

“I Wasn’t Reinventing the Wheel, Just Operating the Tools”:
The Evolution of the Writing Processes of Online First-Year Composition Students

by

Melissa Williamson

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

James Blasingame, Chair
Alleen Nilsen
Duane Roen

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

Writing is an important lifelong skill. Most college freshmen are required to take first-year composition (FYC) to meet the needs of writing across disciplines. Yet, a great number of students enter college unprepared. To combat this, the writing process should be practiced as part of a solid writing program. The Common Core State Standards, the “WPA Outcomes for First-Year Composition,” and the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Education* address the use of the writing process as a lifelong skill. Using Emig’s (1971) work on the composing process and Flower and Hayes’ (1981) cognitive process theory as a theoretical framework, this study seeks to define the components of the writing process and how these evolve for students in an online FYC course.

A qualitative, descriptive case study approach was used to explore qualitative documents. These documents were coded according to themes gleaned from the writing process literature. These emerging themes: invention work, multiple draft production, and the collaborative and social aspects of writing were used throughout the process-based curriculum. Participants made changes to their general writing process by conducting more invention work than they had before and finding the practice worthwhile, by producing more drafts than they had on previous writing projects, and by reflecting more about what the collaborative and social aspects of writing mean to them. The online FYC course curriculum gave students the tools to build and shape their existing writing practices, or as one participant wrote, “I wasn’t reinventing the wheel, just operating the tools.”

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the memory of

Loretta K. Smith, Hugh S. Smith, Mary F. Williamson, and Arthur M. Williamson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To do something this daunting takes more support than I have ever experienced before. I always considered myself a bit of a loner, but when I had to rely on people to help me get through this process, I had to embrace others and let them keep me afloat, despite the constant feeling of sinking. To my advisor and chair, Dr. James Blasingame, thank you for the time you spent reading my work and helping me find the right words. To Dr. Duane Roen, thank you for wanting to work with me without me having to ask. To Dr. Alleen Nilsen, thank you for the opportunities you have afforded me and for staying in my corner these past few years.

Thank you to the participants who allowed me to see the evolution of your writing processes. Thank you to the course managers (past and present) who have built this program: Tiffany, Sherry, Angela, Allyson, Ebru, Jackie, and Michelle. I have been here since the beginning and if it wasn't for your hours writing this wonderful process-based curriculum, I would not have found an amazing course to study. I am thankful that you also listened to me and included my ideas into the program as the years have passed by. I love teaching these courses and I hope it continues to provide more support for the evolution of a student's writing process.

Thank you to my current and former writing fellows who helped me teach these wonderful writing courses over the years. A special thank you to my two writing fellows this past year, Katherine and Daniel, for your hard work while I was writing this dissertation.

Thank you to the ASU library for being an amazing resource. A particular thank you to Linda DeFato who helped me search for articles and find answers to my questions.

When you take on a large project such as this, it is important to have a brilliant librarian in your corner.

I couldn't have made it through this work without the constant support of Shelly Shaffer. I'm glad we bonded and worked together to support each other while making it through the dissertation process together. I can't wait to write that book with you.

Thank you to my mother for reading my work, even though you don't know much about what I do. I trusted your ability to help me find the right words. And thanks, Mom, for the books. Thank you to my father for helping me with all the computer glitches I had while I was writing this. Thanks, Computer Man. Thank you to my two sisters, Shannon and Ashley; my brother, Robbie; my extended family (this is for both of us, Neen!); my best friend, Sarah; my friends, writing center friends, colleagues, and neighbors for their support and encouragement these last few years.

Finally, thank you to Jason, for the encouragement and love and for listening to my constant rants and brilliant ideas. You helped me organize my disastrous dining room/office and took me to the office supply store for dry erase boards, filing systems, computer paper, and ink. You took me out when I needed to leave the house. You helped me work through ideas. You took care of dinner, the house, and my dog when I was too crazy to deal with it. If I hadn't had you here, I don't think I would've gotten through this. I love you, J. Thank you for everything you have said and done for me. Here's to our future...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Theoretical Framework.....	9
Research Question.....	11
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
The Writing Process.....	12
Various Writing Process Definitions	13
Invention Work.....	18
Drafting.....	22
Revision and the Feedback Cycle	25
Final Draft Submission and Evaluation	35
The Goals and Supports of First-Year Composition.....	39
WPA Outcomes and the <i>Framework for Success</i>	40
Using the Process Model and the WPA Outcome: Processes....	48
End of Course Portfolios for Self-Reflection	53
3 METHODS	56
Selection of Participants	56
A Qualitative, Descriptive Case Study Research Approach.....	57
Data Collection.....	59
Data Analysis	60

CHAPTER	Page
Researcher Bias	63
4 FINDINGS.....	66
Jean	66
Magnus	67
Zella.....	67
Treatment: The FYC Workshop Course Curriculum	67
Previously Used Invention Work Strategies.....	70
Invention Work Strategies Learned in the Course.....	71
Invention Work Strategies Used for Future Projects.....	72
Previous Work with Multiple Drafts.....	74
Multiple Drafts Within the Course.....	74
Peer Review Prior to the Course	79
Feelings on Peer Review in FYC Workshop.....	80
Using Outside Editors.....	85
5 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	90
Answering the Research Question.....	91
Participants' Writing Process Knowledge Baseline.....	91
Evolution of Invention Work	94
Evolution of the Production of Multiple Drafts.....	95
Evolution of the Collaborative and Social Aspects of Writing ..	96
Conclusions and Implications for Future Teaching	99

CHAPTER	Page
Implications for K-12 Writing Education	101
Implications for Future Research	103
REFERENCES	106

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Throughout our lives, we write. We first enter the imitation stage where we learn to write in pre-school through first grade by mimicking the writing of adults and other older family members (Levine, 1987). Our (pre)K-12 school years will focus on the four major areas of our writing lives: academic writing, personal writing, professional writing, and civic writing. Every citizen in the United States is required by law to a compulsory education. Therefore, students will learn to write academically from the varying ages of 5 to 16 (as compulsory attendance varies by state) (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2012). Some students will continue to write academically as undergraduates, graduate students, and in post-doctoral capacities. Many people will begin to write personal letters, diaries, essays, blog posts, and social media status updates at a young age and may continue doing so for the rest of their lives. Many employers and employees will write professional documents, such as memos, emails, technical notes, and presentation materials from the time they enter the workforce (perhaps at the age of 16 or after college) until they reach retirement. The civic writing life may begin when people learn to write or perhaps when they are of the age to vote. Thomas Jefferson noted that it is the right of every citizen to make one's voice heard (Roen, Glau, & Maid, 2009). Therefore, writing is important during the (pre)K-12 years and into college. It is also important for writers to understand that a piece of writing simply does not appear out of nowhere. The writer will attend to various cognitive processes throughout his or her writing production. In college, writing is a requirement. All students across disciplines will be expected to write academically.

I am inspired to study the writing process due to the way my own K-16 education paved the way for how I feel about the writing process model used as writing curriculum pedagogy. After tutoring writing for elementary, secondary, and university students for a number of years, I taught high school English. My personal writing curriculum was based on the process model. I moved to the Southwest and began teaching first-year composition (FYC) at the university level. While teaching the advanced FYC writing course, I was astonished by the students who admitted to reading the assignment, writing one draft, and handing it in as a finished product. They did not seem to care about pulling tools from their writing process tool kit to use while creating their finished product. Many of the students barely gave their draft a second glance. These comments emerged during the first few weeks of the course. My students followed the process based curriculum. The growth of my former students from both my years teaching high school English and teaching advanced FYC courses showed me that a great number of students needed this process based curriculum in order to succeed in their future writing endeavors. Studying this phenomenon in the FYC Workshop will help me determine if the components of the writing process evolved for students over the course of an eight-week semester.

Statement of the Problem

College freshmen are usually required to take FYC. Prior to the 1960s, FYC was a “service course” or a “fix-it” course where the curriculum was rigid, grammar was the focus, and students wrote mainly five-paragraph themes (Gilles, 2002). The FYC curriculum shifted in the 1960s when instructors recognized “the complex social and intellectual demands of effective writing” and the course should be viewed as valuable to

exist on its own merits (Gilles, 2002, p. 3). Generally, it is expected that the FYC course meets the writing needs of every student in every discipline across the campus. To meet the various needs of these students, FYC generally allows students to write in a variety of genres, to write for various audiences, and to write for multiple purposes (Peckham, 2002).

The course also aims to have goals for these students to achieve by the end of the FYC course. Two documents emerged from discussions among college educators about common goals for FYC. These are the “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition” (WPA outcomes) and *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Education* (the *Framework*). The “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition” was a document shaped through discussions on the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) listserv and during meetings at the WPA annual conferences. The first draft of the document from 1999 included sections on building a student’s Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Processes; and Knowledge of Conventions. The *Framework* (2011) was developed as a partnership between the WPA, National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the National Writing Project (NWP). The *Framework* described the use of eight habits of mind (such as curiosity and responsibility) for a student’s success in college. The habits of mind were fostered by a student’s experiences with writing, reading, and critical analysis. These experiences included the aforementioned Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Processes; and Knowledge of Conventions. Many writing programs across the country have implemented either or both of these outcome documents in their FYC programs.

However, numerous studies have shown that a great number of students are not ready for writing beyond a K-12 education nor have they been ready (Applebee, 1981; Applebee & Langer, 2011; Hillocks, 2002; Gillespie, Graham, Kiuahara, & Hebert, 2013; Graham, Capizzi, Harris, Hebert, & Morphy, 2014; Graham & Sandmel, 2011; Kiuahara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009; National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (NCWASC), 2003). The NCWASC released the groundbreaking report, "The Neglected 'R,'" (2003) which found that writing continued to be the most neglected of the three "R" subjects in American classrooms. The commission believed that the teaching and practice of writing was "shortchanged throughout the school and college years" (NCWASC, 2003, p. 14). They believed that schools should double the amount of time students spent writing and that writing should cross every part of the curriculum in order to help students learn how to write. "What most students cannot do is write well. At least, they cannot write well enough to meet the demands they face in higher education and the emerging work environment" (NCWASC, p. 16).

Kiuahara, et al. (2009) surveyed 711 high school ELA, social studies, and science teachers on many writing issues. They asked if teachers believed writing was important beyond high school and if students possessed the skills needed for writing successfully. These research questions were based on a number of assumptions. Kiuahara, et al. (2009) believed that writing was important for higher education, in the workplace, and for "social success" (p.136). Also, according to the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results, a majority of students do not develop the necessary writing skills for success in the future (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2008).

One problem is that some teachers may not be well prepared to teach writing (Gillespie, et al., 2014; Graham, et al., 2014; Kiuahara, et al., 2009). If teachers are not prepared to teach their students, student performance on writing assessments may be below par. Studies by Gillespie, et al. (2013) and Kiuahara, et al. (2009) surveyed high school language arts, science, and social studies (Gillespie, et al. (2014) also surveyed math) teachers and asked them if they felt prepared to teach writing. Seventy-one percent of all teacher respondents in Kiuahara, et al. (2009) and 70% of all teacher respondents in Gillespie, et al. (2013) indicated that they had minimal to no preparation to teach writing. Graham, et al. (2014) asked the same question to middle school language arts, science, and social studies teachers. Sixty-four percent of teacher respondents indicated minimal to no preparation to teach writing.

For example, Smagorinsky, Wilson, and Moore (2011) studied one teacher's journey through student teaching and during her first year teaching high school English and focused on her teaching of grammar and writing. The researchers inferred that the teacher struggled to teach grammar and writing and this struggle "might follow from the absence of a strong pedagogical foundation" (Smagorinsky, et al., 2011, p. 286). If teachers are ill-prepared to teach writing, logic dictates that students may also be inadequately prepared for writing beyond K-12.

Applebee (1981) found that much writing instruction was "writing without composing," or instruction based on teachers giving the material instead of students writing original material. Recent studies have shown that writing instruction continues to be "writing without composing" (Applebee & Langer, 2011; Gillespie, et al., 2014; Graham, et al., 2014; Kiuahara, et al., 2009). Applebee and Langer (2011) write that

students are producing “many more pages of exercises and copying than they do [...] original writing” of at least a paragraph in length (p. 24). The most common writing assignments include short answer responses, note taking, worksheets, and writing in response to what the student reads (Gillespie, et al., 2014; Graham, et al., 2014; Kiuahara, et al., 2009).

At the core of a solid writing program is the use of the writing process (Graves, 1983; Murray, 1980/2009; Ziegler, 1981). Yet, two studies showed that some teachers were not using evidence-based writing practices, such as prewriting activities, planning instruction, revising and/or editing instruction, working with peers on writing, and using/teaching the process approach (Graham, et al., 2014; Kiuahara, et al., 2009). At the middle school level, Graham et al., (2014) writes that of all subject-area teachers surveyed 16.5% never use a process approach to writing instruction, 33% never teach extra planning, 6.1% never teach strategies for planning, 7.0% never asks students to complete a prewriting activity, 24.4% never teach extra revising, 18.3% never teach strategies for revising or editing, and 34.4% never provide extra opportunities for peer assistance. Yet, “teachers mostly believed that writing should be taught in all subject areas and it was their responsibility to teach this skill” (Graham, et al., 2014, p. 1024). At the high school level, Kiuahara et al. (2009) found that of all teachers surveyed 33% never used the process approach; 22% never provided student engagement in prewriting activities; 17% never taught strategies for planning; 30% never taught strategies for editing; 26% never taught strategies for revising; and 24% never asked students to collaborate on planning, drafting, revising, and/or editing. Yet, most teachers agreed somewhat that students were taught the writing skills needed for the workplace (78% of

respondents) and for college (77% of respondents) (Kiuahara, et al., 2009). If students are not practicing these evidence-based writing skills in all subject areas throughout their secondary schooling, then a great number of students may not bring these skills to the college level.

