapter of *Writing About Writing*, you read about error, plagiarism, and "objectivity" as constructs commonly understood in a way that does not hold up when people like Williams, Porter, and Murray study them.

For this assignment, you will take on a construct or conception about writing and analyze it yourself. You might choose any construct or conception about writing, or you might look at particular conceptions such as "good writing," "writer," or "literacy/ literate."

Invention
Whatever construct or conception you choose, you should begin brainstorming by mining your own experiences. If you choose "good writing," for example, you might ask yourself:
- What is your idea of good writing?
- Where do your preconceptions of good writing come from?
- Can you think of a time when your conception of good writing didn't work or seem "right" in the context?
- Is your conception of good writing limiting in any way?
- Would you behave differently as a writer, or understand yourself differently as a writer, if you conceived of "good writing" in a different way?

Researching and Analyzing
Now conduct some outside research to help you understand whether others share your conceptions and where those conceptions might have come from. You have several options for research. Some possibilities include
- surveying or interviewing your classmates;
- setting up an online survey through Blackboard or on a social networking site like Facebook; and/or
- conducting historical research to see how your construct has been portrayed in the popular media over time. (For example, there are numerous moments in American history when news media have announced a "literacy crisis." The stories around those "literacy crises" clearly construct "literacy" to mean certain things and not others, and the meaning of the term seems to shift over time. By analyzing these articles, you could see how news media have defined literacy in ways that shape public understanding.)

---

[10]Assignment originally titled "Considering Constructs about Writing" in *Writing About Writing*, pp. 167-169.

Organization
Take some time to plan what you will write and how you will write it. By now you should realize that texts take shape differently depending on their rhetorical situations and purposes. Think and talk with your classmates and me about those with whom you want to share your reflection and research, and what the most appropriate forms (genres) are for reaching that audience. Here are some possibilities:
- Do you want to tell your high school teacher about your new understanding of "good writing"? If so, how could you best communicate with her? Via letter? If so, what are the characteristics of a formal letter?
- Do you want to write a news article to share your findings with a broader audience? If so, for what media outlet? Who are the readers of that publication? What is their prior knowledge? What is their attention span? How do they expect sources to be used?

Style
Once you determine who you want to share your findings with, and what the appropriate genre is for reaching them, you should find and analyze numerous examples of that genre. What's their typical length? Tone? What language do they use? How do they cite sources (or not)?

Drafting
Given your findings, audience, and genre, what claims do you want to make? What support will you provide for those claims? How much detail should you go into regarding that support? These answers hinge entirely on the expectations and conventions of your audience and genre.

Revising
Once you settle on workable answers to these questions, compose a rough draft of your text to share with a classmate as part of peer-review. Be sure to tell your classmate what your rhetorical situation is, and what genre you are attempting to write, so that your peer can provide useful feedback for your revision. Revise your draft and, if time allows, submit it for additional feedback from me, your instructor.

Note that this assignment asks you to take on a difficult topic and consider it in a complex and thoughtful way. It will take some time to work out your ideas carefully and then to write about them in ways that are effective and appropriate for your audience and genre, so be prepared to ask for feedback multiple times and to revise your text over a longer period of time than you might be used to.

What Makes It Good?
Consider that this is meant to be an informative text that you could give to a friend, parent, or teacher in order to help them see a writing-related concept as a construct and understand it in a new way. What makes this assignment good is your ability to do this. This is not an easy task. You are being asked to get people to reexamine something that they may not believe can or should be reexamined. Your text is "good" if the person who reads it puts it down and is somehow changed for having read it.

Documenting Sources
Use one documentation style (e.g., MLA; APA; Chicago) consistently to attribute information and expression of ideas to your sources. Every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation. The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

Minimum page length: [3.5] pages / [1100] words
Due date: [ ]
Grade value: [ ]

COMPOSITION II
ENGL 1023
[Term]
[Instructor's Name]
Essay Assignment 2: Literacy Study[11]

Collaborate with a group of classmates on a formal research study of some theme that emerges when everyone's literacy experiences are compared. You can use the following instructions to guide the writing of this kind of study, which lends itself to answering "bigger" questions or making larger points than a single literacy narrative can.

STAGE I: Conduct a Self-Study
All students in the group should post answers to the following questions on the blog set up for each group on Blackboard:
- How did you learn to write and/or read?
- What kinds of writing/reading have you done in the past?
- How much have you enjoyed the various kinds of writing/reading you've done?
- What are particularly vivid memories that you have of reading, writing, or activities that involved them?
- What is your earliest memory of reading and your earliest memory of writing?
- What sense did you get, as you were learning to read and write, of the *value* of reading and writing, and where did that sense come from?
- What frustrated you about reading and writing as you progressed through school? By the same token, what pleased you about them?
- What kind of writing/reading do you do most commonly?
- What is your favorite kind of writing/reading?
- What are your current attitudes or feelings toward reading and writing?
- Where do you think your feelings about and habits of writing and reading come from? What in your past has made you the kind of writer/reader you are today?
- Who are some people in your life who have acted as literacy sponsors?
- What are some institutions and experiences in your life that have acted as literacy sponsors?
- What have the essays by Brandt, Malcolm X, Alexie, De Voss et al., Rose, and Keller made you think about your past or present as a reader and writer?

STAGE II: Discuss and Code the Self-Study
In your group, read the answers to the self-interviews. Look together for common themes, recurring trends, or unique experiences, and determine which of these might be most interesting to further research and write about. Be sure to consider what data you will need to collect to explore these themes. (For example, do you need to interview some classmates further-or people outside the class?) Common themes that emerge from this sort of study include the role of technology in literacy, hobbies as literacy sponsors, motivations for literacy learning, privilege and access, and help overcoming literacy struggles.

---

[11]Assignment originally titled "Group Analysis of Literacy History" in *Writing About Writing*, pp. 460-462.

STAGE III: Collaborate to Write about Emergent Themes
Pair up with another student and choose an emergent theme to write a paper about. As a pair, pinpoint a specific research question related to your theme and gather whatever further data are necessary. Drawing on terms and ideas from this chapter's readings, you can then write your analysis of and findings on this theme.

STAGE IV: Planning and Drafting
Before beginning to write, the group as a whole should consider audience and genre appropriate for this paper. Discuss the following questions together:
- Who should be the audience for what you write? How can you best reach them?
- How would you like to write about your findings? In a somewhat formal, scholarly way? In a more storytelling, narrative way?
- What content/format would make this narrative most effective? Paper, text –only? Paper, text, and images? Online text and images? Online text, images, video?

As you analyze and begin to write with your partner, you should consider the following questions:
- What is your research question?
- What answers to this question do your research and analysis suggest?
- What data support each of these answers?
- What have you learned from your paper, and what does it mean for the rest of us?

Those questions will actually help you arrange your paper, too, in most cases. That is, an introduction poses your research question and explains the value of it. The following section explains how you attempted to answer the question—what methods you used to gather the data you used to try to reach answers. The next section discusses the data and what answers it led you to. Finally, the conclusion answers the question "So what?" by stating the implications that your findings seem to suggest.

If you haven't written collaboratively before, you may find it somewhat challenging to coordinate schedules with your co-writer, to decide how to break up the work of writing the piece, and to make sure you share ideas and information efficiently. You'll also most likely need to rewrite each other's material slightly in order to make it sound as though the piece was written in a single voice.

What Makes It Good?
A good analysis of an issue emerging from your group's literacy history may take a number of different shapes but will tend to have these traits in common:
- A clear, directly stated research question
- A detailed description of what methods you used to try to answer the question
- A clear explanation of what you found in your research and what conclusions it leads you to
- An statement indicating why your findings might matter
- The usual: readable, fluent prose; transitions that make the paper easy to follow; and editing and proofreading that keep the paper from distracting readers with typographical errors and mistakes

Documenting Sources

Use one documentation style (e.g., MLA; APA; Chicago) consistently to attribute information and expression of ideas to your sources. Every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation. The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

Minimum page length: [4.5] pages / [1400] words
Due date: [ ] and **Grade value**: [ ]

COMPOSITION II
ENGL 1023
[Term]
[Instructor's Name]
Essay Assignment 3: Rhetorical Analysis[12]

One way to better understand the kinds of writing and thinking valued in the university is to compare them to more popular forms of writing and thinking with which you are familiar. Toward this end, this assignment asks you to find a mass media report or discussion about a scientific finding and then trace it back to the original report from which it was taken in order to analyze the differences between the two types of discourse.

Invention
Find an interesting mass media report or discussion about science (e.g., a CNN headline, a blog entry, etc.). Trace the information back to the original research report from which it was taken. Make some initial observations about how they're different. Are there any clear similarities? Begin speculating about the reasons for those similarities and differences.

Researching and Analyzing
Analyze the differences between the original scientific report and the mass media report of the scientific finding. The technical name for what happens when a scholarly source becomes popularized is **accommodation**.

As you analyze each text, consider questions such as:
- What is the **rhetorical situation**—**exigence**, **rhetors** (writers/speakers), **audiences**, purpose, and so forth-for each text? (If necessary, review Grant-Davie's essay.)
- What are the **genres** for each text (e.g., is one a peer-reviewed research article and the other a two-minute news report)? Is there a genre shift between the original presentation of the scientist's work and its popularization? Why was one genre not appropriate or useful in the other rhetorical situation?
- How subtly or obviously are claims stated in each? How accurately are they stated? How do the scientists state the significance of their claims? How does this compare to how the media account reports their significance?
- How are nonspecialists accommodated in the mass media piece—for example, through language change, tone change, more overt statements of significance, the use of more sweeping claims (i.e., "the only kind" or "the first kind"), placement of information in the paragraph or sentence, removal of qualifiers or hedges (i.e., taking out "appears" or "suggests"), other changes in phrasing? Why were these changes made? Do they change the meaning of the original?
- What sources are used in the original science report accommodation of it? Does the accommodation go beyond the published research to include interviews or quotations from the scientists not found in the original article? Do these interview quotations

---

[12]Assignment originally titled "Analysis of Science Accommodation" in *Writing About Writing*, pp. 714-716.

include observations and conclusions not found in the original published article? Why are these changes made? What is their effect?
- Is contradictory evidence omitted in the accommodation? If so, why?
- Are unsupportable or unsupported claims included in the accommodation? If so, why?
- Is there any evidence that the scientists tried to refute claims accommodation? Given your analysis of information published about this research, did the scientists succeed in changing the claims made about their work?
- To your knowledge, did other scientists refute the claims of the original scientists after the original publication? If so, were those counter arguments ever publicized?

Now step back and consider what values are suggested by the scientists' language and what values are suggested by the media's language? For example, do scientists value objectivity and caution more than the media? What do the media seem to value? How can you explain the differences?

Organization
Consider what you found by asking yourself the following:
- What are the differences between the writing done by scientists and the writing done by those in the popular media? What do these differences tell us about the values of academic writers?
- What is hard and unfamiliar to you about the scientific writing?
- How do scientists support their claims? How does this compare to how the news media support their claims?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of each type of writing?

Now plan an essay written for incoming first-year college students in which you outline how academic discourse differs from more popular discourse. In this essay, you should note various levels of difference, from values to length to tone to sources used. It might be helpful to frame your advice in terms of the values, **conventions**, and purposes of different **activity systems** or **discourse communities**. Why and how is language used differently in the university, and particularly in the sciences?

Style and Drafting
You have a variety of options for presenting the information you have gathered to your audience of incoming students:
- You might consider writing a fairly formal and traditional research paper, starting off by making the three "moves" that John Swales outlines (see the CARS model in the Introduction to *Writing About Writing*, pp. 6-8).
- You might present your information in a less formal way, perhaps as a magazine article that includes tables or visual representations of some of the differences you've found or as an interactive Web site where you and your classmates can share your findings.
Discuss your options with me, your instructor, before beginning.

Revising
Once you settle on workable answers to these questions, compose a rough draft of your text to share with a classmate as part of peer-review. Be sure to ask your peer reviewers

- if you have explained how and why academic discourse differs from popular discourse;
- if you make clear claims and have enough support for each claim;
- where there are ideas or stretches of writing in the draft that cause confusion;
- which elements or sections in the draft are particularly effective;
- if they can provide one or two specific ideas for revision.

(Remember that the goal of peer-review is not to correct grammar and punctuation, but rather to work on improving the essay's argument and organization.)

What Makes It Good?
Once you know the differences between the science article and its accommodation, your job is to educate other students about what you have learned. You should be able to explain to them how scientific academic writing differs from more popular kinds of writing, and you should be able to help them understand why these two kinds of writing are so different. A really good analysis will not just explain what is different but why those differences exist and what they mean.