Many universities use a process-based model in FYC programs. Many universities also provide goals for students to meet. These goals may include the WPA outcomes and/or the eight habits of mind from the *Framework*. One of the WPA outcomes, “Processes,” discusses the idea of using a writing process in FYC. The steps in the writing process usually include generating, drafting, revising, editing, proofreading, and publishing. These steps are represented in the Processes WPA outcome as:

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
- Understand collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others' works
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences (CWPA, 2008).

To some degree, state standards across the nation have also included a writing process model throughout the K-12 curriculum. In Arizona, for example, the Department of Education articulated writing standards by three strands (Arizona Department of Education (AZED), 2004). One of these strands includes the writing process. Five concepts of the writing process are drawn out over Kindergarten to Grade 12. Concept 1: Prewriting includes idea generation, prewriting activities, organizational and time-management strategies, audience and purpose selection, and record keeping of writing ideas. “Drafting incorporates prewriting activities to create a first draft containing necessary elements for a specific purpose” describes the second concept of drafting (AZED, 2004, p. 5). Concepts 3 and 4 describe revising and editing strategies, respectfully. Beginning in grade 3, peer review is listed as an example of an “appropriate [tool or strategy] to refine the draft” (AZED, 2004, p. 8). Revising deals with adding additional details; evaluating the draft for use of ideas, content, word choice, etc.; using various sentence structures; clarifying meaning by rearranging words, sentences, and paragraphs; and enhancing word choice and selecting more precise vocabulary. Editing standards in Concept 4 are strictly identifying and correcting errors in convention and proofreading the document. Peer review is mentioned again as a tool or strategy to edit the writer’s draft. Finally, publishing in Concept 5 deals with “formatting and presenting a final product for the intended audience” (AZED, 2004, p. 14). Although one-third of the Arizona writing curriculum involved this writing process model for the last ten years, a great number of students come with a deficit when employing the writing process in FYC.

Although first-time college students often arrive unprepared for university writing, historically, FYC should prepare students to write across the university disciplines. A key to preparing students to write across the disciplines is the use of a writing process model. The FYC Workshop (a pseudonym, as are all names used in this dissertation) program is a FYC program at a major Southwestern University that employs a writing process model.

Theoretical Framework

Prior to Emig's (1971) *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*, focus was on the product and not the process. The writing process described in this dissertation relies heavily on the idea that writers have a process when they compose. "Composing in writing is a common activity of literate persons" (Emig, 1971, p. 1).

Emig (1971) was the first to describe writing as a process model. She studied eight sixteen to seventeen year olds from six schools in the Chicago area. Emig (1971) found that moments and stages of the writing process can be distinguished and there are several elements to this process: the nature of the stimulus, prewriting and planning, starting, reformulating, stopping, contemplating the product, and teacher influence.

The stimulus begins the writing process and keeps the process going. Stimuli are either initiated by the writer or by an outside force, such as the common assignment given by the teacher. The prewriting and planning stages are two possible ways to begin the actual writing process. Prewriting happens when the writer thinks about the idea and puts words or phrases to paper (or computer). The planning stage can occur many times as the writer establishes the elements and parameters of the piece of writing. When a student

starts the piece of writing, the writer will write until they are finished. After the writer is finished, he or she will reformulate or correct, revise, and rewrite. The writer will start, reformulate, and stop when he or she feels the piece cannot be worked on any longer. The writer will then contemplate, or think about the piece. The writer may decide if the piece is good or bad. If the writer has not thought about his or her audience, then the writer should think about the audience at this time. Perhaps the writer could think about the audience's reception of the finished piece. With most writing done by students, the composition is submitted for teacher approval.

Flower and Hayes (1981) introduced a cognitive process theory in composing to show that writing is not linear like a stage model (such as the one in Emig, 1971). The steps in a linear stage model were separate, followed one after another, and lead to the eventual development of a final written product. Flower and Hayes (1981) were interested in the inner process of the writer who was producing this final written product. The cognitive process model would analyze these processes as hierarchical. It is common for writers to embed their individual writing processes as needed throughout their cognitive process. The process is like a tool kit: a tool is used as needed for the job. The tools are not necessarily used in a fixed order or in stages.

In the FYC Workshop pedagogy, the process model is a hybrid, which employs the linear stage model and the cognitive process model. Students in this course are coached to follow a set of writing process steps, yet they may return to various components as they produce their writing. The course envisions that students adopt and customize their own writing process.

Research Question

How do the components of the writing process evolve for students over the course of an eight week semester using the FYC Workshop process model?

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will be divided into two sections. The first section will describe the general stages of the writing process. The second section will describe the goals of first-year composition, which will include a discussion of the “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition” (CWPA, 1999; 2008; 2014) and the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011), and a description of the writing process model that is used in many college writing courses. This section will also describe specific supports for students that are unique to university writing.

The Writing Process

Prior to the 1970s, writing instruction was based primarily on the product. However, real writers do not simply furnish a finished product. Many writing classes rely on a simple pattern: the teacher gives the assignment, the students complete the assignment (presumably out of class), and the students hand in the assignment for teachers to grade and make comments. There are many problems with this process. First, there may not be enough instruction in teacher preparation programs for writing pedagogy (Hillocks, 2006; Kiuahara, et al., 2009) and thus calls for a need to provide further writing instruction to future English teachers (Emig, 1971; Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995). Second, the teacher will laboriously red mark the paper and add comments, which the students may never read. Third, the student may check their grade and bury the paper in their backpack or perhaps throw it out, so they will not learn from

their mistakes. Lastly, when students throw out their papers there is no way of knowing how the student may (or may not) improve over the course of a school year.

Writing instruction researchers turned to the teaching of writing as a process because writers think before they write and rework their piece before they feel it is complete (Emig, 1971; Graves, 1983; Murray, 1972/2009; Perl, 1979; Pianko, 1979). A process-oriented curriculum should be favored over a product-oriented curriculum (Berne, 2004; Flint & Laman, 2012). In this type of curriculum, a teacher will give an assignment and students will write using the writing process.

The writing process can be taught and should be taught. All published writers have a method to get from idea to final product. Defining how this process works is more complicated, as researchers have various ways of defining how the writing process operates. However, general patterns in these processes can be identified.

Various Writing Process Definitions

The process approach pioneering study by Emig (1971) found that students have a multitude of activities during their writing process. These included the nature of stimuli, prewriting and planning, starting, stopping, contemplating, reformulation, and teacher influence. Perl (1979) found that unskilled college students conducted some aspects of prewriting, writing, and editing. Pianko (1979) found several composing behaviors among seventeen college writers: prewriting, planning, composing, rereading, stopping, contemplating the finished product, and handing in the finished product. Murray (1978/2009) simplified these extensive writing processes by including only three stages: prewriting, writing, and rewriting.

Flower and Hayes' (1981) cognitive process model finds that "the process of writing is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers orchestrate or organize during the act of composing (p. 366). Composing is goal-directed and goals were created by the writer. These components of the cognitive process model were found after a series of protocol analysis where the researchers asked writers to produce a written product, but they were asked to verbalize everything that processed through their minds as they wrote. The verbalization was recorded and transcribed.

Flower and Hayes (1981) used the example of idea generation as a sub-process of planning (p. 367). These hierarchical acts could also happen at any time during the writer's process. The cognitive process model included the task environment (which included receiving the rhetorical problem and moving through the written text), the writer's long-term memory (which included extracting prior knowledge of the topic, audience, and writing plan), and the actual writing process (which included the basic processes of planning, translating, and reviewing under the control of a monitor). The writer's cognitive process begins with the received rhetorical problem. In many cases this could be the teacher's assignment. Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, and Rosen (1975) found that in the school culture, students will assume that "his audience will overwhelmingly be predetermined and sharply defined: the teacher, a known audience of one" (p. 63). Emig (1971) found that school-sponsored writing activities were rigid. The student may also see the teacher's assignment as merely meeting the minimum requirements.

When the writer begins composing, whatever the writer writes will dictate what comes next. The words, sentences, and paragraphs develop with a sense that when the

“writing is incoherent, the text may have exerted too little influence; the writer may have failed to consolidate new ideas with earlier statements” (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 371). This growing text is directed by the writer’s long-term memory. The writer’s long-term memory can be anything that exists within his or her own mind or stored in outside resources (such as books and the Internet). What the writer already knows about a particular topic, genre, audience, etc. can be tapped into while writing.

The third component of the cognitive process model includes the actual writing process, which Flower and Hayes (1981) define as planning, translating, and reviewing, under an overarching monitor. “The monitor functions as a writing strategist which determines when the writer moves from one process to the next” (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 374). As the writer moves through the cognitive process, he or she may backtrack and repeat a step before moving forward. The ideas and goals can be redefined throughout the cognitive process because the writer is always working and thinking.

Ziegler (1981) identified the phases of the writing process as prewriting, exploratory writing, developmental writing, external revision, and last look. Graves (1983) wrote that “all writers follow a simple pattern: select, compose, read, select, compose, read” (p. 226). Atwell (1987) outlined that writers “rehearse (find an idea), [complete] draft one, confer, [complete] draft two, confer, decide the content is set, self-edit, teacher-edit, [and produce a] final copy/go public” (p. 127). Murray (1990) suggested that writers move through collecting, focusing, ordering, drafting and clarifying. In the updated edition of *In the Middle*, Atwell (1998) expanded upon these ideas and showed her students that writers

- rehearse: develop an idea, perhaps make notes or lists or try different leads

- draft one and read, revise, confer
- (maybe) draft two and read, revise, confer...
- decide the content is set
- polish: final word choices, clarification, tightening
- final, formal editing for conventions
- peer editing, if you wish
- submit to an outside editor (e.g., the teacher)
- create a final copy
- proofread
- publish (p. 157)

All of these views suggest aspects of the general version of the writing process commonly taught in K-12 schools. These five stages of the writing process include prewriting, drafting, revising, editing/proofreading, and publishing (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001). However, Atwell (1998) warns that the phrase *the writing process* “implies one series of steps through which everyone proceeds in creating a piece of writing. I can talk only in general ways about some of the things writers do. [...] But I also know beginning writers need guidelines” (p. 157). Any and all explanations of the typical stages of the writing process are up to the writer to understand that everything is a suggestion. Students should be able to make their own decisions by considering what to do next with their own writing. Teachers can help students adopt some form of the writing process by teaching them many variations of the process.

A writer might begin writing because he or she has something to say. When students find something to say, their voice will shine in their writing. Voice “underlies

every part of the process” (Graves, 1983, p. 227). When the writer has made a choice about the subject, the voice will shine throughout the entire piece of writing and through their process.

Writing can be a highway with a multitude of exits and ways to circle back onto the same road. The writing process steps may be linear (Alber-Morgan, Hessler, & Konrad, 2007) or non-linear (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001). Hayes and Flower (1986) believe the writing process steps may overlap. The writer might repeat a step once or more than once. Students may also skip over steps and linger on others (Murray, 1978/2009). These steps may not be sequential or even happen at all. Graves (1983) believes that many activities happen simultaneously during writing that some words may be lost and may not fully reveal the entirety of the writer’s idea on the page.

Too often in the traditional curriculum teachers merely teach a particular writing stage and ignore the more important and time-consuming steps of prewriting and rewriting. The professional writer spends most of his time prewriting and rewriting. Murray (1973) spends the least time in the production of his first draft. Some writers might spend their time on revision. Therefore, students need to be given the opportunity to experience these steps and explore their own meanings behind the writing process.

FYC Workshop is a process-based class. Students watch a video called “The Feedback Cycle,” which outlines four major stages used throughout the course: invention work, drafting, revision and the feedback cycle, and final draft submission and evaluation. FYC Workshop uses discussion boards, activities from the electronic textbook (or eBook), and an audience analysis for invention work. Students will read various chapters in the eBook, read course materials, and analyze these various materials

to produce a draft. Revision is called “the feedback cycle.” The feedback cycle includes peer review and a second look from the instructor’s assistants, known as Writing Fellows, or students are referred to the university writing center. Finally, students include their papers on a final portfolio and submit the link to their portfolio (ePortfolio) to the online course for instructor’s grading and further feedback. The writing process will be discussed as they complete the steps within the FYC Workshop course.

Invention Work

The beginning stages are defined in many ways. This stage consists of activities writers do before putting words to paper. How we start the writing process begins with what Emig (1971) calls *the nature of stimulus*. The stimulus is what begins the writing process and keeps the process going. Stimuli are either initiated by the writer or by an outside force, such as a common assignment given by the teacher. In Perl’s (1979) study, when five unskilled college writers were not given specific prewriting instructions, the students began writing within the first five minutes.

Once the stimulus is established, the writer will begin the *prevision* of the writing (Murray, 1978/2009). Prevision is all the “stuff” that happens before the first draft. This can include research, interviewing, and observation. Murray (1984; 1990) also describes collecting, focusing, and ordering as other ways to engage in prevision.

Students can also gather ideas, focus these ideas, and line up their ideas before beginning to write. Angelillo (2005) describes that a student might use a writer’s notebook to write down possible projects before choosing an idea from this list. Writers may reflect in this notebook as they experience the world. Ideas for pieces may come out

of this practice. During the idea stage, students need to understand that ideas can come from anywhere, can be multiple, and can be gathered in a way that is not precise (Painter, 2006). Every writer will have their own ideas to write about that are different than another writer.

The common term for the beginning phase of the writing process is *prewriting* (Blasingame & Bushman, 2005; Emig, 1971; Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Murray; 1978/2009; Perl, 1979; Perl, 1980; Pianko, 1979; Ziegler, 1981). Prewriting includes all the cognitive processes as the writer thinks about the idea and puts words or phrases to paper (or computer screen). Ziegler (1981) might call this “getting into the mood” (p. 33). This warm up phase is different for every writer. Unfortunately, many schools have made the prewriting phase more rigid as all students in the class are required to make a cluster web, story map, outline, or graphic organizer; or conduct interviews and discuss ideas (Angellilo, 2005; Blasingame & Bushman, 2005; Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Painter, 2006). These examples are tools for prewriting. As Atwell (1998) said, “beginning writers need guidelines” (p. 157). If these are treated as prewriting tools for students to pick and choose, by the time students are in college this writing phase should be less rigid.

These tools for prewriting can also work within the *planning* phase before a draft is begun. Emig (1971) noticed that students would plan by setting parameters for the writing. Pianko (1979) found that many of the seventeen college students in her study favored planning mentally instead of writing the plans down. Pianko (1979) found that some teachers give outlines ahead of time to plan compositions. Students, however, usually proceed without an outline. They make up the writing as they go along. They may

set mental parameters, but the planning occurs during the composing stage. Forcing students to write an outline before a draft may inhibit their process and it may not allow for self-discovery (Pianko, 1979). This does not mean that an outline should never be used. It can still be taught. However, an outline may come out of a finished product, it may come out while writing, or it may come out of the planning and invention stages. This act should be up to the writer.

“In the planning process writers form an internal representation of the knowledge that will be used in writing” (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 372). Planning builds on this internal representation of what the writer’s prose might eventually be in the cognitive process theory of writing. Planning includes various processes and sub processes, such as generating ideas, organizing, and goal-setting. Goal-setting in particular is not limited to the planning stage, but it may occur during the continuous cycle of writing. Goals can be created as the writer composes; goals may describe a starting point, a plan to reach the goal, or an evaluation of one’s success in meeting the goal.

We may also prewrite by brainstorming maps, cluster webs, or lists of ideas. Murray (1985/2009) talks to himself in his head or writes in his daybook. Graves (1983) may freewrite “any old thing that comes into my head” (p. 46). Murray’s (1985/2009) brainstorming is not always formal because he believes that planning for writing “should be, above all, play” (p. 80).

When students are both prewriting and planning, it is similar to *rehearsal* as described by Atwell (1987; 1998) and Graves (1983). Rehearsal consists of some of the same activities found in typical prewriting sessions. Writers will think about a topic, gather materials, read, etc. These activities can also lead to something more. “Rehearsal

refers to the preparation for composing and can take the form of daydreaming, sketching, doodling, making lists of words, outlining, reading, conversing, or even writing lines as a foil to further rehearsal” (Graves, 1983, p. 221). Basically, rehearsal is a gathering of thoughts in some way. The key is that it is informal.

Any practice of invention, prewriting, planning, or rehearsal should be done in a way that fits the writer’s goals because some students may think that planning and prewriting is formulaic (Lassonde & Richards, 2013). Teachers should foster any sort of prewriting. It should allow for experimentation as the writer can plan out how he or she will write something, but it may turn a different direction while writing. Both studies by Emig (1971) and Pianko (1979) showed that when the prewriting is school-sponsored, there may be little to no preplanning. Students may be making decisions before they begin writing before choosing the subject of their piece. In the case of Pianko (1979), students were given a choice to write within an assigned genre or students could choose their own genre and topic. However, if the writing was self-sponsored, this stage might be longer, even if it was not written down and only exists in the writer’s mind (Emig, 1971).

Perl (1979) found the same practices with her five unskilled college writers. These writers might have rephrased a topic, broken the topic down into manageable pieces, and wrote associated words for their topic. If the students conducted any prewriting, they had a better sense of where their writing would go, but some students would also begin without any sense of where they may go. Their first sentence may merely be a rephrasing of the assigned question or topic. Once they see this first sentence, in their own words, students might be able to plan what happens next. “Planning and

writing [and] clarifying, and discarding” happened frequently during these writing sessions (Perl, 1979, p. 330).

If students say that they do not plan their writing it could be because (1) they do not know how, (2) they do not recognize what they do is planning, (3) they do not find planning helpful because they have not discovered a planning approach that fits or suits their thinking style, or (4) they think it is too time-consuming (Lassonde & Richards, 2013, p. 203).

Therefore, teachers should take the time to teach various invention work methods. It does not matter how a writer starts writing. A one-size fits all prewriting method does not exist (Richards & Miller, 2005). The point is that there is some cognitive task working in the brain before words are put to paper in a way that makes sense. Teaching these various tools to students will allow them to build their own arsenal to handle any sort of writing task. As long as the students understand that there is no right or wrong way to prewrite, plan, and/or rehearse in this prewriting stage, they can easily move into the next general phase: the actual writing time or the actual drafting of the composition.

Drafting

Ziegler (1981) compares exploratory writing to freewriting. He acknowledges that writers may incorporate exploration into their brainstorming. However, there are “those who do little or no prewriting” and therefore “get right down to exploring on paper” (Ziegler, 1981, p. 34). This starting point could be a first draft. Drafting is where writers start to do the real writing. Researchers may refer to this phase as drafting, rough drafting, writing, or composing. Murray (1978/2009) also calls this the *vision stage*. It is

everything the “writer does from the time first words are put on paper until all drafts are completed” (Graves, 1983, p. 223). The writer simply needs to flesh out the idea. Flower and Hayes (1981) would call this stage *translating*, or “the process of putting ideas into visible language” (p. 373). The information gleaned from the planning stages is captured in the translating stage while juggling the demands of language.

The first draft is a discovery draft and what Peter Drucker calls “the zero draft” (qtd. in Murray, 1978/2009). Murray (1984) expresses that after students collect, focus, and order their thoughts, they begin to draft by listening to the voice in their head. The initial draft can be written quickly or written slowly. Many students may take their time to write this first draft (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001). Time should not matter. What matters is the tone behind which students should write.

The first draft is experimental (Blasingame & Bushman, 2005). Students should understand that this initial draft does not have to be perfect (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Painter, 2006). Author William Faulkner would tell students to simply get their words down on paper: “Take chances. It may be bad, but it is the only way you can do anything really good.” Faulkner is talking about the need to write a terrible draft in order to get to a good one. Students should be encouraged to try any type of writing because the focus should not be about making the student a good writer but allowing them to learn everything they can about writing.

After the initial draft, every student should be given the power to make decisions on whether they should continue with a piece they are working on or move on (Berne, 2004; Graves, 2004) as the process may not take on a linear path (Alber-Morgan, et al., 2007). Some writing can be thrown out in favor of something new. Truman Capote

believed more in scissors than in the pen (Grobel, 2000). It is perfectly acceptable to move on to something else or start over.

Students should also put away their editing tools and focus on getting a large chunk of writing fleshed out because more than one draft can be completed. This lends itself to the writing process not being linear, as multiple drafts can be written from the first line on paper to the last line before publication. Emig (1971), Perl (1979; 1980), and Pianko (1979) found that their research subjects would start, pause, re-read, possibly revise, and move on again. Emig (1971) found students would start, reformulate, and rewrite before stopping (when the writer feels he or she cannot work on the piece any longer). She refers to *starting* as the act of writing until finished. However, when students reformulate, they stop to correct, revise, or rewrite while still in the act of writing. In a way, multiple drafts are being formed while writing the first draft.

Pianko (1979) described composing as writing the text; pausing to think about the text or find a diversion; and rescanning, or rereading, to make revisions. The average composing time in her study was 38.85 minutes for an average 361 word essay. Students were given the entire afternoon to write, but many of them lacked the commitment to write because when questioned about the time they spent actually writing, some said that they wrote as much as they could in that moment. Others said that if they had chosen to spend more time, they would rewrite their version for neatness. Neither response indicates commitment. This supports Emig's (1971) idea of school-sponsored writing as something to be done quickly.

Atwell (1998) encouraged six to seven drafts before a final could be completed. Producing only one draft may limit the student. "The novice view of a first draft as

written set-in-stone (or fast-drying cement) can preclude engaging more fully with the ideas being expressed” (Harris, 1989, p. 174). There are times when one draft is the only reality: timed writing tests. However, there are more advantages to being a multi-draft writer.

Harris (1989) studied the differences between one-draft and multi-draft writers by studying a group of graduate students who were “experienced, competent writers” (p. 179). Of the eight graduate students, half of them were one-drafters and the other half were multi-drafters. The one-drafters needed to clarify their thinking prior to drafting, revised as they wrote and made those revision decisions quickly, and preferred not to return to writing after it was completed. Two of the multi-drafters chose open-ended exploration as they wrote. The other two multi-drafters elected to “plunge in before the topic is clear” (Harris, 1989, p. 181). Writing was more time-consuming for the multi-drafters because they would produce many options while revising and may produce more text than necessary. Multi-drafters also explained that they “are never done with a paper. They can easily and willingly go back to it or [they could] keep writing indefinitely” (Harris, 1989, p. 185). This shows that multi-drafters have more options. They can take risks as they write because they will spend more time in the next two phases of the writing process. The drafting stage is not linear as many activities could happen before beginning the revising and editing/proofreading phases of the process.

Revision and the Feedback Cycle

Revising is an important step toward final publication. Murray (1984) calls the *revising* phase *clarifying* because students are adjusting their work. Revision can be what

the writer does to re-view, re-see, or re-vision their message to be better understood by the audience (Blasingame & Bushman, 2005; Murray, 1978/2009; Painter, 2006; Ray, 2001). Students will use whatever revising tools are necessary during this phase (Angellilo, 2005). For Flower and Hayes (1981) the reviewing phase includes evaluating and revising. Reviewing includes the writer's choice to read what has been written, whereas evaluation may be "an unplanned action triggered by an evaluation of either the text or one's own planning" (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 374). Revising can include those higher-order concerns of content, ideas, and organization of these factors and can first be done by the individual writer (also called self-revision).

Revising is not necessarily editing or proofreading (Blasingame & Bushman, 2005; Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Ray, 2001). Many students may see the revising phase as a way to fix a "bad" paper. Revision should not be taught with the expectation that the student will "fix" everything. Revision is "a composing tool" whereas editing "involves the surface features" (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001, p. 66). Revision should be used to allow the student to expand ideas and write effectively. Young writers, however, may still try to edit their words and sentences instead of revising their content first. Murray (1978/2009) explores two "principal and quite separate editorial acts involved in revision" (p.130). The first editorial act is internal revision, or "everything writers do to discover and develop what they have to say, beginning with the reading of a completed first draft" (Murray 1978/2009, p. 130). Ziegler's (1981) developmental writing stage is, essentially, internal revision. The second editorial act is external revision: "what writers do to communicate what they have found they have written to another audience" other

than themselves (Murray, 1978/2009, p. 130). This act would include conventions of grammar, mechanics, and style.

Pianko (1979) found that most writers in her study only wrote one draft. However, given more time to work on the writing at home, students would write more than one draft. But at home, the writer may only rewrite the same version with minor corrections instead of a major revamp of ideas and words. In some cases, some students in the study also used rereading to count words to fulfill a word requirement. It is important, then, to separate revision from editing and relay that writing is more than a word count. It is about expressing ideas clearly to an audience and for a purpose.

Burton (2009) writes that he learned to embrace a writing process while participating in Nanowrimo, a month long practice where writers are encouraged to write 10,000 words during the month of November. He cites that students may be focused on finishing an assignment rather than producing high quality work as evidenced in Emig (1971). This act is the opposite of what Nanowrimo stands for. In November, you simply write. December is the month for revising. Therefore, Burton (2009) states that “the quality of the final manuscript is not dependent on the draft [but] on the quality of the revisions we make to the draft” (p. 4).

Atwell (1998) provided a listing of what writers do and shows a separation between revision and editing. After the student writes a first draft, he or she should “read, revise, and confer” (Atwell, 1998, p. 157). A second draft may be conducted, followed by another round of “read, revise, and confer.” The writer may then decide it is time to stop (Emig, 1971; Ray, 2001). A student may then self-polish and self-edit. Ziegler’s (1981) last look is the self-editing stage where he will “let it sit for a while – an hour, a day, or

longer – before taking a last look” (p. 35). A peer review may also be conducted, if the writer wishes to do so. Peer review is used in many classrooms but may have different meanings. The writing will then be submitted to an outside editor or an authority figure in the classroom, usually the teacher. The student would then prepare a final copy and proofread.

The FYC Workshop process model is similar in nature. In FYC Workshop, students upload their draft to a peer review discussion board. At least two classmates will read through the writer’s draft and thoughtfully reply to a set of peer review prompts. Students should revise their draft for another round of feedback. The second round asks students to work with an outside editor, which includes uploading their second draft to the instructor’s assistant, known as a Writing Fellow, or working with the university’s writing center tutors. Students will then revise, edit, and polish their draft before deciding when to stop or turn in their paper due to their deadline (Emig, 1971).

Conducting peer review and its various terminologies. While peers can be a useful addition to the writing and evaluation process, teachers and students may be reluctant to engage in peer-to-peer conferences. Peer review is “one of the most diffuse, inconsistent, and ambiguous practices associated with writing instruction” (Armstrong & Paulson, 2008, p. 398). Peer review may be practiced as a choice, but classrooms may utilize peer review in their writing instruction.

Students may not improve their papers for various reasons. Students may feel that the reviewer may not catch all their mistakes (Brammer & Rees, 2007; Hughes, 1991). There may also be a lack of motivation on the part of the student to change his or her own

work. Teachers may also not assign peer review as they feel students may conduct their reviews poorly and they may not stay on task.

At the college level, students seek out the help from a peer through campus writing centers. Many college writing center tutors may be trained in the “global versus local concerns” technique. Global concerns are the larger content-centered revisions. Local concerns deal with the smaller concerns such as grammar, punctuation, and formatting. The writing process deals with these concerns, but in different terms. Students should learn the differences between revision (global concerns) and editing/proofreading (local concerns) in order to work more effectively with a peer. This would also affect the teacher’s focus on how they teach students about the revision and editing processes.

Peer review may not be taught to its fullest potential in middle and high school. One reason could be that peer review is an ambiguous term (Armstrong & Paulson, 2008). Peer review has five different associations: peer review, peer response, peer editing, peer evaluation, and peer critique/peer criticism. These practices are all student-centered during the writing process.

Peer review is a blanket term used to describe any of the revising/editing processes in the practice of writing. It could indicate a “larger concern with holistic and rhetorical issues” (Armstrong & Paulson, 2008, p. 400). Peer review could deal with organization, style, interpretation, and inquiry (Herrington & Cadman, 1991). Or it could be the differences between revising, editing, and proofreading (Paton, 2002).