Documenting Sources
Use one documentation style (e.g., MLA; APA; Chicago) consistently to attribute information and expression of ideas to your sources. Every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation. The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

Minimum page length: [4] pages / [1200] words
Due date: [ ]
Grade value: [ ]

COMPOSITION II
ENGL 1023
[Term]
[Instructor's Name]
Essay Assignment 4: Disciplinary Analysis[13]

Choose a discourse community that has made an impact on you or one that interests you (such as your proposed academic major) and find a preliminary answer to this research question: "What are the goals and characteristics of this discourse community?" Write a four- to five-page report that tries to answer your research question based on careful observation of the community.

STAGE I: Data Collection
- Observe members of the discourse community while they are engaged in a shared activity; take detailed notes. (What are they doing? What kinds of things do they say? What do they write? How do you know who is "in" and who is "out"?)
- Collect anything people in that community read or write (their **genres**)—even very short things like forms, sketches, notes, Ims, and text messages.
- Interview at least one member of the discourse community. Record and transcribe the interview. You might ask these questions: "How long have you been a member of this [scholarly] community? Why did you choose to be part of it? What do [mention words from the **lexis**] mean? How did you learn to write [mention particular **genres**]? How do you communicate with other people in [mention specific situations, settings, roles, or purposes]?"

STAGE II: Data Analysis
First, try analyzing the data you collect using the six characteristics of Swales's discourse community:
- What are the shared goals of the [scholarly] community; why does this group exist and what does it do?
- What mechanisms do members use to communicate with each other (meetings, phone calls, e-mail, text messages, newsletters, reports, evaluations forms, video-conferencing, published articles, etc.)?
- What are the purposes of each of these mechanisms of communication (to improve performance, make money, grow better roses, share research, and so forth)?
- Which of the above mechanisms of communication can be considered **genres** (textual responses to recurring situations that all group members and understand)?
- What kinds of specialized language (**lexis**) do group members use in their conversation and in their genres? Name some examples—TESOL, "on the fly," "86," and so on. What communicative function does this lexis serve (that is, why say "86" instead of "we are out of this"?)
- Who are the "old-timers" with expertise? Who are the newcomers with less expertise? How do newcomers learn the appropriate language, genres, knowledge of the group?

---

[13]Assignment originally titled "Discourse Community Ethnography" in *Writing About Writing*, pp. 574-576.

Then, use Gee, Harris, Hyland, and Wardle for further ideas on how to analyze your data:
- Are there conflicts within the community? If so, why?
- Do some participants in the community have difficulty? Why?
- Who has authority here, and where does that authority come from?
- What are the "modes of belonging" that newcomers are attempting to use?
- What sorts of "multiliteracies" do members of this community possess?
- Are members of this community stereotyped in any way in regard to their literacy knowledge? If so, why?

STAGE III: Planning and Drafting
As you develop answers to some of these questions, start setting some priorities. Given all you have learned above, what do you want to focus on in your essay? Is there something interesting regarding the goals of the community or the types of literacies in the community? What is interesting about its lexis and mediating genres?

Decide what your refined research question is and how you will answer it. Your paper ought to have the following parts or make the following moves (unless there's a good reason not to):
- Begin with a very brief review of the existing literature (published research) on the topic ("We know X about discourse communities" [cite Swales, Gee, Harris, Wardle, and other relevant sources]).
- Name a niche ("But we don't know Y" or "No one has looked at X").
- Explain how you will occupy the niche.
- Describe your research methods.
- Discuss your findings in detail (use Wardle as an example of how to do this—quote from your notes, your interview, the texts you collected, and so on).

What Makes It Good?
Your assignment will be most successful if you've carefully collected the required data and if you've really focused on your research question in trying to answer it. The assignment asks you to show a clear understanding of what discourse communities are and to demonstrate your ability to analyze them carefully and thoughtfully. And, of course, your paper should be a strong example of craft: thoughtfully organized, fluent in its integration of supporting sources, insightful in its analysis, and well edited.

Documenting Sources
Use one documentation style (e.g., MLA; APA; Chicago) consistently to attribute information and expression of ideas to your sources. Every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation. The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

Minimum page length: [6] pages / [1800] words
Due date: [ ]
Grade value: [ ]

Appendix D: Lindsey's Syllabus Modifications

Pop Quizzes: Only the top ten quiz scores will be counted; other scores will be dropped. This will alleviate any problem if you have to miss a quiz for an excused absence – that can be one of the scores that is dropped.

Attendance: After five unexcused absences, your final grade will drop by five points for each additional absence. Use these five "free absences" wisely – you never know when you might get a flat tire or get sick.

Inclement Weather: When the university is closed, all classes are also cancelled. In addition, if the Fayetteville Public Schools are closed, my classes will be cancelled. If a weather delay affects university operations, then class will be cancelled if it is scheduled before the university resumes operations.

Assignment Submission: You need to submit all essay assignments via Safe Assign on Blackboard before the beginning of class on the due date. Without an approved excuse, any late submissions will have 10% deducted from the final grade per day after the due date.

Course Schedule with homework readings listed:[14]

UNIT 1: RECOGNIZING EXPRESSIVE CHOICES
Week 1—January 13-17
- Day 1 homework: chapter 2 in *the St. Martin's Handbook.*
- Day 2 homework: pp. 1-21 and 34-36 in *Writing about Writing* (*WAW)*
- Day 3 homework: "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community" by J. E. Porter in *WAW* and "All Writing is Autobiography" by D. M. Murray in *WAW*

Week 2—January 21-24
- Day 1: no school – MLK day
- Day 2 homework: "The Phenomenology of Error" by J. M. Williams and pp. xv-15 in *They Say/I say* (*TSIS*)
- Day 3 homework: "Teaching Punctuation as a Rhetorical Tool" by J. Dawkins in *WAW*

Week 3—January 27-31
- Day 1 homework: *TSIS* pp. 53-77
- Day 2 homework: chapters 13 & 14 in the *Handbook.*
- Day 3 homework: read *TSIS* pp. 78-101

Week 4—February 3-7
- Day 1 homework: Work on your essay.
- Day 2: **Essay 1 due February 5.** Berkenkotter's "Decisions and Revisions" and Murray's "Response of a Laboratory Rat" in *WAW*
- Day 3 homework: "Sponsors of Literacy" by D. Brandt in *WAW*

---

[14] All course schedules have been limited to the units discussed in the TA's case study.

Appendix E: Susan's Syllabus Modifications

Major Assignments and Evaluation of Grades:
      In-class writings, quizzes, & homework assignments: 10%
      Major Essay 1, Literacy Critique (1000 words):   15%
      Major Essay 2, Literacy Study (1200 words):   20%
      Major Essay 3, Rhetorical Analysis (1200 words):   15%
      Major Essay 4, Disciplinary Analysis (1500 words):   20%
      Disciplinary Analysis Presentation   10%
      Attendance: 10%
      The attendance grade is based on attendance and willingness to speak and contribute in
      class discussion and peer review groups. Missing more than two classes will directly
      affect your attendance grade; the highest possible attendance grade based on absences is
      as follows:

                      3 absences: 90 (A)
                      4 absences: 80 (B)
                      5 absences: 70 I
                      6 absences: 60 (D)
                      7 absences: 50 (F)
                      8-9 absences: 0 (F)
      For each absence after the ninth, I will deduct 5 points per day off your final grade.

Grading Scale:
      A: 90-100%   B: 80-89%
      C: 70-79%   D: 60-69%
      F: 59% and below

On major assignments that do not fall within 100 words of the minimum word requirement, I will automatically begin grading at a 75 I. That means that the assignment cannot possibly receive a score higher than a 75.

Reading notes will be our primary homework assignments. You can choose between two homework options, the Twitter option or the paper option. See "Reading Notes Guidelines" for more details.

In-class writing and homework assignments will be taken up in-class (usually at the beginning of class) and will be graded as check (✓ or 1 point), check minus (✓- or .5 points), or X (0 points). Thorough, well-written responses will be given a check. Shorter answers, answers that only address half of the question asked, or partial completions (at the discretion of the instructor) will be given a check minus. You will need to have 22 points to receive full credit for homework/in-class work. At the present time (assuming no assignments or in-class writings are added), that allows you to miss three assignments completely.

You may not make up in-class writing assignments if you miss the class on which they were assigned and taken up. Homework can be completed early if you know ahead of time that you will miss class.

Attendance Policy:
The English Department advises attendance at all class meetings. Bear in mind that class attendance affects the quality of one's work in a course and, ultimately, the quality of one's college degree.

If you miss three or more unexcused class periods, points will be deducted from your attendance score. This is non-negotiable, no matter how much you participate on days you are present. After the eighth absence, the participation grade will be 0. For each absence after the ninth, I will deduct 5 points per day off your final grade.

 On top of this, you are responsible for the material I say aloud in class. If you are not there to hear me say it, your grades will inevitably suffer.

If you have a written excuse that legitimizes your absence, provide it at the next class meeting you attend. I will not ask for it specifically, so make sure you bring it to me either at the beginning or end of class. Do not come to me and tell me you left it at home or your parents will have to mail it to you later. Do not come to me at the end of the semester with the claim that your ten absences are actually all excused.

Three tardies or early departures will count as one absence and will negatively affect your participation grade in class. You will still be marked for a tardy/early departure even if you notify me ahead of time, but keep in mind that you would have to have 3 of these for it to count as an absence.

If you are an athlete, band member, student leader, or hold some other rank that will cause you to miss class for university-excused activities, you must give me a schedule by the end of the first week of classes. If you will be absent because of religious observances, please also give me a schedule of those events by the end of the first week of classes.

Assignment Submission & Policy on Late Work:
Students will be asked to submit their drafts as hard copies only and final papers electronically on Blackboard. Additionally, they will need to bring extra printed copies for draft groups. Students who do not bring a draft and/or who do not show up on draft group day will have 10 points deducted from the 100 point maximum each paper may receive.

All work should be submitted on time, and students are responsible for ensuring that the instructor receives the paper. This means you should double-check to see that your paper was properly submitted to Blackboard (you should receive a confirmation of some sort). **To avoid a late penalty, you must submit your final essays through Blackboard no later than the beginning of the class period**. Papers submitted immediately after class or during class will be considered late. Remember, these major assignments are due online, and you can submit them

from home: they are still due even if you are unable to attend class on the day they are due. If you need to submit a paper early, that is fine.

Major assignments for this class will only be accepted one class period late (i.e., if the assignment was due by the beginning of class on Wednesday, it will only be accepted by the beginning of class on Friday) and will be given an automatic 10-point deduction from the final grade (keep in mind that if you also did not have a draft, this will mean a 20 point deduction). After next class period has passed, the major assignment will not be accepted, and for that assignment the student will earn a 0. In-class activities, homework, and/or quizzes cannot be made up.

Essay Formatting: All essays must be typed with black ink in Times New Roman 12-point font. Lines should be double-spaced. If you are conscious of paper usage, draft copies may be printed front and back. You are allowed to pick your documentation style (MLA, APA, or Chicago) for this class, so you will be expected to adhere to the format your documentation style's rules for formatting.

Blackboard and Uark Email:
As noted, students will be asked to submit an electronic copy of their final papers through the Blackboard. If classes are cancelled due to weather conditions, teacher absence, or any other reason, students should check Blackboard within one day of the cancelled class for announcements. Online readings and copies of major assignments will be posted on Blackboard as well. If, for any reason, Blackboard is not working or a link/document posted to Blackboard is not working, please contact me as soon as possible.

Students should check their Uark email regularly, as sometimes there are important announcements sent through this means. You will need to use your Uark account when contacting me through email, not your personal account. Please include an informative subject line (i.e., "Question about Summary Essay"), your name, your course and section number, and a clear statement of your question, comment or concern. I will try to respond to emails on the day they are received, but emails received after 9 pm may not be answered until the next day. Emails received on weekends may not receive replies on the same day.

Tutoring Services:
The Quality Learning Center is located in 316 Kimpel Hall and offers tutoring in writing. Visit their website at qwc.uark.edu to make an appointment or call 479-575-6747. They offer face-to-face appoints as well as email and chat tutoring. Take advantage of this free service.

Academic Integrity/Plagiarism:
There are many forms of plagiarism:
- Excessive collaboration: Students allow/have others revise their work to a point that it is no longer recognizable as that student's original work.
- Insufficient documentation or citation: Students must give credit (for another author's ideas, writing, and constructions) where credit is due.
- Patchwork plagiarism: Students copy others' work, change a few words or sentences.
- Outright theft: Students borrow, copy, or buy another's work and represent it as their own.

- Recycling: Students use an old paper that they have written for another class, published on the internet, or published in any form, and represent it as new work for this class.