Brammer and Rees (2007) received 328 responses to a survey about student attitudes toward peer review. Peer review is encouraged among all levels of writing-

intensive courses at their university. Many students found peer review “not very helpful” (p. 75); while two-thirds found that peer review was “occasionally” or “usually helpful” (Brammer & Rees, 2007, p. 77). One question on the survey asked students to write other comments they may have about peer review. One respondent answered that peers may not be willing to be open and honest with their feedback. The conclusions of the study suggest that more work needs to be done to assist students in their understanding of what peer review is (collaborative learning) and what it is not (proofreading).

Peer response is feedback based on the audience’s responses and could use a PQP (Praise-Question-Polish) technique as developed by Neubert and McNelis (1990). The writer will read their paper aloud to a small group of students. Their peers would first discuss what is good about the draft (praise), then ask questions if they do not understand something about the writing (question), and lastly, give specific suggestions for improvement (polish). Graff (2009) describes the use of a “read-aloud protocol” to assist students in making revisions. He noticed that his students were being more critical and trying to fix a peer’s work, rather than respond to it. Graff begins teaching the read-aloud protocol by modeling it to students. He begins by reading a text and making sense of it out loud. He writes out some strategies as suggested by C. B. Olson (2003), such as “tapping prior knowledge, making connections, asking questions, making predictions, and summarizing” (p. 30).

Peer editing consists of surface-level concerns and usually involve peers using a checklist-style worksheet (Franklin, 2010). Graner (1987) emphasizes that peer editing is simply a way to read and critique. Graner (1987) calls for a revision workshop because he feels there are limitations to the peer editing workshop. He feels student writers may be

unskilled and unprepared and that teachers may feel they lose control because peer groups are student-led rather than teacher-led.

After the peer revision is completed, students in FYC Workshop are asked to produce a second draft (called the “More Feedback” draft) before moving onto the next round of feedback: the outside editor.

Working with an outside editor. In many classrooms, the last person to see the final product is the teacher. Atwell (1998) encourages the use of the phrase *outside editor* to identify an authority figure who will read the writer’s work. In the publishing world, this could be an editor. But in the classroom, it is usually the teacher.

Teachers have an unfortunate practice of marking papers (Emig, 1971). There is little evidence to support teachers red marking a student’s paper for pointing out specific errors. Pointing out specific errors may not help students make future corrections in their writing. The time spent on this practice is “futile and unrewarding” (Emig, 1971, p. 99). Graves (1983) understands that parents, teachers, and administrators “were taught in their early school years that errors in writing were close to original sin. Eradicate errors and the writer would be a little closer to heaven” (p. 314). By focusing on the process, instead of the product, the teacher would be able to articulate how a student has grown in their writing over time. This is a better practice than using a red pen to mark everything. Besides, students may not read the comments laboriously written by their teachers either. Murray (1979/1982) experimented with this idea. He would mark students’ papers, but he found that few students questioned him. He then wrote bad advice on the students’ papers and “not one student questioned [his] comments.”

Instead of using a red pen to mark and make comments on a composition, teachers should discuss with their students that not every piece of writing handed in should be the final product. This is why future publication is important. It is important for students to have opportunities where their work will be public, instead of writing only for the teacher. After the outside editor sees the work, the student can then move onto preparing a final copy for publication.

Preparing a final copy. Understanding that the teacher is not the audience, even if there will be a grade attached to a piece of writing, will give students the opportunity to expand their writing skills. In publishing, authors prepare a final copy before sending their work to the publisher. This preparation includes self-polishing and self-editing. The final step, proofreading, may be a collaborative effort between the author and the editing team, but in FYC Workshop, the student will usually complete all the self-polishing, self-editing, and proofreading preparations alone.

Self-polishing and self-editing. Writers might contemplate the product before moving on (Emig, 1971). The writer may decide if the piece is acceptable or unacceptable. Understanding that this piece of writing will have some form of audience is important. Revision is about making sure the audience understands all aspects of the writing.

Atwell (1998) described *polishing* as making final word choices, clarifying and tightening the writing. Word choice is critical. The words help the reader understand the writer's meaning. Polishing and editing work together. Editing is a lower-order concern, where the writer seeks to create a more polished piece. Editing is concerned with surface

features such as grammar, spelling, and mechanics (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Painter, 2006).

Editing has negative connotations because some teachers may feel that students are not ready to edit because they do not possess all the skills needed to properly edit their own writing or the writing of someone else. However, with practice, students can learn from their mistakes and recognize when they make a mistake and have the knowledge to fix it. Teachers can teach students how to do this. It takes considerable practice and students need to understand that this will not happen immediately (Ray, 2001). The issue is how to teach editing to students.

In an era of high stake testing and the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, some principals, parents, school boards, and students prefer prescriptive curriculum. Many teachers may use a grammar textbook to teach the grammar skills necessary to develop these editing skills. Shaughnessy (1977) writes that students may believe that “good writing” means “correct writing” or grammatically correct writing (p. 8). Hartwell (1985) and Hillocks and Smith (1991) found that a study of grammar alone has no impact on the quality of a student’s writing. Hartwell (1985) writes that “the advice given in ‘the common school grammars’ is unconnected with anything remotely resembling literate adult behavior” (p. 120). As an example, Hartwell (1985) examines the rule that states that students should not write sentence fragments. The student should be able to recognize verbs, subjects and verbs, all parts of speech, phrases and subordinate clauses, and main clauses and types of sentences. The *Harbrace College Handbook* from 1982 gives the following advice to avoid sentence fragments:

Before handing in a composition ... proofread each word group written as a sentence. Test each one for completeness. First, be sure that it has at least one subject and one predicate. Next, be sure that the word group is not a dependent clause beginning with a subordinating conjunction or a relative clause (qtd. in Hartwell, 1985, p. 120).

This approach would define “a sentence fragment as a conceptual error.... It demands heavy emphasis on rote memory, and it asks students to behave in ways patently removed from the behaviors of mature writers” (Hartwell, 1985, p. 120). Therefore, grammar and editing should be taught in context. Weaver (1996) wrote *Teaching Grammar in Context* to help teachers teach grammar as part of well-rounded writing instruction. Weaver (1996) includes most grammatical concepts needed for sentence revision, style, and editing. Of course, students may not automatically apply these concepts, but over time, the student may be able to identify and correct their errors.

Self-polishing and self-editing also includes the final proofreading. “When you publish the writing, you need to make sure the writing will be ‘reading-friendly’” (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001, p. 67). Students should be sure that their writing structure and words are clear to the reader. Proofreading is the last and final run through of a piece before publication.

This step can be done solely by the author or it can be done by the author and the editing team where the piece will be published. In school, the final editor may be the teacher. In professional and school journalism publishing, the final editors may be the copy editors. At this point in the writing, the author’s and final editor’s jobs are to make sure the words and meaning are clear to the reader.

This is why a top down approach to revision, editing, and proofreading should be taught. Revision deals with the bigger picture. Editing improves the language of the piece. Proofreading finalizes every word on the page. Most schools do not teach this, but students should be made aware that this is how it works in the real world. There seems to be some effort in the FYC Workshop course, but more could be done to teach an approach like this.

Stopping. Finally, Emig (1971), Pianko (1979), and Ray (2001) discussed that when a student is ready he or she will *stop*. For Emig (1971) this meant that the writer will stop when he or she feels the piece cannot be worked on any longer. Teachers should help students understand that it is acceptable to go far with a draft before stopping. Only the writer can figure out when the stopping point should be (Ray, 2001). This is difficult, however, when there are deadlines to meet.

Final Draft Submission and Evaluation

The final stage in the writing process is submission and evaluation of a final piece of work. This can also be referred to as publication. Alber-Morgan, et al. (2007) stress that publication is “a natural contingency of reinforcement” (p. 122) and it is the end of a long process (Graves, 1983). Publishing will allow students to see the real world context for writing for an audience and for a purpose. The purpose of publishing should be authentic (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001). It focuses on what a student can do. It does not focus on what a student cannot do. Every child can publish in some way.

When students have the opportunity to publish, they may be more apt to write. Reluctant students may not like to write, but they may enjoy publishing (Alber-Morgan,

et al., 2007). Publishing is “an important mode of literary enfranchisement for each child in the classroom” (Graves, 1983, p. 55).

Graves (1983) writes that older students take more time on writing and, thus, publish less. However, work should be celebrated early and often throughout the school year. The publication should take the form of what the author intended, i.e. poetry could be performed aloud or a play could be acted out by students. It should be up to the student what he or she wants to do with it. Teachers can help make that idea happen by encouraging the use of a class collection of writing; or submitting the writing to school publications, state publications, national publications, or writing contests (Blasingame & Bushman, 2005).

Evaluation and assessment. Pianko (1979) found that students will run through the last three phases of writing quickly. These include *stopping*, *contemplating the finished product*, and *handing in the finished product*. A student will *stop* when he/she feels they have written all they want to say at that particular time. *Contemplating the finished product* occurs briefly before handing in the paper. The physical stance and clearing of the desk indicates the *handing in of the product*. This may be quick or a lengthy ritual. These acts were done quickly in Pianko’s 1979 study so the student could be finished and could leave the space where they were writing. Students’ reactions to the writing guidelines were consistent with Emig (1971) who showed that school-sponsored writing was limited because the parameters that teachers give may be rigid and difficult for students to meet, and therefore, they were weary of the teacher’s influence.

Therefore, Pianko (1979) suggested that more can be done to help students work within their own writing process. If students understand writing only as a teacher-specific

context and audience, the writer may never move forward. Unfortunately, teachers might believe that this is the only way to teach writing. Students, then, only “give the teachers what they want” (Pianko, 1979, p. 18). Writing teachers who follow this pattern are essentially grading on how well a student follows directions.

Writing can be difficult to grade. Grades should not be based on the piece alone. Yet, in many classrooms, the focus for the final grade remains on the finished product. Whatever the student does in the writing process should be considered as part of the grade (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001; Ray, 2001) along with the student’s growth over time (Atwell, 1987). The teacher should ask themselves what a writer looks like when he or she is doing well in the writing workshop. These facets could include the student’s productive use of writing time, interaction with peers and with the teacher, and engagement in the entire writing process.

Students can self-evaluate so they can provide their own input toward a letter or numerical grade (Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001). This self-evaluation could ask students to respond to a set of questions to address what the student feels he or she did well and how this new piece might compare to other pieces they have written. Murray (1973) says that honesty is a crucial element when a piece of writing is evaluated. “Is each word true? Does the writer say what he means?” are two questions that students can ask themselves and teachers can ask students during the evaluation process (Murray, 1973, p. 1237). At the secondary level, the students’ evaluative comments could be added to their writing record for the course of the school year. “Making evaluation an occasion for a student and teacher to analyze the work together, set goals, and assess progress, extends and

enriches students' development" (Atwell, 1998, p. 327). This evaluation could be part of a collection of writing over the course of the semester or over the entire school year.

Graves (2004) believes that a collection of work needs to be kept to show a student's writing history. This is "to review unpublished work or to sense the many roads they have taken in their writing" (Graves, 1983, p. 63). This can be done on paper or in a digital portfolio (Nobles, 2010). Portfolios allow students to reflect on their skills and development as a writer. Teachers should assess their students based on "who the student is becoming" (Atwell, 1998, p. 314). As the students add their pieces to their writing folder, teachers can evaluate how many pieces were produced, and the range of topics and genres the students explored. Based on the evidence in the portfolios, Atwell (1998) writes accomplishments, strengths, and goals for each student. Goals should be short because students should also set their own goals.

Any grade given is always up for interpretation. Therefore, keeping records of conferences and daily writing time productivity, and copies of drafts and final writing projects will help teachers evaluate their students. Showing artifacts and taking good notes can be used to back up grades as necessary to show strengths and improvements over time. This is why it is important for students to never throw away their writing. Writing should be kept over time for teachers to provide evidence to the student, parents, and administrators of a student's progress. FYC Workshop uses an electronic portfolio, or ePortfolio, to house the pieces of writing and reflections done throughout the semester. Instructors grade each writing project and emerging self-reflections on the course goals over the course of the semester. The final evaluation includes the reading of final reflections and surveying the multiple drafts of writing projects.

The Goals and Supports of First-Year Composition

Generally, FYC courses are to provide general writing skills for college students to write at the university level and beyond into the workforce. Historically, writing instruction was a concern for the “scripting of oral performance” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Bordelon, Wright, & Halloran, 2012, p. 212). During the second half of the nineteenth century, there was a growing population of students, from a variety of backgrounds, entering college. These students brought a diverse knowledge and to compensate for these varying abilities, university writing composition courses were focused more on form and correction than on creative thought or the writer’s process (Bordelon, et al., 2012; Gold, Hobbs, & Berlin, 2012). Today, college level writing instruction may happen at multiple points across the university with supplemental instructional support in the forms of writing centers, tutoring centers, and in-class support.

Many in and out of academia may continue to believe that writing courses should focus on grammar and form. Official reports: “The Neglected ‘R’” (NCWASC, 2003) and *Writing: A Ticket to Work...Or a Ticket Out* (National Commission on Writing for America’s Families, Schools, & Colleges, 2004) read that students should concentrate on these matters. Yet, FYC should prepare students to write in any discipline, across the university. Wardle (2009) states that “students in FYC can be taught ways of writing (genre and genre knowledge) that they can then transfer to the writing they do in other courses across the university” (p. 766). Sometimes, the writing instruction of college

professors is tied to their older knowledge of teaching writing. Richardson (2008) cites Linda Brodkey who says that these older notions of how professors learned to write are “common-sense myths of literacy” (p. A47). In the 1960s, some instructors realized that students need to learn to write well in more than one area, that conventions in the disciplines vary, and that grammar and mechanics is not writing. Yet some gaps in preparation for the rest of college writing remain (Richardson, 2008; Thonney, 2011; Wardle, 2009).

Many universities continue to mold and shape FYC programs to meet the needs of students and attempt to close these gaps. Many universities are using the WPA outcomes and/or the *Framework* to assess student learning at the end of first-year composition. To assist students in meeting these goals, instructors may use a process model to set up FYC courses. Many universities may also employ supportive sources for students; these supports may include the university writing centers and Writing Fellows, who are built into the FYC course. To show the growth of the writer, end of course portfolios may be produced to showcase the student’s work and include self-reflective writing, which may be informed by the WPA outcomes and/or the *Framework*.

WPA Outcomes and the *Framework for Success*

At the university level, many writing programs across the country have implemented goals from the WPA outcomes for their first-year composition programs that may build upon the knowledge from the college and career-ready state standards in K-12 and extend this knowledge into college writing. A complementary document, the

Framework for Success in Postsecondary Education, was released in 2011 and is also used by university writing programs across the nation.

History of the WPA Outcomes and the *Framework*. In the spring of 1996, a professor asked the CWPA listserv about what other professors believe students should learn by the end of FYC. Specifically, the discussant, Gordon Grant (1996), wanted to know what students should know and be able to do and if there were any particular standards that other professors used. This idea was turned into a question by another CWPA member who asked if the listserv could draft a set of objectives (White, 1996). After much conversation online, an initial version of the outcome statement was discussed during a forum at the 1997 WPA conference.

An unofficial draft was written prior to the 1997 WPA conference forum for discussion. Four primary outcomes were drafted in this working document: Rhetorical Knowledge, Genre Knowledge, Writing-Reading Connections, and Processes. Rhetorical knowledge covers the use of appropriate discourse for the intended purpose, and recognizing and responding to differences in discourse. Students should also be able to write for a specific audience, write for a specific purpose, write in an appropriate voice, and write formally. Genre knowledge discusses specific conventions of genre, including format, mechanics, and structure. The writing-reading connection asks students to use reading and writing for learning, thinking, and communication. The practice of a writing process allows students to be aware that it takes multiple drafts, collaboration, and giving and accepting critique to write a composition. Students should also know how to locate, analyze, and evaluate appropriate primary and secondary sources to use in their writing (“CCCC ‘97,” 1997).

A group of college writing instructors met to discuss these drafted outcomes. This group became known as the “Outcomes Group.” They wanted to determine if there were any commonalities between writing programs and if they could articulate an understanding of what writing instructors do and establish a common set of outcomes (CWPA, 1999). These primary outcomes were further discussed during the 1998 Conference on College Composition and Communication and the 1998 WPA conference. After the 1999 WPA conference, a steering committee published the first official outcomes document.

The first WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition “described the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes” for programs in American postsecondary education (CWPA, 1999, p. 60). It attempted to regularize what teachers have learned from practice, research, and theory on writing instruction at the college level. The outcomes attend to the hope that students’ writing abilities will “not only diversify along disciplinary and professional lines but also move into whole new levels where expected outcomes expand, multiply, and diverge” (CWPA, 1999, p. 61).

The 1999 WPA outcomes document describes four areas: Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Processes; and Knowledge of Conventions. These outcome areas include ideas from the original 1997 draft, but add ideas about identifying, analyzing, and writing in multiple genres; and using technology to address audiences. The four major outcome areas are described with specific bullet points and add ideas on how faculty in all programs and departments can build upon these skills.

The “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition” is the first statement of its kind to define and articulate what is expected from students who complete FYC

courses (Yancey, 2001). When the document was published on the internet and in a 1999 edition of the *WPA* journal, instructors across the country responded. Some found it useful (Moneyhun, 1999) while others were “ambivalent” (Rhodes, 1999, p. 65). It could also be misused (Moneyhun, 1999; Yancey, 1999) or seen as a political document (Wiley, 1999). However, the document served as a stepping stone for instructors across the country to give the outcomes context for extensions beyond composition courses.

It is important to note that these outcomes are not standards. Standards are levels of achievement that are set for the curriculum. Outcomes are results. The introduction to the WPA outcomes statement published in 1999’s *WPA* journal cites that learning to write is a long process that must be practiced with instructor guidance. This guidance should be informed by theory and practice.

The outcomes statement changed in 2008 with the inclusion of standards for composing in electronic environments. The document cites the idea that writing in the 21st century includes writing online and using digital technologies to produce writing in all the writing process areas of brainstorming, drafting, and reviewing work with peers (CWPA, 2008). This new outcome also covers conducting research online and understanding the rhetorical strategies for writing using electronic mediums.

Discussions on college and career readiness prompted educators from three organizations: CWPA, NCTE, and NWP to develop the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*. This task force developed a framework that will discuss the experiences, knowledge gained, and the use of eight habits of mind that students need to be successful in their first year of writing (and beyond) at the college level.

The *Framework* believed that writing instruction is shared by all teachers K-16; college and career readiness should be defined by college professors at two-year and four-year colleges and high school teachers, and should draw on the experiences of K-16 teachers and research on writing instruction. With the introduction of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), students at K-12 were provided with an understanding of what they are expected to learn at each grade level. These college and career ready standards for K-12 include reading, writing, speaking, and listening. The writing standards, specifically, focus on three primary modes of writing (argumentative, informational, and narrative). These modes increase in complexity at each grade level. It is “clear that the Standards outlined in that document would significantly affect the writing experiences that students would have before entering college” (O’Neill, Adler-Kassner, Fleischer, & Hall, 2012, p. 522). A response to these standards would be necessary to ensure a student’s success.

The Common Core State Standards for writing ensures that students are college ready. However, college writing teachers and researchers were not part of the discussion. Thus the *Framework* was developed to address what students would need to know and be able to do for success in college endeavors. The Task Force worked with a series of questions about what the members value in writing and necessary rhetorical experiences for students to be successful in college and in future careers. The final *Framework* was released in January 2011.

The *Framework* adapted the five outcomes from the original WPA document, but adds eight habits of mind. The habits of mind are ways to approach learning to support what students will do in various fields and disciplines. These eight habits of mind are

curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence, responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition. The *Framework* identifies that these habits can be fostered through the experiences similarly outlined in the five major WPA outcome areas: Developing Rhetorical Knowledge; Developing Critical Thinking Through Writing, Reading, and Research; Developing Flexible Writing Processes; Developing Knowledge of Conventions; and Composing in Multiple Environments.

The *Framework* names a primary audience: “instructors who teach writing and include writing in their classes at all levels and in all subjects” (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011, p. 2). The use of the document is encouraged to exist outside the realm of FYC. Writing should be across the curriculum and this document can help bridge all writing practices across fields of discipline.

On July 17, 2014, the CWPA released a third version of their outcomes statement. In March 2012, the Task Force was asked to revisit the outcomes statement by figuring out who were using the outcomes, how it was being used, and whether revisions of the document were needed. The members informally discussed this with their local colleagues. Twenty-seven WPAs and faculty at various universities (large, small, public private, two-year, and four-year) responded to the inquiry (Dryer, Bowden, Brunk-Chavez, Harrington, Halbritter, & Yancey, 2014). Four of these institutions did not employ learning outcomes and the remainder used the WPA outcomes as-is or they adapted the outcomes to fit their local needs.

The 2014 WPA outcomes statement is aligned with the *Framework*. The document uses the word “composing” instead of writing because writers are using technologies more to compose their work. Composing also refers to design and graphic

elements used in composing a work that will be available digitally and/or in print. Due to this idea of using the word “composing” instead of “writing,” the fifth outcome from the 2008 document, “Composing in Electronic Environments,” is now incorporated throughout the document instead of standing on its own.

Potential uses of the WPA outcomes in FYC. Since the WPA outcomes are not standards for teaching writing, but goals for students to demonstrate at the end of FYC, the course curriculum is usually built by the instructor. Instructors must create assignments where students can see future application and where students can understand that they will gain something by completing the assignments. Rankins-Robertson (2013) discusses an assignment where students were asked to write a biographical sketch. She revised the assignment and reflected on the use of the WPA outcomes: “My goals in revising the assignment were to directly incorporate the WPA [outcomes statement] into my assignment in an effort to allow students to see the application of the learning outcomes throughout the course” (Rankins-Robertson, 2013, p. 68). The revised assignment asked students to write for a specific purpose and audience, engage in the writing and research processes, make specific rhetorical decisions, and conduct a self-assessment upon completion of the final draft.

W. Olson (2013) created a curriculum design for the basic writing program and FYC at Washington State University Vancouver with the hope that the outcomes will serve as a “means for addressing and negotiating the politics of basic writing -- from the curriculum up -- at other colleges and universities” (p. 19). Using the Stretch program at Arizona State University (ASU) as a guide, the author created a sequence of syllabi and assignments for the basic writing course and the FYC course. The Stretch program at

ASU is an extended version of ENG 101 that is stretched over two semesters of course study (“Arizona State University’s Stretch Program,” n.d.). W. Olson (2013) used part of the philosophy of ASU’s stretch program to emphasize that reading and writing are interdependent of each other, and she extended the time frame from one semester to two. “Using the outcomes to connect these courses provided basic writing students with a programmatic structure and coherence from one class to the next” (W. Olson, 2013, p. 26). The program would also include rhetorical analysis, a process model approach, and portfolio assessment in each course.

The Process Model. There are multiple models of FYC courses that may use the WPA outcomes and the *Framework* or have similar goals. During the 1970s, Ken Macrorie (1970), Peter Elbow (1973), and Mina Shaughnessy (1977) outlined a process model that many instructors have used to influence their college writing course curriculum that focuses on the writing process.

The Penn State Composition Program Handbook (2002) and Villanueva (2002) also discuss the idea of a process model course that stresses the idea that writing should be treated as a work in progress. The Penn State Composition Program Handbook (2002) encourages writing assignments that are structured and sequenced to encourage engagement with the writing process. The program asks that writing assignments should include a subject, aim (or purpose), genre, and audience. Invention work should be conducted. A written topic proposal and rough draft workshop should also be included in the curriculum. When the writing is submitted for evaluation, a self-reflection should also be written to show a student’s learning of the objectives for the writing assignment.

Choosing a subject and writing for a specific purpose, audience, and genre is important for creating assignments in FYC. Wardle's (2009) study on the problem of genre in FYC focused on 23 teachers and 25 sections of FYC in second-semester courses. The results of this study found that teachers and students should be "educated about the genres of various disciplines, collect as many examples of them as possible, explicitly abstract the textual characteristics of those various genres, and reflect on how those genres are used to mediate work in different classrooms" (Wardle, 2009, p. 782).

Thonney (2011) studied academic discourse in 24 research articles from six disciplines: psychology, sports medicine, biology, marketing, literature, and engineering. All 24 of these writers showed common general rhetorical knowledge that could be passed onto FYC students. These academic discourse moves include summarizing what has been written about their topics, stating the purpose for their writing, establishing a reasonable and authoritative tone, using discipline-specific language, and emphasizing evidence. Teaching these rhetorical moves may allow students in FYC to apply these learned skills to their own disciplines throughout the university (Thonney, 2011).

Using the Process Model and the WPA outcome: Processes

Courses using a process model may have multiple opportunities for invention work, the production of multiple drafts, and opportunities for peer review. The Processes WPA outcome lists several bullet points for students to meet throughout first-year composition. The outcome reads:

By the end of first year composition, students should:

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
- Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others' work
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- To build final results in stages
- To review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing
- To save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process
- To apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields (CWPA, 2008).

If faculty in FYC programs support students by providing the opportunities listed, students may be able to meet these outcomes by the end of their course.

Instructors may also utilize support from the university writing center and/or an embedded-in-the-course Writing Fellow.

Writing centers. While writing centers are prevalent at the high school level, they are typically found at the university level. One of the most popular resources for writing center help is the Online Writing Lab (OWL) at Purdue University, which offers handouts on writing in different citation styles and information on general writing resources. The OWL was developed by Muriel Harris and David Taylor and went live online in the spring of 1994, years after Muriel Harris had started the university's physical writing center in 1976 as a resource for all writers at the university (Purdue OWL, 2014). Writing centers across the country share common traits: one-on-one tutorials with professionally trained tutors (who may be undergraduate students, graduate students, professionals, or part-time/full-time faculty members); a focus on the students' individual needs; and availability for all students, at any level, in any discipline.

While an argument exists that writing centers are seen as help for struggling writers, it is a place for trained peers to “intervene in the writer’s process” (Jackson, 2002, p. 375). Students can come into the center with finished rough drafts, works in progress, or the assignment for a brainstorming practice. It is a way for writers to receive what they need the most: “talk in all its forms” (North, 1984, p. 443). Harris (1995) describes that tutors can cover these aspects of “talk in all its forms”:

Tutors can help students learn how to proofread, how to let go and brainstorm, how to capture a flood of ideas in the planning stage, how to take all those scraps of paper and note cards and organize them, how to insert revisions into a text, how to draw back and figure out if the organizational structure is appropriate, or how to check on paragraph development (p. 33).

The tutor provides feedback in a safe, non-judgmental environment to help the student gain more knowledge to use in their later writing practices.

Writing instructors at the college level have used the writing center in various ways. They may offer the center as an optional (yet encouraged) resource. Other classes may make a visit to the writing center a requirement. Some researchers have found that instructors should be careful when assigning their entire classes to attend the writing center (Clark, 1985; Gordon, 2008; North, 1984). Some students may enter the center and “arrive with an indifferent or hostile attitude from being forced into going” (Gordon, 2008, p. 155). Yet Gordon (2008) also found that some students appreciated the writing center and would not have gone before. Clark (1985) also writes that requiring students to attend sessions at the writing center gives them encouragement as writers.

Bell (2002) studied differences between drafts before and after the writer’s work with a tutor. The researcher conducted two studies, as the first study with peer tutors was inconclusive. However, a second study was conducted and Bell (2002) found that the writers who made revisions after receiving feedback from a professional writing tutor (who seemed to not be a university writing center tutor, but a freelance writing tutor) improved on their papers: “In short, the writers became better writers” (p. 14). This study can help prove that working with a tutor can benefit the student.