SafeAssign is embedded in the Blackboard program; it will be used to analyze all of the major assignments submitted in this course. As part of university policy, instructors are required to turn plagiarism offences in to the Academic Integrity Monitor (AIM). The AIM will then go through the necessary process to determine punishment for the offense(s). If you ever have a concern about whether or not you are committing an act of plagiarism, please contact me or consult the tutoring center.

Classroom Conduct:
Students are to treat the instructor and each other with respect and courteous behavior.

Any electronic devices should be silenced and/or turned off and put away for the duration of class, unless otherwise noted. **There should be absolutely no text messaging during class.** Students may be counted absent or asked to leave the classroom if they do not comply with these guidelines. If a cellphone rings, the student should quietly turn the phone off and should not leave the class to respond to calls except in cases of emergency. If, for some reason, you need to have your phone on during class, please notify me and place the phone on vibrate.

Sleeping, reading, working on assignments for another class, and listening to music during class are not permitted. Please do not wear headphones or ear buds in class, even if they are not in use, and not even if they are draped around your neck. If you forget and engage in these activities, you will be asked to stop. If you continue to engage in these activities, you may be asked to leave class for the day and will be counted absent.

Appendix F: Sample Literacy Critique

Writing Actually CAN Have Different Meanings

Abstract

Constructs affect the way we write every day. In my research, I sought information to back up my thesis that not all writing will have the same meaning to all readers. Within my study, I used the Bible as a reference for people to provide me with an answer in their opinion on what they believed a specific verse meant. After I completed my research, I concluded that my thesis was correct.

Introduction

In literary writing, there are many constructs that we will come across. We have the idea that going against those constructs will produce a poor paper, however, I do not believe that is so in this case. The literary construct that "texts inherently "mean" something-the same "something"-regardless of who's reading them" isn't entirely true in my book (Downs, Wardle 34). Although I agree that some writing will have the same meaning to all readers, I must also say that I believe that there are times when writing will not always produce the same meaning. I find such a time when reading the Bible. Yes, the Bible is meant for people to grasp the meaning of what is written and to understand it and it is not intended to be difficult. But there are places in the Bible where people struggle more than others. At the end of this journal, I hope to have informed my readers of my opinion on this topic. From this, I propose that not all writing will have the same meaning to different readers.

Research

To back up my hypothesis, I did some research to find out how similar or dissimilar the answers were. In my study, I asked people to read a verse from the Bible. This verse says "as a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so is a fair woman which is without discretion" (*Holy Bible*, Proverbs 11:22). The people of whom I conducted my study on included youth group leaders, fellow youth group members, non-church going Christians, and myself. As well, I sought the Internet to find out an online meaning of the verse. I had trouble, myself, trying to decipher the meaning of this verse and could not come up with a meaning. One non-church going Christian claimed that to him, it meant that just because something is shiny or pretty does not mean that it is good (this being said in rough terms). As I questioned a youth group member, she and her friend agreed that the meaning was as follows: gold in a pig's snout is worthless, so a woman who doesn't take care of herself is pretty much worthless. My youth group leaders suggest that the verse 22 means a beautiful girl that does not show modesty and discretion becomes undesirable, even offensive. A girl who does not attend my church said it shows the difference between righteousness and wickedness. The ring of gold being righteousness and a woman without discretion is wicked. Concluding my research, I went to the Internet for answers. As I researched for a meaning, I found this one site, Creative Ladies Ministry, which explained it like this: women must be discreet in all that they do, whether it be by voice or clothing or financial circumstances. Whatever women do, there will be an impact in some manner. Once a woman is not discreet in what she does, she shall be like the pig, doing whatever she wants thinking that it is ok as a Christian woman (Bettencourt).

Discussion

I found that my hypothesis, texts do not always have the same meaning to all people, is correct. Throughout the study, I asked people to tell me what they thought Proverbs 11:22 meant and they responded with different suggestions. Although, I admit, some participants had similar ideas of the meaning, there were still different suggestions. I believe that people get different meanings due to different levels of understanding and comprehension of the material. Some of my participants, myself included, are not as familiar with the Bible as the others which, in my opinion, really affects the overall understanding of the verse. Also, an influence on the meaning to a person could be due to ongoing happenings in their current lives which will affect the outcome of their response. Another point that I would like to make is that no person is the same so it is fair to assume that no person or few will get the same meaning exactly. After my study on this literary construct, I found that certain texts will be easier to understand leading to more accurate and correct meanings, but other texts will require more thoughtfulness and open-mindedness in order to acquire the ideal meaning; even if it is not the desired meaning, it is close to it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank and recognize those people who participated in my study. I could not have conducted my research without you. You provided the most important aspect of my study: your meaning of Proverbs 11:22. You helped prove my point that not all writing has the same meaning to all people.

WORKS CITED

Bettencourt, Julia. "An Earring In a Pig's Snout." *Creative Ladies Ministry,* n.d. Web.

Downs, Doug and Elizabeth Wardle. "Texts/Constructs: How do Readers Read and Writers Write?" *Writing About Writing.* New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. 34-36. Print.

Holy Bible. King James Version. Tennessee: Holman Bible Publishers. Print.

Appendix G: Neli's Syllabus Modifications

Assignment Grade Distribution:

Major Writing Assignments:		Other Assignments:	
Literacy Critique	10%	In-Class Assignments	10%
Literacy Study	20%	Drafts, Proposals & Annotated Bibliographies	15%
Rhetorical Analysis	20%		
Disciplinary Analysis	25%		
		TOTAL	100%

Attendance Policy: Since the classroom is the place where students and instructors meet to engage in learning, attendance is **required.** I will take roll at the beginning of each class. 2 unexcused absences can be tolerated. **(This does not excuse you from exams or projects due dates.)** 2 points will be deducted from your grade for each absence beyond the two allowed unless students provide appropriate documentation such as doctor's note, court document, etcetera. For extreme situations that may result in unscheduled absences, please contact me to discuss possible arrangements.

Assignment Submission: Unless you have documentation for an excused absence, in-class work cannot be made up and you will lose the points for that assignment. If you do miss a class, it is your responsibility to <u>follow the syllabus, get the notes from a student in class and be prepared for the following class.</u>

Turn in **ONE HARD COPY** of each assignment on the date it is due. You **must also submit a copy** to Blackboard's **SafeAssign.**
Unless an extension has been requested and granted in advance of the deadline, all assignments will be accepted with a penalty of 5points for **each day** past the due date. After three days, the essay will be accepted for **half-credit**, up to a week past the due date. An absence does not justify a late paper. However, with the proper documentation discussed in the absence policy, I will consider extenuating circumstances. Please note that you must complete **all** assignments to pass.

Essay Formatting: All essays must be typed with black ink in Roman-based 11 or 12-point font. Lines should be double-spaced, on single-sided 8.5 (times) x11 inch sheets of white paper. MLA documentation style will be used in this class. The following must appear on the top left corner of the first page of each essay: Student's name, Course Identifier, Date. Page numbers must appear at the bottom of each page. For more details on MLA documentation style, see (St. Martin's Pg. 300 & 337).

Cheating
Unless I have specified directly, **all work is independent work**. Each University of Arkansas student is required to be familiar with, and abide by, the University's 'Academic Integrity Policy,' which may be found at http://provost.uark.edu/. Keep any and all drafts of your work for documentation purposes, especially drafts I have commented on. Any academic dishonesty will result in a referral to the Academic Integrity Monitor.

Classroom Conduct: In order to facilitate learning, we all must cultivate an environment of mutual respect. To engage in a discussion, raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you. While working in groups, please show courtesy and helpfulness to others and stay on task. I expect you to be on-time, prepared, and focused on our classwork.
Do not use technological devices during class. Set your cellphones on silent or vibrate. Behavioral problems may result in a reprimand, a request to leave class, and/or a referral to the Division of Student Affairs.

Available Resources: I encourage the use of campus resources such as the Quality Writing Center (Kimpel 315). They will help you one-on-one at any stage of the writing process (qwc.uark.edu). The Library's Research Help Desk can be a good resource for finding scholarly sources for your paper topic.

** For questions related to the course, feel free to come during my office hours or schedule a time to meet. To get the most out of this class, I advise you to show up, do the work, and participate.

[…]

(Unit 2) Recognizing Oneself as a Writer

February 6th: Paper 1 Due/ Introduction to Unit 2.
- Discussion of Sherman Alexie's essay
- *TSIS* 55-75
- **Choose partner, group work**
- **Homework:** Read "Sponsors of Literacy" by Deborah Brandt in *WAW*.
- Decide about your interview and bring a draft of survey or Questionnaire

February 11th: Define Literacy/ Introduction to Paper 2
- Discussion of D. Brandt's "Sponsors of Literacy"
- Get started on Paper 2
- **Homework:** Read "The Future of Literacy" by D. DeVoss et al. in *WAW*.

February 13th: Literacy Theory
- Discussion of D. DeVoss et al.'s text .
- Homework: Read "The Risky Business of Group Work"

February 18th: Group Writing Strategies
- Discussion "The Risky Business of Group Work"

February 20th: Group writing/ Drafts
- Bring drafts to next class for revisions

February 25th-27th: Revision workshops.

(Unit 3) Evaluating the Writing of Others

March 4th: Paper 2 Due/ Research Strategies

SMH 251-263: introducing/reviewing the concept of an annotated bibliography
- **Homework:** Read "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents" by K. Grant-Davie in *WAW*.
- Keep an Annotated Bibliography
- Work on a research proposal

March 6th: Rhetorical Reading Strategies
- Discussion of K. Grant-Davie's text
- **Homework:** read "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning" by C. Haas & L. Flower in *WAW*.

March 11th: Evaluating the Writing of Others
- Discussion of C. Haas & L. Flower
- **Homework:** Read pp. 121-137 *(TSIS);* Read "Reading and Writing without Authority" by A.M. Penrose & C. Geisler in *WAW*.

March 13th: Introduction to Essay 3—Rhetorical Analysis

- Continue planning and researching essay 3. Bring Annotated Bibliography for at least 3 entries to next class.
- Discussion of A.M. Penrose & C. Geisler
- **Homework:** Read "Helping Students Use Textual Sources Persuasively" by M. Kantz in *WAW*.

March 18th: Rhetorical Analysis
- Discussion of M. Kantz
- *TSIS* Ch. 13
- Write draft for Peer Workshops and bring next class

March 20th: Peer Workshops
- *TSIS* Ch. 14
- Further revision of Essay 3
- Sign up for Individual Conferences

March 24 th 28th : Spring Break

April 1st- 3rd : Individual Conferences. Regular class cancelled. Come to your sign up time.

Appendix H: Courtney's Syllabus and Prompt Modifications

Assignment Grade Distribution:

Major Writing Assignments: (points)   Other Assignments:

Literacy Critique   <u>10</u>   Critique Re-write   <u>10</u>

Rhetorical Analysis   <u>20</u>   Daily Assignments   <u>15</u>

Literacy Study   <u>20</u>   (In-class writing, quizzes, and homework)

Disciplinary Analysis <u>25</u>

TOTAL   100

Attendance: Attendance affects your daily grade. If you miss class, you cannot make up daily assignments. I will drop your three lowest daily grades.

Classroom Decorum:
- Please *silence* and *put away* all phones and all other electronic devices before coming to class unless I have given you permission to use them. At times, smart phones can enhance a classroom discussion; however, texting, browsing, or playing games during class is unacceptable.
- No laptop computers or recording devices may be used during class unless you have documentation from the CEA that these are necessary for your learning.
- If you have documentation for any special accommodations through the CEA office, see me early in the semester so I will be aware of your needs.
- If you are having difficulty with the class or have other concerns, please see me as these occasions occur instead of waiting until the end of the semester when it is too late for me to help you with your work. Come see me during my office hours, or email me to set up a time to meet with you. Also, note that the Quality Writing Center in Kimpel is also an available resource: qwc.uark.edu
- Check your UARK email and Blackboard regularly for class announcements.

ENGL 1023 Course Schedule

Monday, February 24, 2014	Literacy Sponsors	**Homework:** Read "Protean Shapes" p. 367-393
Wednesday, February 26, 2014	Defining Literacies	**Homework:** Read "Learning to Read" p. 353-360
Monday, March 3, 2014	Defining Discourse Community /Narrative Writing	**Homework:** Establish contact with interviewee.
Wednesday, March 5, 2014	Interviewing/Organizing	**Homework:** Write Outline
Monday, March 10, 2014	Conferences	**Homework: Conferences**
Wednesday, March 12, 2014	Conferences	**Homework: Conferences**
Monday, March 17, 2014	Peer Review	**Homework:** Submit essay via safeassign.