Writing Fellows. Writing Fellows are typically undergraduate students who work alongside instructors in writing across the curriculum (WAC) courses and in FYC courses. Writing Fellows work with students on multiple drafts and hold conferences with the students after reading their drafts (Hall & Hughes, 2011; Soven, 2001). Writing

Fellows, as a concept, developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s and are typically credited to Harriet Sheridan and Tori Haring-Smith (Regaignon & Bromley, 2011).

Haring-Smith (1992) writes that in 1980, she was asked by the dean, Harriet Sheridan, to solve the issue of struggling writers across the Brown University campus. Haring-Smith would open a writing center, but she soon found that the instructors outside the English department felt that they were not responsible for teaching writing. She found that the university needed a WAC program. The program needed to focus on the writing process. Peer feedback should be a factor because “peer feedback helps writers retain authority over their own texts” (Haring-Smith, 1992, p. 177). The peer feedback idea evolved into the Writing Fellows Program at Brown. The Writing Fellows are different than writing center tutors. Writing centers are centrally located, whereas Writing Fellows are built into the course. The Writing Fellow also works more closely to the particular instructor he or she works with.

Hall and Hughes (2011) describe two crucial parts for setting up Writing Fellow programs: 1) the preparation of faculty to work with Writing Fellows, and 2) the preparation of Writing Fellows to work with the faculty. Faculty are carefully chosen for the program who demonstrate a commitment to the teaching of writing and to collaboration with the Writing Fellow, who are patient and flexible with working with the Writing Fellow program, and who can implement a process model into their writing assignments. The Writing Fellows are also trained in a “writing-intensive honors seminar” to learn strategies for commenting on papers and holding successful conferences (Hall & Hughes, 2011, p. 28).

The success of a Writing Fellow program is discussed in a study conducted by Regaignon and Bromley (2011). The researchers studied the portfolios of students who were enrolled in two courses. Ten of the participating students were in a section with a Writing Fellow and another fourteen participants were in a section without Writing Fellows. Regaignon and Bromley (2011) found that “students who draft and revise in light of feedback from trained peer tutors multiple times over the course of the semester may very well show more improvement than those that do not work with fellows” (p. 44). In Regaignon and Bromley’s (2011) study, the two Writing Fellows who worked with students in the Writing Fellow section were also trained writing center tutors.

End of Course Portfolios for Self-Reflection

End of course portfolios at the college level are an opportunity to provide an overview of a student’s growth over the course of the semester. Like the portfolios described at the K-12 level, college level portfolios usually include writing projects alongside their subsequent drafts. Many college level portfolios may also include self-reflective pieces (Burch, 2002; Ryder, 2002). These self-reflections may show a student’s own writing progress, their writing goals, their achievements, and their thoughts about writing. The portfolio may also use the WPA outcomes and the *Framework* as a model for students to self-reflect about their learning.

Ryder’s (2002) portfolio assignment may include one of the three (or all) major projects written throughout the semester. All drafts should be included with the major projects. Other samples of writing may also be included to provide support for the student’s learning. A metacognitive essay is also included to reflect on the writing

completed during the semester. This essay should “persuade your readers that the portfolio demonstrates your learning and achievement in this course” (Ryder, 2002, p. 182-183). Burch’s (2002) portfolio assignment is similar in that students may present writing projects with drafts as their “best work,” but they are also encouraged to pull in pieces that were left unfinished. This work will be supported by an analysis that is self-reflective and articulates the student’s learning. The portfolio will present the writing strengths and the documented growth of the writer (Burch, 2002).

The portfolio assignment may also reflect the WPA outcomes. Blanchard, D’Antonio, and Cahill (2002) discuss the use of a portfolio assignment with an attached presentation where the student must present his or her portfolio to a panel of five fellow students and two instructors. The assignment presented in Blanchard, et al.’s (2002) chapter is a portfolio overview written by chapter author, Amy D’Antonio. Like other portfolios previously described, the portfolio serves as a demonstration of the student’s mastery of skills throughout FYC. There are two components: one, an introduction that discusses the changes students made as a writer, using the WPA outcomes as a guide to show their progress; and two, a revision plan for how the student might revise a project “if you had the chance to revise the project” (Blanchard, et al., 2002, p. 197). The panel of students and instructors will evaluate the student based on all the work included in the portfolio (invention work, rough drafts, final drafts, revision plans, peer reviews, and other written entries from the class). Students should use any piece of writing they produced in the course and self-reflect on the WPA outcomes (and on any other skills the student felt he or she developed) “to persuade your audience that you have carefully evaluated your own work” (Blanchard, et al., 2002, p. 199). The portfolios will then be

presented orally to the panel in which the student will summarize the best components to describe their “progress as a writer, reader, thinker, and learner” (Blanchard, et al., 2002, p. 198).

Using a process model and the WPA outcomes and eight habits of mind from *the Framework* alongside an end-of-course portfolio may be the key to the success of a student in FYC.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

A qualitative, descriptive analysis of case studies was utilized for this research study to consider how the components of the writing process evolved for three students in their FYC Workshop ENG 101 course. The data was collected through the FYC Workshop, which is a process-based FYC program offered primarily to students earning online degrees. Sources of data collected for this study include a number of written documents (or online FYC artifacts): a discussion board posting from week 2 (on the writer's existing process before the course work fully employs the writing process); a short, written assignment from week 3 (the writer's thoughts on peer review prior to conducting the first required peer review in the course); drafts from the two major projects, which include at least three drafts (a peer review draft, a more feedback draft, and a final draft); and materials from the final ePortfolio with major focus on the WPA Outcome Processes page. An understanding of these documents could help bridge the assumed disconnect between high school writing and college writing.

Selection of Participants

Due to the FYC Workshop course already having a blanket IRB study in place, I was added as a co-Investigator. My dissertation work fit into the goals for the existing study. All 94 students were solicited via email and eleven students submitted their consent. Qualitative case studies usually work with a small sample (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2014). Yin (2014) discusses a one-phase approach when the researcher has “only a dozen or so” in the participant pool (p. 95). The researcher could collect limited

documentation about each candidate and use a set of operational criteria to determine the best qualified cases to study. Of the eleven who gave consent to study, I chose to study three individuals, whose ages range from 20 to mid-40s who provided the most comprehensive data.

I chose FYC Workshop for various reasons. First, I have worked for the FYC Workshop program since its inception as the sole instructor of the advanced course (ENG 105). I was familiar with the basic format, the assigned papers and projects, and the WPA outcomes and eight habits of mind from the *Framework* that students reflected upon in the final ePortfolio. Second, I was most interested in the types of students who take FYC in this online environment. Many of the students had not taken composition courses in years; some as much as 20 years. Other students were fresh out of high school. In the past, I have taught mothers and fathers, grandmothers, former military, people with full-time jobs and families, and the typical college student age of 18-22. Therefore, the environment yields a range of student backgrounds and provides a rich variety for choosing case study participants.

A Qualitative, Descriptive Case Study Research Approach

Qualitative research seeks to describe an individual representative of a group, an organization, or a phenomenon in its natural context, bounded by space and time (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). This approach allows researchers to explore and understand a social action. The process of researching in the qualitative manner consists of “emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participant’s

setting, data analysis inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of the data” (Creswell, 2014, p. 4).

Qualitative research deals in words and this study dealt in the words of the participants through what they wrote on the course discussion boards and on their written end-of-course portfolios. In particular, case study research examines phenomena through a particular context. If a research question seeks to explain the “how” or “why” of how a social phenomenon works, then the case study method can be used (Yin, 2006; Yin, 2014). A case study was chosen because the case (the writing process) cannot be considered without the context (the online FYC course in FYC Workshop).

Baxter and Jack (2008) describe that after choosing to use a case study design, a researcher should decide the type of case study to conduct. Yin (2014) identifies case studies as explanatory, exploratory, or descriptive. A descriptive case study would describe the phenomenon in its real world context. He also recognizes that case studies can be single, holistic, or multi-case.

Therefore, a descriptive, multi-case study was chosen to examine the changes in the writing process that students applied during the eight week semester of FYC in the FYC Workshop model. In this study, the cases “are carried out in close proximity to a local setting for a sustained period of time” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 9). An end-of-course portfolio was created online at the beginning of the eight week session. Students participated in discussion posts to first explore the writing process, complete various writing process activities to produce invention work and multiple drafts on two major writing projects, develop their self-reflections based on the WPA outcomes and habits of mind from the *Framework*, and finalize their reflections in their ePortfolio for

the final graded assignment in the course. The activities existed in an online writing course (space) and over the course of eight weeks (time).

A multiple case study enables the researcher to explore the various differences within and between the cases (Yin, 2014). The three cases provided a deep understanding of how each individual viewed the writing process before and after the extensive writing process work they completed in FYC Workshop. The data was gathered through the collection of qualitative documents/artifacts (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014).

Data Collection

Sources of information for case study research may include interviews, observations, instruments created by the researcher, documents, and physical artifacts (Creswell, 2014; Hancock & Algozzine, 2011; Yin, 2014). However, students were not interviewed or observed by the researcher in this study. Therefore, the process-based curriculum in FYC Workshop gave me the opportunity to read various documents (online FYC artifacts) written throughout the course to “uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem” (Merriam, 1998, p. 118). I collected discussion board posts, written assignments, drafts of projects, and the final reflections on the ePortfolio to get a sense of the students’ feelings toward using the writing process throughout the eight week session.

One of the first discussion boards serves as a starting point to understanding what the student brings into the course. This writing process discussion board in week 2 asks students to talk about their existing writing process. In week 3, the students will watch a video from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2011) titled “No One Writes Alone –

Peer Review in the Classroom: A Guide for Students.” This video is about peer review and students will write about their views on the subject in a short, written assignment.

Throughout the course, students write two major projects. These major projects cover different topics with an opportunity to write in different genres, for different audiences, and for various purposes (namely, writing to explore and inform and writing to analyze). Students are required to submit a draft to the peer review discussion board for feedback from their classmates. Students are then encouraged to write a second draft based on this feedback and submit their paper to the “more feedback” discussion board for possible feedback from the Writing Fellow, if the instructor is working with one. The Writing Fellow is an undergraduate student who serves as an assistant to the instructor. The student may also submit their draft to the university writing center for feedback.

Over the course of the eight week semester, students also fill an ePortfolio with all drafts of their major writing projects, which include the peer review draft, the more feedback draft, and the final draft; metacognitive reflections on the WPA outcomes and eight habits of mind; and optional freewriting, invention work, and extra credit assignments.

Data Analysis

The method of data analysis was influenced by Creswell (2014). First, I organized and prepared all data that I wished to collect. I gathered eight to ten pieces of online FYC artifacts from each participant. The number depended on the drafts the writer included on each project. Students were asked to upload their rough draft, which would be peer-reviewed; a second draft was submitted to the Writing Fellow or the writing center for

review; and a final draft for evaluation. A handful of the rough drafts and second drafts were occasionally the same text.

Next, I read through all the data. Creswell (2014) described this second step as a way to gather a general sense of the data as a whole. The researcher should reflect on its overall meaning. This step may lead to the qualitative researcher to write margin notes or observations. These margin notes became memos throughout my reading of the data (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). The memos provided hints and clues to code my data.

The third step was to begin coding the data. I turned to a computer system, NVIVO, to store and code my qualitative data. This process was faster and more efficient than hand coding and allowed me to find all passages that responded to a code across the multiple cases (Creswell, 2014). To form the codes, I used Tesch's (1990) eight-step method. These steps were paraphrased as follows:

1. Get a sense of the whole.
2. Pick one document and think about its underlying meaning. Write thoughts in the margin.
3. Make a list of all topics, cluster similar topics, and make columns to distinguish between major, unique, and leftover topics.
4. Code the text.
5. Categorize and draw lines between categories to show interrelationships.
6. Alphabetize final codes.
7. Assemble by final code and perform preliminary analysis.
8. Recode, if necessary.

During step 3 of Tesch's (1990) method, codes were determined in two ways: 1) codes I expected to find based on my literature review of the general writing process, and 2) codes that were surprising and not anticipated while I read through the material.

Creswell (2014) described the fourth step as "us[ing] the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes and analysis" (p. 199). Creswell (2014) recommended generating five to seven major themes. These themes were often used as headings in the findings section. These themes should "display multiple perspectives from individuals and be supported by diverse quotations and specific evidence" (Creswell, 2014, p. 200).

Fifth, I decided how the description and themes were represented in the findings narrative. Creswell (2014) wrote that a narrative passage is frequently used in qualitative research to convey the researcher's findings. This might include a chronology of events, detailed discussion of the major themes, and a discussion of the interconnecting themes. Case study research conveyed this descriptive information about each participant.

Lastly, the qualitative researcher would make an interpretation of the findings (Creswell, 2014). Using thematic analysis, each online FYC artifact was examined with the research question in mind (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). Themes were formulated to answer my research question. The interpretation and formulation of themes were a result of personal interpretation combined with the information gleaned from the review of literature. A description of each case study presented "a detailed account of the phenomenon under study" (Merriam, 1988, p. 27).

Researcher Bias

Since the researcher is the primary collector of the data, the data is filtered through the researcher's theoretical position and biases. "Deciding what is important -- what should or should not be attended to when selecting and analyzing data -- is almost always up to the investigator" (Merriam, 1998, p. 182). When thinking about this notion of the researcher deciding what is relevant, I believe my own subjectivity is important to understand my own interpretation of the data in this study.

I hail from a rigorous K-12 education system in the state of Virginia. My state took great strides to provide a high-expectation and high-achievement education due to the changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which set new mandates for high expectations and accountability and sought to fund primary and secondary education. In 1994, President Bill Clinton reauthorized the ESEA. This was called the Improving America's School Act (IASA). Part of the IASA was to improve instruction for all students. It added math and reading/writing standards to assess student progress. A year later, the Virginia Department of Education adopted the Standards of Learning (SOL), which "describe the commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12" in all four core areas as well as technology, the fine arts, foreign language, health and physical education, and driver education (Virginia Department of Education, 2012).