Wednesday, March 19, 2014	**Essay 3: Literacy Study Due**	**Homework:** Read "Discourse Community" p. 466-478
March 24-28, 2014	Spring Break	**Homework:** Read "Discourse Community" p. 466-478
Monday, March 31, 2014	Discourse(s)	**Homework:** Bring one source to class
Wednesday, April 2, 2014	Language Analysis	**Homework:** Read "Literacy, Discourse" p. 481-494
Monday, April 7, 2014	Integrating Sources	**Homework:** Find 2 sources. Collect Data
Wednesday, April 9, 2014	Outlining	**Homework:** Outline
Monday, April 14, 2014	Conferences	**Homework:** Write essay
Wednesday, April 16, 2014	Conferences	**Homework:** Write essay
Monday, April 21, 2014	Peer Review/Presentation Assignment	**Homework:** Submit essay via safeassign.
Wednesday, April 23, 2014	**Essay 4: Discourse Analysis Due Presentations**	**Homework:** Presentations
Monday, April 28, 2014	**Presentations**	**Homework:** Presentations
Wednesday, April 30, 2014	**Presentations**	**Homework:** Submit Re-written Literacy Critique

Note: The above schedule is provided for reading and assignment preparation and may be adjusted to suit the progress of the course. The homework tab is filled in for some assignments, but the progress of the course will likely call for more homework assignments. Some of the tabs are left blank for you to fill in your assignments for the upcoming class period. It is highly recommended that you print this document and make use of that feature to help you meet deadlines.

Assignment 2: Rhetorical Analysis of Two Sources in Your Field
Due: Wednesday, February 19, 2014

Articles:
When people in a field write for other scholars and professionals in the discipline, they operate differently than when people write about a topic for a generalist audience in more popular media.

For this project, you need to find and to read two articles **written in the last two years**:
- The **first** should be an article in a **scholarly/professional journal in your field**—a publication written by professionals, academic or otherwise, in the field for other professionals in the field to read.
- The **second** should be an article **on the same topic (or a *very* closely related one) written for a generalist/popular audience**—educated people who are interested in your field but not necessarily professionals or experts in it.

To find the **scholarly/professional journal article**, you will need to refer to previous research you have done in your field or ask professors or graduate students which are the best journals for use by undergraduates. You do not want a journal article that is so advanced that you have no idea what it means. However, some uncertainty is fine. You are not being asked to *fully understand* every word in the article. Yet, you will want to do some side research or ask questions of other professionals or peers if you have uncertainty.

To find the **popular/generalist article**, use the generalist databases at the University of Arkansas Mullins Library. Also, **consult a reference librarian in Mullins**. I would highly recommend this if you have any questions. You may find a generalist articles online, but be sure that you come to me if you have any questions. *Popular Science* online is not the same as TMZ's website.

Writing Instructions:
Your paper should be a straightforward, academic comparison-contrast paper, **around 3-5 pages**, **12-point Times New Roman font**.

Analysis is separating a whole into its parts to better understand it. *Rhetoric* means the use of language for a persuasive or impressive effect. So, I am asking you to break down the *rhetorical, or persuasive,* parts of the articles and how they are used to reach their audience. To do the rhetorical analysis, follow these steps:

1. Carefully read your articles and brainstorm the multiple rhetorical issues. Try to answer most to all of the following questions **before you start to write on each article**. Write these out in short, but complete, responses. Not all of these answers need be in the analysis, but it may give you a good place to begin.
   a. What is the author's background? Why is he or she qualified to write about this topic? This may involve a little research. You can Google if you need to.
   b. Where and when was the article published? From what type of journal or periodical or website does it come?
   c. What is the article's topic?
   d. **What is the **thesis or main claim** of the article?

e. **Who is the intended **audience?** What is the **purpose of the article:** to inform, to explain a new idea, to persuade, to analyze, share a personal experience, etc.?

f. What are the **supporting or secondary claims**? These are usually organized in a way that highlights them: their own sections, paragraphs, visual aids, etc.

g. What types of **evidence** does the author (or authors) use to support his/her thesis? Figures? Statistical evidence? Personal observation or narrative? Experience? Reasoning? Quotes from other authorities? Etc?

h. How is the article **organized** overall? How are the paragraphs, sections, or visuals structured?

i. How have visual aids been incorporated (photos, charts, graphs, etc.)?

j. What is the article's **tone**? Is it objective, playful, bitter, even, inspired, etc.?

k. How formal or informal is the language? What field-specific terminology do you see? Jargon? What types of words or ideas are defined, for instance?

l. How would you describe the **style** of the author's writing? Short or long sentences? Statements or questions? Active or passive voice? First, second, third person? Vivid descriptions, scenes, dialogue, imagery?

m. **What types of **appeals (logical, ethical, emotional)** does the author make?

n. **What **fallacies** do you recognize in the article?

2. Set up Project 2 as an essay that uses a documentation style. Pretend that your **audience** is a group of professionals and peers (a course in your field perhaps) that are interested in how these texts are written and how rhetorical approaches affect the content of the article.

3. Organize your essay in a clear and logical manner to compare and contrast the decisions being made by the two authors. We will further discuss organization in class.

Introduce the purpose of your writing by explaining the need for your rhetorical analysis and by giving some **background information on the authors and the printed or online sources that have published their respective works**. You should also use your introductory paragraph to summarize briefly the two texts' main topics and ideas. In addition, a brief insight into the rhetorical approaches of each is needed. Therefore, this could be more than one paragraph.

In the body of your essay, analyze what you consider to be the most important rhetorical approaches of the texts (i.e., the key choices made by the writer in composting their texts). Be specific and organize your essay logically so that it is clear that you are comparing and contrasting the texts and, in particular, the ways in which they are composed to meet the different sets of audience expectations. Here give **specific examples and reasoning** you find in the text. Most of the questions in #1 relate to the body paragraphs.

Conclude your report by summarizing the key similarities and differences in the rhetorical strategies. Also, explain how these two texts demonstrate **how well the writers achieve their purposes and reach their audiences**. You might even make some claims about what this rhetorical analysis says about the writing in your field.

4. Review your manuscript format and make sure your paper aligns with it. Also, **revise**.
Due: Wednesday, February 19, 2014.

COMPOSITION II
ENGL 1023
Spring 2014
Essay Assignment 3: Literacy Study

This assignment asks you to:
1. Conduct a self-study and write your own literacy history*
2. Collaborate with another student and compare and analyze your literacy histories OR Interview someone outside of class about their literacy history.
3. Find a common theme, reoccurring trend, or unique experience from those literacy histories that you would like to further research and write about.
   (common themes that emerge from this sort of study include but are not limited to: the role of technology in literacy, hobbies as literacy sponsors, motivations for literacy learning, privilege and access, and help overcoming literacy struggles)
4. Begin planning and drafting your paper by gathering whatever further data are necessary to explore your research topic (Do you need to interview some classmates further? Do you know what has already been said about the topic from other written sources?).
   a. Draw on terms and ideas from the readings in class (Brandt, Heath, Malcolm X) to support your analysis and findings on this theme.
5. Write a good analysis of an issue emerging from you and your partner's literacy history. A good analysis may take a number of different shapes but will tend to have these traits in common:
   a. A clear, directly stated research question
   b. A detailed description of what methods you used to try to answer the question
   c. A clear explanation of what you found in your research and what conclusions it leads you to
   d. A statement indicating why your findings matter
   e. The usual: readable, fluent prose; transitions that make the paper easy to follow; and editing and proofreading that keep the paper from distracting readers with typographical errors and mistakes

Documenting Sources
Use one documentation style (e.g., MLA; APA) consistently; every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation. The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

Look at pg. 442 in *Writing about Writing* for an example paper submission for this assignment.

Minimum page length: 4 pages
Due date: Wednesday, March 19th and Grade value: 20 pts.

*Literacy History guiding questions
- How did you learn to write and/or read?
- What kinds of writing/reading have you done in the past?

- How much have you enjoyed the various kinds of writing/reading you've done? Why?
- What are particularly vivid memories that you have of reading, writing, or activities that involved them?
- What is your earliest memory of reading and writing?
- What sense did you get, as you were learning to read and write, of the *value* of reading and writing, and where did that sense come from?
- What frustrated you about reading and writing as you progressed through school? By the same token, what pleased you about them?
- What kind of writing/reading do you do most commonly or is your favorite?
- What are your current attitudes or feelings toward reading and writing and where do they come from?
- What in your past has made you the kind of writer/reader you are today?
- What people, institutions, and experiences have acted as literacy sponsors in your life?
- What have the essays by Brandt, Malcolm X, and Heath made you think about your past or present as a reader and writer?

Appendix I: Sample Literacy Study

The Impact of Social Media on Writing

The world is constantly changing from day to day. New inventions and devices are making it easier for us to communicate and stay in touch. Social media can be attributed to the new ways in which we talk, act, and write. Some of the things one will be informed about throughout this essay are Facebook, Twitter, and Pintrest. You will see what all of these social media sites are, how many different generations are using Facebook today, who really uses Twitter, and the contrast from Facebook and Twitter to Pintrest. Hopefully, after reading this essay you will have a better understanding of what these social media sites are, how they work, and how they affect our writing styles in our everyday lives.

Facebook, created in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, is one of the most popular social media sites still to this day, connecting people from all over the globe. Facebook allows users to post photos with captions, statuses that do not have a character limit unlike Twitter, which will be further discussed later, and send private messages to one person or a group of people. When you accept someone else's "friend" request, it allows them to read all of your posts and you can in turn read theirs as well.

Facebook has the ability to affect your writing because there is not any limit on how many characters you can use. If someone starts to use slang or bad grammar on Facebook in statuses and posts, then it will most likely become a habit and show up in their academic writing. On the other hand, if someone writes properly on Facebook, those good habits will start to show up in their writing. Depending on how you use Facebook and how you write makes all the difference. Also, if you are friends with people on Facebook with bad writing habits and are consistently reading those posts, that might hurt your writing style(Ralston, 2010).

When Facebook was first created, it attracted many teenagers between 13-16. As technology has advanced, many older generations have flocked to Facebook. Many adults that are on it use it to keep in contact with old high school and college friends that they lost touch with. My older sister and I first started off on Facebook and now, a few years later, my aunts, uncles, grandparents and other older family members use it religiously while my sister and I have moved on to other social media sites. To my generation now, Facebook is seen as the social media site full of old family members and distant friends. My prediction for Facebook is that it will eventually die off and become a thing of the past as younger generations move on to more technologically advanced social media sites.

Some may remember back when Twitter was first created in 2006. Although this popular social media site was created eight years ago, it only just recently within the last couple years took off and became the new "Facebook" of our time. Twitter allows its users to send tweets that contain 140 characters or less to each other. These "tweets" can be compared to how a basic text message would work only for everyone to see through the Internet. Tweets are used by typing the "@" sign then the person's username that you are trying to contact following directly after with a space and then the message you wish to send. Other features of Twitter would be retweeting someone else's tweet, favoriting someone else's tweet, or even sending a direct message to someone. Direct messages give the advantage of talking to someone, but privately through the network. These direct messages are also of 140 characters(Zeevi, 2013).

Some may ask then: how does Twitter affect our writing skills if we are only given 140 characters to say what we are trying to say? The answer may not always be defined as "good" or "bad," but rather a multitude of answers that depend on many different factors. These factors can include what the person's message is, how long that message is, and who the person is. For

example, if a well-known business was trying to relay a message to thousands of viewers, they would not use bad grammar or writing, instead they would shorten their message to make it short and sweet, full of good grammar and spelling. Now, if you were writing a tweet and the only people who followed you, which would be the people who saw this tweet, were your friends from high school and you had a lengthy message to write, then you might use wrong grammar or bad spelling. With such a large percentage of people who actually do use twitter, there is no right or wrong answer to what extent Twitter actually affects good writing skills, but if you were to learn how to speak and write correctly before using such a social media site then there is a larger percentage that you will continue to use your skills in social media as well.

Lastly, when considering Twitter in writing, you should also look at who actually uses the social media site. Many people within the business world use Twitter and may even have a person within their company whose main job is to update Twitter and advertise their company's products. Using hashtags (#), companies can trend their message. Television shows, newscasts, and other forms of media use Twitter as well. Often times, you will find the hashtag located at the corner of a show you may be watching which tells how you can find on Twitter what other people are talking about on the same subject, such as a juicy new episode, song, or even the news and give your feedback. This can be compared to the pages found on Facebook that you "like" to receive updates. Twitter would be considered a more interactive and efficient way to advertise because of the easy communication from consumer to producer.

New social media site are beginning to evolve unlike Facebook and Twitter. One of these sites known as Pintrest, which came about in 2010 can be considered a new way of viewing things. Pintrest is a fairly new and revolutionary social media site used for self-benefit by visual discoveries. Pictures known as "pins" can be found in different categories known as "boards."

These boards include some of the popular everyday subjects such as food, beauty, fitness, DIY, and others.

Considering a large portion of Pintrest is visual, this leaves little room for writing. After viewing a picture of interest, you can click the picture, which will then lead to an outside link describing how to create that beauty style, recipe, health tips, or item. Instead of Pintrest users giving the advice, most users are actually the ones viewing what others wrote. The writing being done by others has little to no affect on the users because of the short and precise articles being read. Reading few of these articles will not change a person's writing style or how they choose to write on the Internet. Most times these articles are actually old ideas already written and are just now being brought into the light by an interesting picture that catches the eye.

After looking at Facebook and Twitter, it is evident that Pintrest is very different from these social media sites. From the business stand point to the personal use of these sites, you can see how these three contrast to each other. Facebook and Twitter being a more "what's on your mind" type of writing and advertisement based site compared to Pintrest, a visual aid "do it yourself" type of help site that allows you to read other's posts and ideas. Facebook and Twitter would definitely have a greater impact on writing, if any, than Pintrest in the long run.

As you can see, social media is constantly changing with new and innovative ideas. Who knows what new social media site will come about within the next few years and change the way we interact with each other even more so than we do now. Social media sites are powerful tools that must not be taken lightly. How you use social media can affect the way you write, think, and act, as well as, how others view you based off of your writing. As you can see from this essay it is important to always have good writing so that bad habits do not start to incorporate themselves in everyday writing and academics.

Works Cited

Ralston, K. "Facebook Affects Students Writing." *The Battalion Online.* 23 March 2010. Web. 24 February 2014.

Zeevi, D. "Twitter 101: What is Twitter Really About?" *Social Media Today,* 12 April 2013. Web. 25 Feb. 2014.

Appendix J: Lisa's Syllabus and Prompt Modifications

Course Policies:
Attendance
I will take roll every time class meets. <u>Five or more unexcused absences will result in a full letter deduction from your overall grade in the class.</u> This means that even if you made full points on all of the assignments the highest grade you can receive in the class is a B. Student attendance in this class is important, and grades will reflect the time and consideration a student commits to attending class. ***Note***: If your absence is unexcused, it is your responsibility to ask a classmate what you have missed. If I assigned journal writing or class work, you will need to get those materials (and any notes from class that day) from a classmate and complete that work on your own time.

Classroom Discipline Policy
Please behave appropriately during class. If you are talking with a classmate during the lecture or class work time, I will ask you to move seats. If it happens again, you will be asked to leave the class, and you will receive an unexcused absence for the day. Keep in mind that five or more unexcused absences will lower your overall grade in the class a full letter grade.

Assignment Submissions
All papers must follow the various formats discussed in class and designated on the paper assignment sheets. <u>You are required to submit **two** final draft copies of each paper at the beginning of class they day they are due</u>. If there are not two copies, I will not grade your paper. Please staple each copy together, and then paperclip the two copies. Keep in mind that printing on campus is time consuming; anticipate long lines at the printers and adjust your schedule accordingly so you can get to class on time when papers are due.

Peer Review Workshop and Conferences
A fully completed rough draft of each paper will be due for either Peer Review Workshop or for one-on-one conference. I will check off that you brought your draft at the start of workshop or conference and will award the 25 points at that time. If you are absent the day your rough draft is due, you are expected to take your rough draft to the Quality Writing Center—before the final draft is due—for a tutoring session in order to earn the points. <u>To receive credit, have the QWC send me a notification email detailing the results of your session.</u> You can schedule an appointment online at http://qwc.uark.edu/

Late Work
Important Note: **I do not accept late papers or award points for in-class assignments unless you have a legitimate, documented excuse.** <u>If you have a documented excuse, you will be allowed one full week after the due date to get your make-up work to me.</u> If you know you will be absent the day your paper is due, please make arrangements with me to hand it in early. <u>Please note</u>: It is your responsibility to come to me with your documented excuse, as well as to ask about make-up work.

Blackboard Policies

Please note that this syllabus is available on Blackboard throughout the semester. I will post the Paper Assignment Sheets and various other handouts on Blackboard before class on the day we cover them; you will have access to these materials during and after class. I encourage the use of laptops/ tablets and will specify when to use them during my class.

Grading Scale (On a point system)
The following assignments and their respective weights are:

Paper #1 (Literacy Critique)	200
Paper #2 (Digital Literacy Study)	200
Paper #3 (Rhetorical Analysis)	200
Paper #4 (Disciplinary Analysis)	200
Paper Rough Drafts (25 points each)	100
Journal Responses	100
Total	1000

900-1000=A; 800-899=B; 700-799=C; 600-699=D; 0-599=F

English 1023, Spring 2014 Schedule

Please note that the syllabus is subject to change at the instructor's discretion; check your email before class for updates and reminders. The homework listed is to be completed by the next class.

Unit III.: Evaluating the Writing of Others
Week Nine

Mar. 11 Discuss Penrose & Geisler article
      Journal Response (10 points)
      Homework: Read pp. 121-128 in *They Say I Say (TSIS)*

Mar. 13 Discuss Paper Three (Stage 1)
      Journal Response (10 points)
      Homework: Review Ch. 10-11 in *SMH,* pp. 220-250.

Week Ten

Mar. 18 ***Class meets in Kimpel 206B*** for a presentation on library database
      research
      Librarian available for consultation
      Homework: Based on the scholarly article you found in class today, complete Stage 2 of
      the Paper Three assignment sheet for homework; Stage 2 Journal Response is due next
      class for 10 points.

Mar. 20 ***Class meets in Kimpel 206B*** to begin drafting Paper Three
      Examine Sample Papers

Discuss Paper Three (Stage 3)
Homework: Read Ch. 13-14 in *TSIS*, pp. 156-192; Rough draft of Paper Three due April 3rd for Peer Review Workshop

Week Eleven—March 25 & 27—Spring Break

Week Twelve

Apr. 1 ***Class meets in Kimpel 206B*** to continue drafting
Review general expectations for Paper Three
Review MLA format
Homework: Rough draft due next class, April 3rd

Apr. 3 **Paper Three Rough Draft Due; Peer Review Workshop** (25 points)
Homework: Paper Three final draft due April 8th

Unit IV.: Preparing for an Academic Discipline

Week Thirteen

Apr. 8 **Paper Three Due** (two copies)
Introduction to Paper Four Assignment
Homework: Read pp. 520-533: "Identity, Authority, and Learning to Write in New Workplaces" by E. Wardle in *WAW*

Apr. 10 Discuss Paper Four Assignment Sheet (Stage 1)
Journal Response (10 points)
Class Discussion

Week Fourteen

Apr. 15 Discuss Paper Four (Stage 2)
Class discussion
Journal Response; Extra Credit Points
Homework: Review pp. 30-51 in *TSIS*

Apr. 17 ***Class Meets in Kimpel 206B*** to draft Paper Four
Sign up for conference
Homework: Conduct your interview; review Ch. 16 in *SMH;* Paper Four Rough Draft due at your conference (25 points)

Week Fifteen (Apr. 22 & 24) *Regular class does not meet this week. Conferences will be held in my office, Kimpel 227, during normal class time.*

Week Sixteen
Apr. 29 *Individual Conferences—Regular class does not meet.*

May. 1 **Paper Four Final Draft Due** (one copy)
    <u>Note:</u> This is our last day of class; we do not meet during finals week.

Paper Assignment Three: Rhetorical Analysis

One way to better understand the kinds of writing and thinking valued in the university is to compare them to more popular forms of writing and thinking with which you are familiar. Toward this end, this assignment asks you to find a mass media report or discussion about a scientific finding and then trace it back to the original report from which it was taken in order to analyze the differences between the two types of discourse. If you are unable to find the original report, finding a scholarly, academic article on the same topic is acceptable. My main requirement is that you use the library database to find the scholarly article. Keep in mind the librarians in Mullin's are available for consultation if you have trouble with your research.

Your audience for this essay is incoming first-year college students. Your purpose is to outline how academic discourse differs from more popular discourse. In this essay, you should note various levels of difference, from values to length to tone to sources used. Why and how is language used differently in the university, and particularly in the sciences?

STAGE 1: Exploring Your Mass Media Source

Find an interesting mass media report or discussion about science (e.g., a CNN headline, a blog entry, etc.). Make some initial observations about the text by responding to the following prompts.

- What is the rhetorical situation—Who is the writer(s), what is/are (if any) their qualifications? What is their writing purpose, i.e.—why did they write this text?

- What are the genres for the text (online news forum, blog, a two-minute news report)?
    - What moves made in the writing help show you its genre?
    - How "good" is this genre? Does it have a wide audience/media popularity, good design, a solid reputation? How can you tell?

- What significant, important claims are being made? What language or signals in the writing help you see this?

- How can you tell this was written by nonspecialists for nonspecialists?
    - For example, do you notice any sweeping claims (i.e., "the only kind" or "the first kind")?
    - Any instances where scientific terms and or scientific processes have been defined for the reader?
    - How much time does the author spend on background information/setting the scene for the information he/she is about to present?

- What sources, if any, are referenced in the text? Interviews with an expert? Quotes from more academic/scientific studies or reports? What is their effect on you, the reader?

- Evaluate the source(s)—do you feel as though there are unsupported claims in the text? How could the author make him/herself sound more credible?

- What, overall, does this mass media type of writing seem to value? Excitement? Intrigue? Reliability? Predictions about the future? Explain why you think this.

Paper Three
STAGE 2: Comparing Your Sources

Analyze the differences between the scientific report and the mass media report of the scientific finding. Please refer to your responses to the mass media article from our Stage 1 assignment sheet as you respond to these prompts for homework tonight. This will be due next class (Thursday, March 20th) and counts as a 10-point journal.

As you analyze each text, consider questions such as:

- What is the **rhetorical situation**— (writers/speakers), audiences, and purpose, for each text?

- What are the **genres** for each text (e.g., is one a peer-reviewed research article and the other a two-minute news report)? Why was one genre not appropriate or useful in the other rhetorical situation?

- How are **claims** stated in each? Are any claims left out of the mass media article? Why do you think that is? How much detail & page space is given (or not given) to explaining claims in each document? Why do you think that is?

    o Consider the following when it comes to how claims are treated in each: language (use of field-related jargon, if it is explained or not explained), tone (professional vs. enthusiastic or cautious), the use of more sweeping language (i.e., "the only kind" or "the first kind"), placement of claims in the article (throughout, beginning, middle, or end), use of qualifiers or hedges ("appears" or "suggests"), and other changes in phrasing between the two documents? What do these differences suggest overall about each author's **authority** on the topic?

- Compare sources. What **sources** are used in the science report vs. the mass media report? Are there any shared sources? Who shows more **authority** when using sources? Examine how can you tell that the mass media author is an **outsider**, and the scientific author is an **insider** when it comes to how they use their sources.

    o For example: Which article names more scientists, research, and studies than the other when integrating sources? Does the mass media article go beyond the published research to include interviews or quotations from the scientists? Do these interviews or quotes include observations and conclusions not found in the science report? Are any major findings left out of the mass media article? Why? Are unsupported claims included in the mass media article? If so, what effect does this have on how your view of the author's authority?

- Now step back and consider what **values** are suggested by the scientists' language and what values are suggested by the media's language? For example, do scientists value objectivity and caution more than the media? What do the media seem to value? How can you explain the differences?

STAGE 3: Shaping Your Paper

You should **shape your responses from Stages One & Two into a traditional five-paragraph essay** made up of an introductory paragraph, three body paragraphs, and a conclusion. In your body paragraphs you should bring in examples from both articles to show how they compare/relate, and each body paragraph should have a clear, distinct topic that is explored—for example, body paragraph one could be a comparison/analysis of the **rhetorical situations** (purpose, audience, & genre) from both articles, bp two could deal with the differences in **how claims are made** between the articles, and bp three could cover how each article's **sources/evidence** are used. Your conclusion paragraph should deal with how the **values** between the articles seem to differ; for example, do scientists value objectivity and caution more than the media? What do the media seem to value? How can you explain the differences?

Remember, your audience for this essay is incoming first-year college students. Your purpose is to outline how academic discourse differs from more popular discourse. In this essay, you should note various levels of difference, from values to length to tone to sources used. It might be helpful to frame your advice in terms of the values, conventions, and purposes of discourse communities. Why and how is language used differently in the university, and particularly in the sciences?

Specifications

This paper should be between 3 ½-4 pages long, MLA format, with correct in-text citations, and a Works Cited page. You will bring a fully written rough draft to class on April 3rd for Peer Review Workshop, worth 25 points. If you bring an outline or an incomplete draft to class keep in mind that I cannot award the full points.