During my junior year of high school, I took Virginia's new assessment tests, the SOL, which were implemented the year before in 1998 (Virginia Department of Education, 2005). The Language Arts assessments are only given to third, fifth, eighth, and eleventh graders. Also as a high school junior, my particular county implemented a

mandatory research paper to be written by all eleventh grade students. By 2001, President George Bush signed another authorization of the ESEA, known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The SOL served as support for NCLB. By 2004, all students were required to pass all SOL assessments and the mandatory research paper to graduate from a high school in my home county. The standards were high, and Virginia rose to achieve them. During the 2004-2005 school year, nine out of ten Virginia public schools were fully accredited, based on the schools' achievement in English, math, science, and social studies (Virginia Department of Education, 2005).

Due to the implementation of the state standards, the SOL assessments, and the mandatory research paper, I was required to follow the curriculum framework, which included a rigorous writing strand. During my years in the Virginia education system, I learned a great deal about the writing process. I learned that there is more than one way to approach a writing task, but the idea behind each step is basically the same. I enhanced this information when I attended college in another high-achievement state, Massachusetts.

My K-16 teachers taught me how to think, gather my ideas, research an idea, and form a plan of attack when I started the actual writing. I learned that I needed to write more than one draft in order to be successful. I also learned the power of revising, editing, and proofreading my work in stages. After my freshman year of college, my composition professor recommended me to train as a tutor in the college writing center. I began my writing center training, where I learned how to revise and provide appropriate feedback to my peers, similar in vein to the Praise-Question-Praise (PQP) technique of Neubert and McNelis (1990). In my journalism courses, I learned how to copyedit my

own work as well as the work of others. I would later serve as the copy editor on the college's newspaper. I also wrote a profile piece for a magazine writing class where I interviewed a professional copy editor, who built the entire copy editing department for a major magazine based out of Chicago. She taught me that a writer must revise for content, edit for the correct words and usage, fact check every piece of information, and carefully proofread before final publication. In college, I learned the power of multiple drafts and writing collaboratively.

Years of immersion in Virginia's rigorous English/Language Arts curriculum, journalism study, real world copyediting knowledge, and university writing tutoring experience have allowed me to see how the process model could be used to effect a writer's growth over time. I have been teaching in the FYC Workshop program since the course was first created. The growth of my FYC students due to this pedagogy and the ability for students to self-reflect on the "WPA Outcomes for First-Year Composition" (CWPA, 2008) and the eight habits of mind from the *Framework for Success in First-Year Composition* (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011) was an experience I wanted to explore further.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter will first present a brief introduction to the research participants and their general thoughts on writing at the beginning of the course. The treatment of the course section includes a general outlook and sequence of the course to explain the assignments mentioned by the participants throughout the remainder of the chapter. Students' writing processes evolved in four components of the writing process: invention work, multiple drafts, the peer review process, and outside editor support. These components will be divided into how they dealt with each component before diving into the process-based curriculum and how they feel about these components after experiencing them throughout the course.

Jean

Jean does not disclose her age in the course nor on the portfolio. However, she is the mother of two young children and is taking her first English course in two decades. Jean is working toward a bachelor's degree in technical communications and hopes to become a technical writer, concentrating on the architecture or construction industry.

Coming into the course, Jean writes that she hasn't "written an essay or short story in a very long time." She is also not aware of her own writing process and writing style. She hopes to refine and develop these skills over the course.

Magnus

Magnus is a veteran of the U.S. Army and has been working as a designer and producer in the video game industry. He writes that “working in the video game industry = grey hair and bad eyesight.” He is now in his mid-40s and lives and works on the West Coast. He finds that he is always thinking about writing, “even if I’m not actively writing something.”

In the beginning of the course, Magnus believes in his writing skills and has “some latent ability.” He is aware of his limitations. He sometimes has trouble focusing: “whenever I’ve written without purpose my writing meandered.” Magnus also wants to work on the “technical aspects of writing (grammar, writing process, [and] conventions).”

Zella

Zella is 20 years old and is originally from the Middle East. She is married and has moved to Southeast Asia. Zella is studying for a bachelor’s degree in family and human development.

In the beginning of the course, Zella writes that she doesn’t “have a lot of experience in writing.” She believes that writing is an individual’s work and she might write in “one [or] maybe two sessions and be done.”

Treatment: The FYC Workshop Course Curriculum

FYC Workshop is a fully immersed online FYC course. The classes are generally large. Therefore, there are multiple instructors to accommodate the large number of

students. Students are divided into smaller groups and paired with a particular instructor. Many, but not all, of the instructors in FYC Workshop are paired with a Writing Fellow to support the group. The three participants were in three separate groups. Jean's group worked with a particular instructor, but the group did not have support from a Writing Fellow. Magnus and Zella were in two different groups, but they shared the same instructor and Writing Fellow.

All FYC Workshop courses are set up in sequential order. Students must complete the first step before moving onto the next step. In an eight week course, students complete two major writing projects coupled with a multimedia component and a final ePortfolio that includes all projects and reflections on the WPA outcomes (CWPA, 2008) and the eight habits of mind from the *Framework* (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011). The class is based on the value of the writing process and helping students improve their own processes. Therefore, students are guided through a writing process that includes invention work; the production of multiple drafts; and a feedback cycle of revising and editing via peer reviews, the Writing Fellow, the writing center, and other outside editors.

During the second week of the course, students are asked to respond to a discussion board about their writing process. Students answer the question: "What's your writing process?" This is the first glimpse into the writer's existing writing process. During Week 3, students are asked to complete a freewriting assignment based on their previous experience receiving feedback from others. This assignment is referred as "Introduction to Peer Review." Students are asked to watch a video from MIT TechTV titled "No One Writes Alone: Peer Review in the Classroom" (2011). After watching the video, students are asked to open their portfolios and find the "Learn to critique their own

and others' work" bullet point on the Processes outcome page. They are then asked to spend time freewriting their thoughts on peer review and ideas from the video.

Each writing project includes discussion board posts related to understanding and reflection of the material, team invention activities, and further invention work. The primary invention work is conducted via eBook activities that ask students to complete various tasks such as freewriting, listing, clustering, and interviewing.

Students write for two purposes. Project 1 asks students to “Write to Explore and Inform.” Project 1 is an interview project where students will create a biographical sketch (or profile) about a particular point in their interviewee's life. Each project includes a multimedia piece: a movie trailer or print advertisement for the profile. Project 2’s purpose is to “Write to Analyze.” Students choose a photograph from Peter Menzel and Faith D’Aluisio’s book *Hungry Planet: What the World Eats* (2005), which profiles 30 families around the world on their weekly food purchases. Students analyze their chosen photograph using the rhetorical appeals (ethos, pathos, and logos). Students also recreate their own “Hungry Planet” photograph and write a reflective essay on their own picture for the multimodal assignment.

After students produce a rough draft, it enters the feedback cycle. FYC Workshop values an extensive revising and editing process. This includes the submission of rough drafts for peer review and opportunities for review from Writing Fellows and/or the university writing center. Students are asked to conduct peer review on two separate classmates’ papers. They conduct peer review based on a set of predetermined questions, but students have the opportunity to ask for specific help on their work. Students should then seek another opinion, using the More Feedback draft discussion board. This board

includes information on the number of papers the Writing Fellow will review and discusses the use of the university online writing center. Students are asked to seek help from one of these sources. Some students might also utilize other sources such as family and friends.

Electronic portfolios (ePortfolios) are used to archive all drafts of the projects and to reflect on the 2008 WPA outcomes and eight habits of mind from the *Framework for Success for Postsecondary Writing* (2011). The ePortfolio will allow students to demonstrate what they learn about writing throughout the short period of the class. It is the hope of FYC Workshop instructors that students develop a wide range of skills and knowledge needed to perform various writing tasks in the future. These ePortfolios are created early in the course. Students are expected to begin their self-reflections with the submission of both of their projects. At the end of the course, students should be able to comment on each of the five WPA outcomes and each of the eight habits of mind using concrete evidence from all the work they have completed throughout the course and show their growth and learning from the course.

Previously Used Invention Work Strategies

During week 2, the students were asked to reflect on their existing writing process. Jean, Magnus, and Zella discussed their existing strategies for invention work. The three participants will conduct research; however, they may conduct research at various points.

Zella may “start bulleting down points, ideas, and thoughts” if she has knowledge about the subject. If she does not have knowledge, she will conduct research. Zella will then divide “points into introductory, and then subsequent paragraph sections.”

Magnus may begin by conducting research, but he says that he has “a loose approach; I don’t work methodically.” He may brainstorm key words and ideas, or create a mind-map. “Mind-mapping is a practice I learned in the videogame industry that creates ‘heat’ around groups of related words and concepts.” Magnus may also open a new document on his word processing program or use a physical notebook to “start blasting ideas as they come to me over a day or two.”

Jean is methodical: “I tend to do things intuitively.” She will follow a sequence, which is listed below in numerical form:

1. Research, tag books with sticky notes, print out articles or other online research, highlight, etc.
2. Create an outline, jotting down every idea that I want to include.
3. Then, I’d clean up the outline and eliminate weak points and rearrange the order.

Invention Work Strategies Learned in the Course

The course uses discussion boards, invention work activities from the eBook, and an audience analysis assignment for the students’ invention work. Jean writes that “it empowered me as a writer to know that I had tools and so I wasn’t reinventing the wheel, just operating the tools.”

Jean used the freewriting assignment for her second writing project to set goals for herself. She also writes that “the eBook was very helpful in providing concrete ways of organizing different types of writing, as well as invention strategies. There were a few moments when I was stalled. I then referred back to the text, which guided me straight.”

Magnus found the invention strategies “fun.” At first his thoughts were “jumbled and random, but as the exercise worn on I discovered more ideas forming and eventually I spotted a concept I wanted to pursue. It’s a brilliant technique and results in something tangible!”

Zella found the audience analysis assignment useful. With her first writing project, a biographical profile assignment, Zella conducted an interview to “contextualize his life [...] and ascertain what direction I wanted to take.” She was able to produce a particular purpose and focus after completing the audience analysis assignment.

Invention Work Strategies Used for Future Projects

Jean wrote in her initial writing process assignment in week 2 that she would create an outline after conducting research. However, using the invention strategies in the course allowed her to take a different approach to begin the first project, the biographical profile. “I found that with this project I didn’t read my finished piece aloud or write an outline, which I usually always do.” Instead, she needed to conduct more secondary research after completing the primary research. Jean skipped the outlining process and instead “took my interview notes and wrote a very rough draft, freewriting and generating notes, as I went along.”

For Project 2, an analysis of a photograph, Jean's invention work was different. She had many ideas but needed a way to organize them. Jean writes:

I had all my research and attempted to make an outline. Somehow it wasn't coming together. So I decided to use the clustering technique [which was used in the eBook assignment from Project 1] for gathering ideas. To take it a step further, I wrote all my big points with details around each, then added "ethos", "logos", and "pathos" to the top of the page. I then wrote the details around those. Lastly, I drew connecting lines between those three major points and the other points of the paper. There was going to be some overlap, but I wanted to be sure to organize it well. This enabled me to make a stronger and more connected outline the second time around.

Magnus admits that he spent a lot of time thinking about writing, more than he usually had before. His research process changed as he worked on the two writing projects. He writes that "the act of research and writing is actually less important than the act of reflection, which was a new concept for me (I'm a person who liked to go by my gut and wing-it)."

Zella found that working through the projects helped find the purpose in her writing. "I had thought that I was able to pinpoint the purpose of my writing fairly accurately." However, with her work in Project 1, it helped

further refine my skills in this area. Initially, I had very little to go on, as I was having some difficulty coordinating a meet up with my subject for an information session, so I couldn't make up a clear intent of my focus.

With the second project, Zella knew how to focus: “This project helped me strengthen my ability to correctly pinpoint my subject for the analysis.” She knew that she had to “focus on an object to create a visual analysis of it, targeting its purpose and elements of design, what they mean, and how rhetorical appeals are at work with it.”

Previous Work with Multiple Drafts

In week 2’s assignment on their existing writing process, the three participants in the study complete their invention work and write a rough draft. Magnus may begin the initial draft by opening a new document in Word (or in a physical notebook) and “start blasting ideas as they come to me over a day or two.” Jean will write the rough draft “sometimes making simplified sentences and leaving a generic introduction.” She also tends to write the introduction at the end. Zella will begin “with the middle content, then [go] back to the introduction, and then [write] the conclusion.”

At this point, the three participants conduct self-revision. Jean reads the draft aloud and “edit/change sentences around.” Magnus employs the self-revising technique of stepping away from the draft for a day or two so that he can “hear” his words differently and be able to spot grammatical errors easily. Zella will self-revise for grammar and mechanics. Therefore, the participants technically complete at least two drafts before submitting their work.

Multiple Drafts Within the Course

Jean alludes to creating multiple drafts as she was “surprised at how much editing that I did.” She discusses the process of creating multiple drafts for Project 1, a profile on

her older brother. Jean and her brother discussed the technological advances he has experienced over the last thirty years. After receiving only one peer's feedback on Project 1, Jean turned to her sister for help. After these two reviews, Jean reworked the entire concluding paragraph.

The concluding paragraph on the rough draft, which was shared with peers, begins with a mention that one of the popular songs from 1987, when her brother graduated high school, was R.E.M.'s "It's the End of the World as We Know It." Jean then writes:

And within that decade, if innovation hadn't pushed beyond the personal computer towards the inter-connected Internet and the WWW, producing smaller and smaller chips, then we wouldn't be pondering quantum computing today. The personal computer may have actually stalled there.

She then writes that our future may still be in "space, the final frontier" – a line quoted from *Star Trek*. The conclusion ends: "And we will rely upon the firstborns, the pioneers, to lead us into that next chapter of technological advances."

Jean received feedback from her sister and one classmate that made her rethink this final paragraph. A peer wrote that the conclusion was great, but the reference to the R.E.M. song and the *Star Trek* quote came "out of left field." Jean kept the first sentence about the R.E.M. song but added a few more sentences to connect the song to her brother's work.