Outline
Because this is the most "traditional" of the assignments we've worked on this semester, I decided to provide an outline and an MLA checklist to help as you draft.

a. **Introductory paragraph**

   i. Introduce the general topic of your articles. Provide necessary background info.
   ii. Include both article titles in quotes, and name all authors.
   iii. Write a thesis statement that explains, in general, how the writing differs between the articles.
   iv. Write an essay map that describes the 3 topics that will be discussed in the body paragraphs of the paper. This can be 3 sentences long, 1 per topic.

    b. Next include **3 body paragraphs** that analyze the differences in rhetorical strategies in the two articles.

        i. <u>Body Paragraph 1</u>:
           1. <u>Topic Sentence</u>: Use a sentence very similar to your 1st essay map sentence to start off this paragraph, clearly stating both authors' views on topic 1.
           2. Next, using summary, paraphrases, and a quote from the mass media article, provide examples that show your topic.
           3. Next, using summary, paraphrases, and a quote from the scientific article, provide examples that show how the writing differs between the two articles on the same topic.
           4. <u>Note</u>: Be sure to use parenthetical citations for all paraphrases and quotes from the articles: "Quote…."(Author1 277).   Paraphrase (Author2 295).
           5. <u>Note</u>: Please reference *TSISR* page 692 for a list of transition words & phrases that show **Contrast**. Use transitions throughout your paper to help show the difference between the authors' views.
        ii. <u>B.P. 2</u>: Repeat the same set-up as above for topic 2
        iii. <u>B.P. 3</u>: Repeat the same set-up as above for topic 3.

    c. **Conclusion**—Should address why and how language used differently in the university, and particularly in the sciences, versus in the mass media. Address how the values between the articles seem to differ.

MLA Format Reference Sheet

<u>Note</u>: All of this information is found on the QWC website and in your St. Martin's Handbook. If you have additional questions, you should reference those resources.

- General MLA paper format:
  - Double spaced, size 12, Times New Roman font (what this font is),
  - Double-spaced heading in the upper left corner: your name, Ms. Angelino, ENGL 1023, due date)
  - Your last name & the page number in the upper right corner (go to header/footer in Microsoft Word to set this up)
    - **Make sure you switch the font in the header to Times New Roman!**
  - 1-inch margins—no more, no less!
  - Indent each paragraph one-half inch, or five spaces

- Works Cited page—Start on a new page and make sure your last name & page # are in the top right corner. Make sure the 2nd line of your entry is indented. <u>**Your Works Cited should have two entries, one for each article.**</u> You can use the "cite it" button on the database website, select MLA format, and it will do the entry for you. As for your mass media article, reference the St. Martin's handbook for templates.

Paper Assignment Four: Disciplinary Analysis

For this paper, you will research and analyze a specific discourse community and find a preliminary answer to this research question: **"What are the goals and characteristics of this discourse community?"** You will then write a four- to five-page report that tries to answer your research question based on careful study of the community. The discourse you should explore in this paper is one that takes place in your chosen field of study.

Pick one of the following three discourse communities to explore:

1. Upper-level courses in your current field of study; what are the goals and characteristics of the **upperclassmen discourse community** (Juniors and Seniors) in your major?

2. Graduate-level courses in your chosen field; what are the goals and characteristics of **graduate school discourse community**?

3. Working professionals in your chosen field; that is, a specific **workplace discourse community.** This is the option I recommend because it will give you an opportunity to explore and analyze the writing in your chosen field by focusing on the kinds of writing done on the job in post-graduation life.

A large portion of your research will come from interviewing someone you know who currently involved in one of those communities. You will need to schedule and conduct the interview on your own time, and will need to do so by April 17th at the latest, so please contact a potential interviewee ASAP. Your options for the interview are in-person, online via Skype, facetime, etc., or via email (my least preferred method as it takes much more of your interviewee's time to write responses vs. saying them aloud).

STAGE I: Data Collection: The Interview

- _**Required**_: Interview a member of your chosen discourse community. Base your interview questions on Swales's six characteristics of a discourse community listed below. Take notes as your interviewee relays his/her answers. It might help to record and transcribe the interview. Start with these questions:

  o How long have you been a member of this community? Why did you choose to be part of it?
  o What are the shared goals of the workplace community; why does this group exist and what does it do?
  o What mechanisms do members use to communicate with each other (meetings, phone calls, e-mail, text messages, newsletters, reports, evaluations forms, video-conferencing, published articles, etc.)?
  o What are the purposes of **each** of these mechanisms of communication (to improve performance, make money, share research, and so forth)?
  o What kinds of specialized language (**lexis**) do group members use in their conversation and in their genres? Name some examples—i.e.— "on the fly," "86,"

and so on. What communicative function does this lexis serve (that is, why say "86" instead of "we are out of this"?)

- o Who are the "old-timers" with expertise? Who are the newcomers with less expertise? How do newcomers learn the appropriate language, genres, knowledge of the group? Based on a grade/feedback from a group? Over time through trial & error? Mentor/training programs? Raise & benefits incentives?
- o Optional: Use your interview day to observe members of the discourse community while they are engaged in a shared activity. Think of this as a "job shadowing" opportunity; observe your chosen interviewee in class or at work and take detailed notes. (What are they doing? What kinds of things do they say? What do they write? How do you know who is "in" and who is "out"?).

- If possible, collect any materials people in that community read or write like written assignments, op-eds, news releases, proposals, even very short things like forms, sketches, or notes made available to the public.

PAPER 4; STAGE II: *Developing Your Interview Questions*

Directions: Below are some strategies for gleaning specific answers from your interviewee. Make sure to change the rhetorical theory vocabulary from Swales' article into laymen's terms.

1. How long have you been a member of this community? Why did you choose to be part of it?

2. What are the shared goals of the workplace community; why does this group exist and what does it do?

3. What mechanisms do members use to communicate with each other (meetings, phone calls, e-mail, text messages, newsletters, reports, evaluations forms, video-conferencing, published articles, etc.)?
   a. After your interviewee has given you the list, **ask him/her to pick three to talk about extensively**—**focus on the two most common mechanisms** (for my class it would be class discussion & 10-point journals) AND **the most important mechanism** (your major papers for the class) of communication.

4. What are the **purposes** of these three mechanisms? (To improve performance, make money, share research, and so forth). To glean a more in-depth response to the above, particularly when it comes to the written documents produced, I want you to think back to the Rhetorical Situations you described in Paper Three. You could ask your interviewee to describe:
   a. The **indented audience**
   b. The **style** (clear, concise, descriptive, informative, persuasive, professional in tone, etc)
   c. How much **time** is spent writing it

5. What kinds of specialized language (**lexis**) do group members use in their conversation and in their genres? Name some examples—i.e.— "on the fly," "86," and so on. What communicative function does this lexis serve (that is, why say "86" instead of "we are out of this"?)
   a. To delve deeper into this, you could ask your interviewee about his/her **writing process**:
   b. What is the writing environment like? Are there document templates or verbal scripts people are expected to follow? In what way is feedback given from others? How often is the writing process collaborative?
   c. On average, how many drafts do the more important documents go through? How essential is it to revise and edit?

6. Who are the "old-timers" with expertise? Who are the newcomers with less expertise? How do newcomers learn the appropriate language, genres, knowledge of the group? (Based on a grade/feedback from a group? Over time through trial & error? Mentor/training programs? Raise & benefits incentives?)
   a. Ask about what happens if the newcomers don't comply or learn quickly enough—what are the consequences? (Flunking a course, getting fired, losing money, etc)
   b. Ask about any advice your interviewee might have for those starting out in that community, ways to avoid pitfalls, etc.

Focusing Your Paper: Given all you have learned from the interview, Swales, & Wardle, what do you want to focus on in your essay? Is there something interesting regarding the goals of your chosen discourse community or the types of communication in the community? Is there a common problem or challenge that comes up for members of your chosen field (for new-timers and/or old-timers) that you would like to address?

Decide what your refined research question is and how you will answer it. **Your goal is to be informative and relay what you learned from the interview about communication within that community, AND to get at some larger observation you made about that community.**

Paper 4 Stage III: Developing Your Paper Outline
Your paper ought to have the following parts or make the following moves:

- **Introductory Paragraph**: Begin with a very brief review of the existing literature (from our textbook) on the topic of discourse communities ("We know X about discourse communities" [be sure to cite Swales and/or Wardle as you do this]). Conclude with a thesis statement & essay map that sets up focus and topics of your paper.

   o Pick ideas from these theorists that best relate to the answers from your interview—for example, you could cite from Swales' Six Characteristics of a Discourse Community (this will be easiest because we based our interview questions on Swales' characteristics) **and/or** you could cite from the Modes of Belonging in Wardle's article.

- **Thesis Statement**: Explain the focus of your paper—something you learned overall about this community that is particularly interesting to you.

    - Pick your topic based on the goals or types of communication within that community, and/or a common trend or challenge that members in your chosen field face today.
    - **Be sure to draw a conclusion or make a claim** about your field.

- **Essay Map**: Describe the information you will cover (from the interview) that supports your thesis statement.

    - How can you organize your findings in a way that helps illustrate your thesis? Should you follow the order of the questions on the Interview Questions sheet? Combine questions? Rearrange? What might you leave out from the interview that doesn't apply to your thesis?
    - Make sure you briefly list what you will cover in each body paragraph.

- **Body Paragraphs**: Of course you'll want to introduce your interviewee (see questions 1 & 2 from the sheet), but keep this information brief. The focus of your body paragraphs should be on your interviewee's answers to questions 3-6.

    - Make sure your body paragraphs follow the line-up presented in your essay map.

    - Make sure you can relate the topic of each body paragraph to the claim you made in your thesis statement. Remember, you're working overall to convince that X about your discourse community is true/interesting/challenging.

    - **You will be describing your interviewee's answers in your own words**; you can include pertinent quotes from you interviewee, but don't dedicate whole paragraphs to extended quotes of what he/she said. Keep direct quotes brief and only use them when you think it's most pertinent (for an expert example of this, see how Wardle tells Alan's story, she quotes him sparingly)

- **Conclusion**: Relate the claim/observation from your thesis statement to a strategy for acclimating into that community **or** a solution that you see to overcome some of its challenges. Answer how you see yourself "fitting in" and "gaining authority" in that community when the time comes for you to join it.

STAGE IV: Documenting Sources & Submission Guidelines

- Use **MLA documentation** style consistently to attribute information and expression of ideas to your sources.
    - Every time you quote or paraphrase from the sources provide the corresponding parenthetical citation.
    - The last page of your essay should be a "Works Cited" page, which, as the name indicates, lists the sources to which you made reference in your essay.

- o **Conferences**: A rough draft of this essay is due during your one-on-one conference with me, worth 25 points. As stated on our syllabus, **regular class on April 22nd, 24th, and 29th, will not meet in lieu of conferences**.
  - o Conferences will meet in my office, and the sign up sheet will be taped to my office door.
  - o If you miss your conference for any reason, you can make up the points by taking your rough draft to the QWC (before May 1st!) and having them notify me via email that you were there.
  - o Bring a fully written rough draft (4-6 pages) with a Works Cited to your conference, or else I cannot award full points.

- o **Submission Guidelines**: As today is our last class meeting, here are some guidelines of how to turn in Paper 4:
  - o **This essay is due by 4pm via email on May 1st;** regular class does not meet that day.
  - o **Email your paper and attach it as a .docx file.**
  - o There is no final exam for this class, we do not meet during finals week.

Appendix K: John's Syllabus Modifications

Assignment Grade Distribution:

Major Writing Assignments:		Other Assignments:	
Literacy Critique	15%	Annotated Bibliographies	10 %
Literacy Study	20%	One-minute Reflection Papers	10 %
Rhetorical Analysis	15%	Research Proposals	5 %
Disciplinary Analysis	20%	2Questions/2Comments Notecards	5 %

TOTAL   100%

Late Work Policy: All assignments will be marked down 5 percent for each class day they are late, unless the paper is accompanied by a note from a doctor stating the nature of your illness. Missed in-class work – exercises, workshops, daily writing – may not be made up even with an excuse, due to the nature of this work. Late papers will not be accepted at all if the assignments are turned in more than five class days after the original due date. The final essay will not be accepted late.

Available Help: University of Arkansas Quality Writing Center (Kimpel Hall 315). Instructor's office hours (also available by appointment).

UNIT THREE: EVALUATING THE WRITING OF OTHERS

Week 9 – March 10-14
- ■ **Wednesday March 5:** *The annotated bibliography*
  In-class reading of "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents" by K. Grant-Davie in WAW.
- ■ **Friday March 7:** essay 2 in-class revisions for extra credit
- ■ **Monday March 10:** Introduction to Unit 3
  Receive Assignment 3: Rhetorical Analysis
  In-class reading of "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents" by K. Grant-Davie in WAW
- ■ **Wednesday March 12**
  Review: rhetorical strategies, meaning, and perceptions of authority
  Be prepared to discuss "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning" by C. Haas & L. Flower in WAW
- ■ **Friday March 14:**
  In-class reading of "Reading and Writing without Authority" by A.M. Penrose & C. Geisler in WAW
  Essay 2 Feedback: Strengths and weaknesses from your papers

Week 10: March 17-March 21
- ■ **Monday March 17:** *Be prepared to discuss "Reading and Writing without Authority" by Penrose & Geisler*
  Be prepared to discuss They Say I Say pages 129-138
- ■ **Wednesday March 19:**
  In-class review of a model paper for Assignment 3

Be prepared to discuss TSIS chapter 14, "Analyze This."
- **Friday March 21:**
  Be prepared to discuss "Helping Students Use Textual Sources Persuasively" by M. Kantz in WAW
  In-class reading of TSIS chapter 13, "The Data Suggest."
  Essay 3 student collaboration

SPRING BREAK: March 24-28
  Week 11: March 31-April 4
- **Monday March 31:** *INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES*
- **Wednesday April 2:** *INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES*
- **Friday April 4:** *INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES*

Week 12: April 7-11
- **Monday April 7:** Essay 3 Due

UNIT FOUR SYLLABUS: PREPARING FOR AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE
- **Monday April 7:** *Introduction to Unit 4*
- **Wednesday April 9:** *Discourse and Identity*
  In-class reading of "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction" by J. P. Gee in WAW.
- **Friday April 11:**
  Be prepared to discuss "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction."

Week 13: April 14-April 18
- **Monday April 14:**
  Be prepared to discuss "Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing" by K. Hyland in WAW
  In-class reading of "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing" by J. Harris in WAW
- **Wednesday April 16:**
  Be prepared to discuss "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing"
  In-class reading of "The Concept of Discourse Community" by J. Swales in WAW
- **Friday April 18:**
  Be prepared to discuss "The Concept of Discourse Community" by J Swales
  Review: Citation styles
  Discuss/develop research proposal to be turned in on Monday

Week 14: April 21-April 22
- **Monday April 21:**
  In-class reading of "Identity, Authority, and Learning to Write in New Workplaces" by E. Wardle in WAW.
  In-class troubleshooting/development of Essay 4
- **Wednesday April 23:**
  Be prepared to discuss "Identity, Authority, and Learning to Write"
  Review of Essay 3: strong and weak points from the student papers.
- **Friday April 25** *INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES*

Week 15: April 28-May 2
- **Monday April 28:**
  INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES

- **Wednesday April 30**
  INDIVIDUAL DRAFT CONFERENCES
  Friday May 2: Essay 4 due

Appendix L: Sample Rhetorical Analysis

Rhetorical Analysis with Minimal Reading!

There are many different ways to present our ideas in an effective manner. The way in which we choose to present these ideas in writing is known is rhetoric. Professor of English at Utah State University Keith Grant-Davie states that there are four main elements of rhetoric that can help determine the "rhetorical situation". His elements include the rhetor or the speaker/author, the audience or the "target", the exigence or purpose, and the constraints, which are better understood as external situational factors. The proper use of rhetoric and its elements separate writings into the multitudes of functional categories such as advertisements, news reports, or announcements of new knowledge.

Take the announcement of new scientific discoveries for example. You can often find both "popular" reports and the initial scientific articles that deal with these discoveries. We'll be comparing how two of these articles that both deal with announcing the discovery of a new blood test used to predict the early onset of Alzheimer's appeal to three of the aforementioned rhetorical elements to get their points across. One article, being from a popular source, is trying to reach out and share the news with the general public, in a way that is easy to understand and interesting. The other article being the original scientific study itself is meant to further expand the existing body of knowledge on the subject and help future researchers to be able to gain from the understanding of this new advancement.

Right away there are a multitude of things one can look at in the written material without really even having to read the body of the piece itself that already sets the rhetorical situation. The difference in the titles of each article alone is enough for most people to be able to distinguish between the scientific and popular article. The popular article is entitled "Blood test

predicts Alzheimer's risk early" which sounds pretty interesting and more importantly is easily understood and almost reads like a news headline which are designed to grab a reader's attention. The popular title is certainly much simpler when compared to the scientific article's title: "Plasma phospholipids identify antecedent memory impairment in older adults". Now, when dissected word for word both of these titles actually say almost the exact same thing. Why make them different you may ask? Well it helps establish the targeted audience of the pieces nearly immediately. The more scientific title clearly appeals to other scientists and academics who would certainly be more likely to be looking at more scientific publications than the average joe. Plus it fulfills the primary purpose of the title of an academic article which is to summarize the whole point in one sentence. Academic articles are often sought out and can be used as sources for newer scientific studies so the "key words" in the title are certainly of great importance. The Popular article on the other hand, has to fight to grab the attention of its potential readers. The title is like the first impression, when the average person reads the title of an article it must grab their attention right away or they probably won't bother to read the rest of it. In order to accomplish this goal the title of a popular article on a scientific topic must not only sound interesting, it must read simple enough to make the reader think they can understand it which this article does.

Another big difference between these articles is another thing one can observe very easily: the pictures and figures! Upon loading the popular article you might even see the picture before you see the title itself. It is very strategically placed to serve a very similar function to the title itself which is the grab the attention of the reader. That's right, the popular article is continuing to fish for readers with the ever so appealing bait and hook of a big colorful picture. The picture the popular article uses (see figure 1) appears to go along with the title of this article

about a blood test for Alzheimer's: it's a row of several vials of blood samples up close in a laboratory setting. With its placement right up at the very top of the article itself, it's practically an eye magnet. People are often fascinated by blood; it's one of those things that often pique people's interest. It's certainly very different from the pictures you see when perusing the scientific article. The figures of the scientific article serve a similar purpose to its respective title: they aren't there to grab your attention like the popular article's picture; they are there purely to convey data.

They certainly aren't very entertaining or attention grabbing. They are there to display things important to other researchers such as "composite z-scores" and "trend plots" but these are of no real interest or use to the average reader. Plus these figures aren't at the start of the article like in the popular article; they're placed to most properly correspond with where they are mentioned in the body of the paper. The differences in the choice and display of figures and pictures are simply more context clues to help distinguish the targeted audience of each respective article.

If you glance towards the ends of the articles there is another apparent difference in the references and citations used by each. Now this might seem like a tiny detail to nitpick for meaning, but there is a great deal to be gleaned about the authors themselves and their bids for credibility or "ethos" simply by looking at their sources and how they cite them. The popular article cites a single reference, the scientific article itself. The mission of the author of the popular article is to sort of serve as a translator for those who are not experts on the complex subject contained within the original study. Citing the original study is also a way the author of the popular article can prove to readers he didn't "make all this up" especially by providing a direct link to it. Thanks to freedom of speech, any nutjob can write about whatever they want to

on the internet, it's up to the author of the popular article to prove to his audience that he has credibility and that what he's reporting on is indeed true. The scientific article has just a few more references than the popular one. In fact, it actually has 40 cited sources! It's plain to see that these 40 sources are also all scientific with titles like "cerebrospinal fluid tau/β-amyloid ratio as a prediction of cognitive decline in nondemented older adults". Man what a doozy. That's a huge number of sources especially to all be other peer reviewed publications themselves. It even takes up multiple pages of the article itself just to enumerate all these sources used for the study. But a large number of supporting outside work is always a good thing in the world of academic publishing. Whereas the popular article's biggest challenge is to contend for readers, the most important thing for the authors of any scientific study is the credibility of themselves and their work in relation to other scientists and their work. When a scientist tries to publish their findings from a study, the first thing they must do is have their work be "peer reviewed" and be deemed worthy of even being published (which is often the hardest part over the research itself). One of the biggest ways to establish the credibility of scientific work is to cite a plethora of sources that relate to the topic at hand and proper citation of these sources show where exactly any outside information came from and that it came from a reliable source.

The proper manipulation of rhetoric is such an important part of writing, that much can be learned without even needing to read the body of a piece itself. Seemingly minor things like titles, sources, and pictures can reveal all you need to know about who is expected to read the work, the authors who wrote each piece, how credible their work might be, and the overall purpose for each work.

References

Grant-Davie, Keith. "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents." *Rhetoric Review* 15.2
(1997): 264-79. Print.

Mapstone, Mark *et al.* "Plasma phospholipids identify antecedent memory impairment in older
adults" *Nature Medicine* (2014). Web. 10 March 2014.

Michaud-Rochester, Mark. "Blood test predicts Alzheimer's risk early." *Futurity.org,* n.d. Web.
10 Mar 2014.

Appendix M: Sample Discourse Analysis

The Discourse Community within the University of Arkansas as an English Major

Discourse communities are everywhere, and everyone is a part of one. Swales describes a discourse community as "…a broadly agreed set of common goals… [with] mechanism of intercommunication among its members… [and] uses its participatory mechanisms primary to provide information and feedback…. In addition to owning genres, a discourse community has acquired some specific lexis" (471). Essentially what the above quotation means is that a discourse community is a community that wants the same goals, communicates with its members to provide feedback, and a discourse community utilizes special words to reach their goals. The discourse community that I am interested is an upperclassman English major at the University of Arkansas. As an English major, I found it interesting how the English professors expect you to write like once you are an "old-timer" and what English professors most commonly teach.

I interviewed an English Major at the University of Arkansas, Flannery Quinn. Flannery, a senior, has been an English major officially since her junior year of college; she chose English as her major because she was interested at looking at culture through literature. Most English majors have a common goal-to utilize their skills in writing to better the world around them; another goal that all English majors share is to succeed in their classes. English majors often try to reach their common goals with communication, and 3 major mechanisms that English majors use to communicate are, according to Flannery, Facebook, email, and blackboard. Flannery says that when communicating with her peers and friends, a fast easy way to communicate about a project is with Facebook, which has a very laidback style and offers a wide range of people that one may know to communicate with. Often the Facebook messages are written in 1-2 minutes, and can be written on a smartphone, and without much punctuation. Flannery says that this lack

of punctuation is due to the way that social media has changed the way that we view punctuation; for instance, adding a period is seen as an angry expression rather than a grammatically correct choice. On the other hand, email has become more of a formal way to communicate, it takes anywhere from 10 minutes to 2 hours to write an email, depending on who is the receiver. Email is often used with group projects, employers, professors, or with people that she doesn't know well enough to be friends on Facebook. For example, if she were in a large class and they were assigned partners by the professor, than if her partner was someone that she didn't know, than she would utilize email rather than Facebook. Email is also a great tool to utilize when helping someone better their paper or assignment, because it is easier to send a word document over an email rather than Facebook. Flannery often utilizes email to get the opinion of friends or peers who are also English majors, especially when she is working on a harder project that she is not sure how to go about. Blackboard, according to Flannery, is a very handy tool for teachers to communicate with students on, but not very helpful if the student is trying to communicate to the teacher. Often, students will just utilize blackboard to upload assignments. All of these mechanisms are useful in discovering how the teacher wants their students to be able to communicate with not only their employers and professors, but also peers and friends; and how students actually communicate with one another.

There are many words for English students that may seem odd or unusual to an outside person; these words are specialized language and are called "lexis." I asked Flannery what sort of lexis were used as an English major at the University of Arkansas, she says that with being an English major there is a lot of vocabulary surrounding social elements. As an example, a common theme with literature is gender studies and what it means to be male and female and there is jargon that goes along with that, such as utilizing "sex" as a determination of men and

women, rather than being a slang for intercourse. Flannery says that she deals with gender studies and gender roles often with in her classes and in her studies. According to Flannery, gender studies and sexuality studies are a big part of being an English major, especially in the upper level classes, because these themes are present in most writings, either implicitly or explicitly, and the terminology that goes along with those studies help readers understand what the authors are trying to convey in their writings. I think that it is interesting that there is a common understanding among those who study English, of gender studies and how professors of upper level courses expect their students to know certain aspects of literature before coming in to their class.

The experienced people in the English department, according to Flannery, are definitely grad students, and seniors, especially those who have had their major be English for a long period of time. Typically, Flannery says, new comers come in and don't understand certain elements such as certain authors of books that would be useful to know, and because of that, newer students can be intimidated. Flannery continues on saying that people who stick with their studies will learn the important authors and the most notable books and be able to make connections, just because they are being exposed to the literature. There are a lot of consequences that can happen if new comers do not comply with the English discourse community, according to Flannery. One of the most notable one is the tone of the writing, which often new comers are more informal and passive, rather than formal and active. Most English professors expect the students to write in the active voice instead of the passive voice simply because in the passive voice it is not necessary to include the one who is preforming the action, while in active voice it is mandatory. For instance, if there was the passive voice, "the boy was chased" it is not necessary to include "by the dog" in order to make it a complete sentence;

however, if we changed the sentence to active voice, we could not have a complete sentence without "the dog" as the subject, for instance: "the dog chased the boy." The active voice is very important for upperclassmen and for grad students, because it helps the paper be more direct. New English majors tend to try to argue for something that really isn't supported by the text, which makes the paper very weak. If students do not comply with the standards that the professors set, then one of the consequences are getting a poor grade in the class. Some advice that Flannery gave to all newcomers was to speak plainly and clearly, which makes the writing stronger, and it makes your point stronger as well. Another piece of advice from Flannery was to make sure that you really believe in everything that you are writing and to care about your writing, because if you think that the essay you are writing is weak and you are just making up arguments as you go, than the professor will think that too. Flannery also says to read a lot, because that will help in understanding what professionals are saying about literature.

To reiterate, English majors have any different ways to communicate, specialized language, and certain standards that the professors expect the students to know. I think that some solutions to overcoming some challenges of being an English major are really paying attention to what is read in class and paying attention to the criticism of the teacher. Most of the problems that arise when English majors don't comply with the standards set by the professor can be avoided if the student just listened to what the teacher was trying to tell them. I can see myself gaining authority at the University of Arkansas English program by being really carful in my word choice, and by really trying to follow the professor's advice on papers. Sometimes that may be hard, I know that it can be difficult to completely change your writing style in order to get a good grade, but even if it is hard to believe, typically there is a reason the professor is telling saying to write that way. I believe that I will do very well once I am an English major

upperclassman, because I am pretty good at changing the way that I write to suit each discourse community that I am in.

Works Cited

Swales, John. "The Concept of Discourse Community." *Writing About Writing*. Ed. Karen S. Henry. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. 466-480. Print.

Quinn, Flannery. Personal interview. 13 Apr. 2014.

Appendix N: Sample Personal Essay

The Gamer Life

My true self emerged when I decided to work together with a stranger in a fight of survivor. We are fighting our way to the other side of the jungle. The jungle is completely covered by a massive fog and our vision was only five feet. This fog is known as the Fog of War. I can hear a faint voice encouraging us to move further into this massive jungle. We must get to the other side quickly. The faint voice continues to encourage us, but I can hear other voices in the background. The voices started out quiet and slowly grew louder as it drew closer to us. There was also a noise that sounded like footsteps of about two people. The stranger and I decided that we needed to move away from this area. We ran as fast as we could through the massive fog and further into the jungle. Two figures suddenly flew out of the Fog of War. We quickly braced ourselves for a fight. The battle has begun in the virtual game called League of Legends.

I am just a Gamer, which is a person who sits at home at and stares at a screen while pressing buttons. I basically live in a box with no knowledge of what is happening outside of that box. I have shy personality and I try to avoid making a fool of myself when I am in public. Socializing in public and making new friends is very difficult to do. The only conservation I can engage in has to have a topic about gaming. My speech has improved during my last year of high school and it is improving more as I start my life in College. My high school was very small and I graduated with a class of 98 students. I was friends with everyone, but we had nothing in common. There were only two friends that were gamers like me and everyone else was only interested in choir, band and sports. I was afraid to go to College because I will be moving from a school with around 400 students total to a school with about 30,000 students.

Most people say gaming is a bad thing. Gamers have a reputation of being people who sit at home and stare at a computer or TV screen. People also think that Gamers are people who have no friends and are very bad at socializing. I was not allowed to go over to my friend's house and I just started playing video games at home. I started playing video games when I was 7. My parents also think that I am wasting my life on games. I agree with the fact that Gamers cannot socialize. I have trouble talking in public because I do not know what to say, but I can socialize quite well online. I can socialize easily when I play games with other players. I am not afraid to talk a virtual person. I would usually only chat to friends online and not text them on the phone. It is very hard to tell how someone is feeling when they are talking through an online chat. The only facial expression used during the online chat is when someone makes a smiley face or sad face. People can hide their feelings pretty easily when they are chatting online with other people. I can hide my feelings too. I can just type "lol", which is just laugh out loud in text lingo, whenever I have nothing to say. It's hard to say nothing when someone is talking to me and it is very awkward if you just stand there while someone is waiting for a response.

Gaming is like a therapy. Gaming is what I go to when I feel stressed. There is always someone I can talk to when I play League of Legends. The game is really fun and exciting to play every day. I feel like I accomplished something whenever I win a game or get a good Kill/Death Ratio. The game never gets old to me and I would play it after I do my homework and finish my studies. I relax by playing League of Legend compared to people relaxing by watching TV or playing basketball outside. League of Legends is the game that I play most right now. I socialize on League of Legends and I have friends in real life that play League of Legends. I met many new people who play League of Legends in my College. The conversation I had with my friends at first was only about our careers and future goals. Then they started asking about my

hobbies. My hobby is gaming and I felt very awkward saying that, but I didn't expect my friends to be excited about it. They are gamers too and they play League of Legends everyday just like me. My friends that play League of Legends are from the University of Arkansas and that is very exciting. I can now have conversation with other people in public and not be afraid to make a fool of myself. I will have something to talk about that I really enjoy doing.

Gaming is what I am good at and I am very proud to be a Gamer. I do not get distracted from my studies when I play games because school does come first. I now know that I can make friends in College who play League of Legends. Socializing will not be a problem now that I have friends in College that I can talk to about gaming. Having a conversation will not be a problem as I progress through my College life. My life has been all about studying and gaming. I can play games and still get good grades in school. I know how to set a limit when I play games. Gaming will still be my hobby as I grow old, but I will have to play less when I start working my way towards graduation.

Appendix O: Sample Autoethnography

Online Interactions of a Gamer

In the past few years there have been school shootings. Most of the shootings were cause by teenagers who shoot their classmates. In most cases, people would say that those shootings were only caused by bullying. However, people began to assume that all these violent teenage behaviors were all caused by exposure violent video games. School shootings today, would include facts that say that these violent behaviors were caused by excessive exposure to violent video games. I play video games for about 5-10 hours a day and 7 days a week. I have never expressed any violent behaviors. I do get mad sometimes when there is a connection issue, but I never had any thoughts of going out and shooting people. Many of my friends, who also play video games, do not have violent behaviors. Gaming is not just all about violence and killing people. Gaming has its own community and many people are joining the gaming community. Gaming is also a way for people to communicate and build their teamwork skills. Teams with great teamwork are usually the ones that win the game.

Playing video games should not have any violent effect on an individual's behavior. In the article, "An Examination of Violence and Gender Role Portrayals in Video Games: Implications for Gender Socialization and Aggressive Behavior," the author quoted, "Videogame violence is abstract and generally consists of blasting spaceships or stylized aliens into smithereens. Rarely does it involve one human being doing violence to another" (Dominick qtd. in Dietz 7). Inside video games are characters that are not real, also known as NPC or non-player character. Dietz mentions that Dominick did some experiments on exposure to violent video games. Dominick's experiments showed interesting results. The results that Dominick received showed that there are signs of moderate aggression adolescents, but that doesn't mean

teens will go out and shoot random people. There will be some aggression when playing video games. There is a possibility for someone to get mad over the game because of connection issues or for having very bad teammates. I get frustrated when I lose connection in a match with my friends because it means that I have made my team lose. Gaming requires excessive amounts of teamwork. The pace of the game can change very quickly if one of the teammates happens to disconnect from the match. Playing a game where the match-up is 5v4 would be very tough for most players. There is one less player to worry about and the communication between teammates becomes disrupted. Losing a game is normally caused by teammates arguing with each other and most of the time the team would lose confidence.

Today, many people are playing video games to socialize with their friends and families. There is no violence when people are just talking to their friends. I play video games to have fun and talk to people. Gaming helps me meet new people and find ways to socialize online. I can socialize easily when I play video games because all I need to do is to log on and just chat. Many video games are becoming more like MMOG. MMOG stands for mass multiplayer online games. League of Legends is the most played PC game and it has over 1 million players. I can meet many different people. The servers for League of Legends are all over the world. People from the United States can make friends with people from Korea, Europe, or South America. In the article, "Teens, Video Games, and Civics," the authors say that majority of teens play games for social experiences (Lenhart et al. 26). Lenhart and many other authors say that 76% of teen Gamers play with other people online or in person. People can socialize with someone from another state or even from another country. Most of my socializing is done online through gaming, but I also socialize in public. Socializing in public is very different compare to

socializing in a game. The conversation in a game is usually smaller and simpler than a conversation that is in public.

Communication in a game can be confusing to someone who has no experience with that certain game. For example, when I play League of Legends, there are different ways to communicate with my teammates. League of Legends is a strategy based game with a 5v5 match up. There are three lanes that connect one base to another and each team of 5 is on one side. The roles are split so that there are two in the top lane, one in the middle lane, and two in the bottom lane. One player from the top lane or bottom lane is able to move into other lanes, which is also known as "roaming." Teammates can type "Gank" when a roaming teammate is hiding in between two lanes. The word "Gank" is a term used to ambush a player that is in the lane. The communication between teammate has to be very strong and clear for teams to "Gank" well to get the kill. People do not want to type "I am losing my lane, please help me ambush this player," because that would be too long to type and opening the chat box would disable the character's movements. Every game will have many different terms to use. Talking about a game in public while using the terms will just sound like gibberish to someone who has never played that game before. The communication and teamwork in sports are different to the communication and teamwork in gaming. Gaming is mostly interactions with the mental side, while sports is mostly interactions with the physically side.

Video games are usually being played with other people. I can play a game by myself, but it is boring when there is no one to talk to. Playing video games alone is very hard to do because I need help sometimes when I am stuck on a level. People who play games by themselves are able to play are their own pace. The bad thing is that they do not have to resource to get help. Many other players might have finished a mission that a solo-player was stuck on.

People can ask for help when they are playing online with other people and they can also join together and complete the mission as a team. Gaming can help build a person's teamwork skill. MMOG provides many different types of game mode that requires teamwork to win the game. Socializing with other people online is the most important thing to win a game. Teams can quickly lose a game if the teammates do not communicate well with each other. There is rarely any violence when people are playing online.

Communicating online is simple and easy. Some people can get very rude when they play online, but other players can mute or ignore them. People are able to block or ignore any kind of offensive behaviors online. I can block a player if that player offends me, but there is no way do this in real life. I wish I could tape someone's mouth if they are being rude to me in real life, but that is not possible. This is the reason why I like to play online with people that I know well in real life. In Lenhart's article, the author mentions that most teens play online with people that they know offline. I agree with that because I mostly play online with friends that I know from my college. It is easier to play with people that I already know and I can understand what they want when playing online. My teamwork skill is at its best when I am playing with friends that I know in real life. Professional players are good at playing video games because they team up with people they know well in real life. These professional players play together in a gaming house and they communicate to each other in one room. The teamwork skills for these players are the strongest because they would play as a team every day in the same room. Gaming is not all about violence. Gaming requires many different ways of communication and teamwork.

The communication in gaming is very complex. Different games will have many different types of terms and teamwork skills to use in the gameplay. Communication in public is usually general things that people us to talk to one and another. Socializing through a game is on

a whole other level and an individual can easily make friends with someone that is from a

different country. The gaming community is becoming more popular and people are socializing

more online than in public. I would rather socialize online because it is quicker and easier.

Works Cited

Amanda Lenhart, et al. "Teens, Video Games, and Civics." Pew Internet & American
    Life Project, 16 Sept. 2008. Web. 5 March 2014.

Dietz, Tracy L. "An Examination of Violence and Gender Role Portrayals in Video Games:
    Implications for Gender Socialization and Aggressive Behavior." *SpringerLink, n.d.*
    Web. 5 March 2014.

Appendix P: IRB Approval Letter

January 7, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: Katie Smith
                             Elías Domínguez Barajas

FROM: Ro Windwalker
                             IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #:   13-12-360

Protocol Title: *An Analysis of the Transition to Writing about Writing Teaching
                             Approach at the University of Arkansas' Composition Program*

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 01/07/2014 Expiration Date: 01/06/2015

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of
one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you
must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the
expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance
website (http://vpred.uark.edu/210.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months
in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation
to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit
retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to
the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can
give you guidance on submission times.
This protocol has been approved for 40 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications
in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval
prior to implementing those changes.   All modifications should be requested in writing (email is
acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.
If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210
Administration Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.