[The song] could be used as an analogy between the end of the non-computer era and our current technologically driven environment. Quite a contrast, considering all that is performed digitally within the education sector alone. Even my children

today have iPads and computers in their classrooms. If innovation hadn't pushed beyond the personal computer towards the inter-connected Internet and the World Wide Web, necessitating smaller and smaller chips, then we wouldn't be pondering quantum computing today. The personal computer may have actually stalled there.

Jean also kept the *Star Trek* reference and the fact that we may rely upon the firstborns to lead society into more technological advances. She then made the connection back to her family.

As for me and my family, we will continually engage our eldest, [Arthur] the brain, to keep us informed of these changes and to remind us of all we've accomplished. He may even retrieve his old IBM to show my young iPad educated children. Will they even know what to do with a keyboard? Hopefully, my firstborn will join in on the quest of successful quantum computing and fulfill his own dreams of space travel.

Magnus says that his projects "went through many, many (sometimes too many) iterations before completion." Magnus gathers secondary research and completes his initial draft in Google Docs. He would keep this Google Doc open on his computer 24 hours a day. "This compelled me to continually look at it or add/remove/modify my sources and references; I could see the little blue icon staring at me every time I answered an email or checked a sports score."

This practice of self-editing would continue even after the projects were turned in. Magnus would continue to edit and re-arrange up until the submission deadline. "It felt like both projects were completely re-written four or five times each." One example of

this is from Magnus' Project 2. Magnus made major changes to one particular paragraph. His rough draft reads:

Is the relative simplicity and accessibility of Big Macs, Frappuccinos, and Twinkies to blame? Or are these just the street thugs fronting for a more insidious and deceptive shadow conspiracy? Though there are plenty of bad choices on the Fernandez table (pizzas, pancake syrup, and ranch dressing) there are also some healthy choices too (apples, carrots, and lettuce). So, let's establish a bit more ethos, and look beyond the physical boxes and labels on the Fernandez family's groceries; let's try to understand why they're choosing to eat this way.

The second draft posted to Magnus' portfolio is the More Feedback draft, which was submitted to the Writing Fellow, a teaching assistant assigned to the instructor. The same section changed some wording, deleted the idea of establishing ethos and made different assumptions:

It's easy to point out the low-cost, easy-access nature of Big Macs, Frappuccinos, and Twinkies – that's only part of the story. There are certainly plenty of bad choices on the Fernandez table (pizzas, pancake syrup, and ranch dressing), but there are also a few healthy choices too (apples, carrots, and lettuce). Some would say that the Fernandezes are acting in moderation. Are they? Let's look beyond the food labels, and let's try to understand why they're actually choosing to eat this way.

The final draft shows the same section with a drastic difference. It was shortened to one sentence: "There's strong visual evidence that at least two of the Fernandez's [sic] are borderline overweight (if not already)."

Zella thinks that “a writer can never have enough drafts [...]. There is always room for improvement, tweaks we can make, rephrasing, furthering clarifying, rearranging.” Zella completed a freewriting activity before writing a rough draft “for myself, to see what I would come up with.” She would then rewrite multiple times. “I think it took about five drafts to finally come up with a final piece.” Zella writes that producing multiple drafts is a first “as the maximum I had done was maybe 1 or 2 drafts for a single writing work.”

Zella’s multiple draft practice further solidified her understanding that “writing can’t be done in a single, rushed go.” With Project 2, she produced a first draft. After self-revising the work and sharing it with others (peers, the Writing Fellow, and her husband), Zella rewrote the draft before turning the project in. She writes that “a comparative reading of my rough draft and my final draft will display my efforts.” A comparative reading of Zella’s Project 2 rough draft and final draft show how she improved the work through the use of multiple drafts. She writes the following line in the rough draft: “Unlike most of the photos in the Hungry Planet series which show the place of food preparation, this photo was taken in the Ukita’s dining area.” The following sentence was the topic sentence to a new paragraph: “We can see the food has been set up-front, with the Ukita family essentially framing it.”

For her final draft, Zella rearranged sentences, used different words, and combined ideas from the two paragraphs to create a new section:

Unlike many of the photos in the Hungry Planet series, which display the area of food preparation, this photograph was taken in the Ukita’s dining area; the place

which has the most connection with the subject of the photograph. We can see the food has been set up-front, with the Ukita family essentially framing it.

Peer Review Prior to the Course

In the week 2 discussion on the participants' writing process, only Jean talks about having "another set of eyes review my work" before making final revisions. She also approached peer review with "trepidation." Having someone else review her work is not new. When Jean was in art school, she participated in peer review on classmates' art projects. It was also anonymous, which she loved because "it gives the advantage of taking greater risks on the part of the artist and it allowed the critique to be more honest without fear of betraying a friend or even being dishonest to the competition." Jean also encountered peer review in the workplace: "all proposals and printed marketing materials were reviewed once or twice by at least two sets of eyes." She found the experience positive because it provided both praise and criticism. However, Jean writes that since she has not written a research paper in over 20 years she feels the need to do enough work to be sure the audience understands what is written since she will lose the face-to-face interaction due to the online work environment.

Zella writes that peer review is "sort of new for me." She has only had experience receiving feedback on personal aspects of her life from her "parents, friends, and other people in my life." She also writes about receiving feedback from teachers. In secondary school, Zella was working on a speech and sought feedback from her homeroom teacher. Zella writes that this teacher

helped me improve my work by guiding me on how to rearrange the sequence of points to make more sense, omit and merge some points that were almost the same, in addition to better constructing my sentences, etc. It was a great learning experience as I wouldn't have otherwise realized those errors.

Magnus, on the other hand, “thrives” on constructive criticism. Yet, the process has had mixed results. Most of the criticism Magnus has received have either been “too positive or too negative.” He prefers a balance: “I want to know what I'm specifically doing well AND where I can specifically improve.” In the past, the person giving the critique was “bland, sought to avoid conflict, or simply failed to be specific.” He also feels that people saying “I liked it” or “I hated it” does nothing to help a writer. Instead, he wants

clear, definitive, and pointed feedback about what I've written, even if that feedback is “I was confused by what you meant or “I don't understand your point in this sentence or paragraph.” That sort of blunt and clear communication is invaluable - it enables me to take immediate action.

Feelings on Peer Review in FYC Workshop

The WPA outcomes describe collaborative and social aspects under the Processes section. These include: “Understand collaborative and social aspects of writing processes” and “Learn to critique their own and others' works.” Students are asked to reflect on the statement, “learn to critique their own and others' work” as part of an “Introduction to Peer Review” assignment in week 3. This happens before students begin the first round of the feedback cycle in week 4. The feedback cycle includes peer review

and a “more feedback” step, which may include feedback from the Writing Fellow and/or the university online writing center. Students will then reflect on their final ePortfolio on the collaborative and social aspects of writing and the critique of their own and others’ works after they have completed both writing projects. Working with their peers is something new to many students in first-year composition, yet all participants found some value in working with their peers, the Writing Fellow, the university writing center, and/or other outside support. The first step in the feedback cycle is working with peers.

The feedback cycle process showed Jean that “feedback was necessary because I couldn’t clear my mind of all the details and take a big picture look at it.” In the Multiple Drafts section of this dissertation, I showed how Jean used peer feedback on the first project. Jean had received only one peer’s feedback before seeking other assistance. The classmate had first noticed that Jean was not making the connection between a mention of R.E.M.’s “It’s the End of the World As We Know It.” Jean made changes before the final draft.

However, peer review did not work out for Jean on Project 2. She found that her peers didn’t provide “substantial enough criticisms.” She had written in the “Introduction to Peer Review” assignment in week 3 that “you wouldn’t want to give feedback that tries to change the writer’s style, which is unique to the individual. That seems to be the case in this situation.” The peer reviewer wrote that Jean’s rhetorical questions throughout her paper may be better as reformatted sentences. The peer points out a sentence in Jean’s work that reads:

Choices are there, but transportation and refrigeration are not. That means local markets aren’t storing large amounts of frozen or refrigerated foods. So what –

what impact does it have on these indigenous Mayan people? They eat what's seasonally fresh and available.

The peer offers a suggestion to rewrite the passage as:

Local markets aren't storing large amounts of frozen or refrigerated foods because access to transportation and refrigeration is limited. Because of this, the indigenous Mayan people only eat what's seasonally fresh and available.

Jean did not agree with the suggestion. The peer's suggestion "was to write it more like a report, which I didn't feel was an accurate suggestion." This feedback made her wonder if the point of peer reviews was to "get the writer thinking about or defending what was written."

Jean also felt that she should be more explicit when sharing concerns about her writing. Jean would spend time providing feedback, but the peer reviewers were slighting her. "I definitely felt a little cheated, as I put in significant time to reviewing other classmates' papers and didn't feel that the work was reciprocated." Jean would take time reading the essays multiple times before making comments. "I felt a responsibility to my classmates to take the time and consideration necessary to provide a worthy critique."

Magnus writes that "getting critique just isn't fun. [...] I just don't like it." Yet, he "thrive[s] on constructive criticism." On the week 3 assignment, "Introduction to Peer Review," Magnus writes that he loves "the idea of peer reviews." From past experience, he found that he will sometimes "omit reasons or rationales when something is obvious to me." Peer review is crucial to help Magnus "pinpoint where I've jumped to a conclusion or only provided a partial explanation."

When he reflected on peer review after Project 1, he felt crushed when a peer told him that he still had work to do on the multimodal portion of Project 1. He gave this feedback a lot of thought and he “realized that I could approach my subject from a different angle.” He thinks that his beliefs on peer review were first built on “the quality of the message itself” because “as students we’re new to constructive feedback and there’s definitely an art to it.” On Project 2, a peer had written that Magnus’ first paragraph was too long and could be split into 2 or 3 paragraphs. “She is right,” he writes, “it is too long [... I] just didn’t want to hear it.” Yet, he realized that feedback from others could help “to consider different angles and perspectives in my writing, which adds depth or layers to what I’m trying to express.”

Peer review is, of course, reciprocal in this course. Magnus felt that his feedback was successful because “I put a lot of emphasis on being positive and friendly in my comments – no one wants a stranger to barge in and set fire to their efforts (I certainly don’t enjoy that kind of critique).” Magnus is not sure his feedback is “just my opinion or something the other student really needs to consider.” Magnus understands that “this is just something the other writer has to decide for himself or herself.”

Overall, Magnus’ takeaway of peer review was positive, “but it needs to be weighed and utilized like any other form of data or research.” Peer review should “inform my writing, but it shouldn’t overwhelm or change it -- unless my writing is just awful, and I sure hope I don’t need someone else to tell me that!”

Zella first felt that peer review would help her “be honest about [her peers’] weak spots.” She vowed to “keep a balance of being respectful, unbiased, and not be overly critical.” After conducting peer review, Zella found that it helped her “be more careful

and attentive to the details of my writing, and has made me keep a larger audience in mind than just my instructor.” Peer review helped “further cultivate my thinking on how to communicate my ideas in a better way.”

Giving feedback can be a positive learning experience for Zella. On the week 3 “Introduction to Peer Review” assignment Zella writes that peer review “helps me be more critical and open-minded when reviewing my own work, as well as help my peers progress their writing skills too.” She writes later in the course that peer review helped her “learn about questions I should ask myself when writing.”

However, some peer reviews did not help. “I unfortunately didn’t get any ‘help’ on my mini-assignment [the multimodal piece for Project 2].” Zella also “spent time and energy analyzing and criticizing my peers’ works and reviewing them, they both just rushed a ‘great work!’ response of a few lines and that was it.” These reviews were disappointing. “There is always room for improvement and another individual’s perspective helps a lot so I was counting on it.”

In the end, “peer review was a major part of what helped me achieve a grade closer to what I was hoping for.” Zella writes that “without it I think I would have done a very poor job.” Zella used feedback from multiple sources and that “the feedback greatly helped me produce a final draft that was better than I could have managed alone.” Peer review “had a positive impact on my willingness to consider new ways of thinking, as I realized the benefits of having an outsiders’ perspective on my writing.” An outside perspective helped Zella improve her writing.

Using Outside Editors

After students write a rough draft and receive their first round of feedback from their peers, they are expected to write another draft to share on the More Feedback discussion board. In FYC Workshop, the More Feedback discussion board is for students to post their draft to their group's Writing Fellow, if there is one assigned to the instructor. If there is no Writing Fellow working in that group, the instructor may provide feedback. Students are also encouraged to utilize the university's online writing center services. Some students may also seek feedback from other sources, such as trusted friends and family members.

Writing Fellow Support. Magnus calls the Writing Fellow, Andrew, “a tremendous and patient resource throughout this semester” and that the feedback he provided was “marvelous.” On Magnus' ePortfolio, various emails between him and Andrew are included. Andrew's “input and insight was incredibly beneficial as I tuned each paper for final submission.”

For Project 1, Magnus and Andrew communicated back and forth through email. Andrew first tells Magnus that “as far as a thesis goes, that's the only thing I'm missing. I want to know earlier on what I'm getting into, and I want all of your evidence to be tied to that throughout the paper.” Magnus wrote that he was making a case for a “midlife career change as a necessary life adjustment, particularly when you've made incorrect, poor, or un-informed career and/or educational choices.” He wants “to make these points more succinctly” and asks for Andrew to offer any strategies because he is “open to all ideas.” Andrew writes back and notices that these ideas are emerging from the text: “I think a good step to begin with is stating that point early on and constantly reinforcing

it.” Later in his email, Andrew writes the takeaway: “the thesis is less of a one-liner and more of a thread that you weave.” At this point, Magnus comes to the realization that he can work the thesis as a thread. “For some reason I’ve always fixated on a thesis as being incredibly emphatic and covert, which I thought implied: one-liner.”

Even though Zella and Magnus were in two different groups, they shared the same professor and Writing Fellow, Andrew. Zella utilized the Writing Fellow for both projects. She shares Andrew’s feedback on her ePortfolio. Andrew noticed two major items: that Zella’s paragraphs felt short and incomplete and that she needed to contextualize the interview throughout the profile piece. Andrew shares, “when you’re introducing a piece of evidence -- a quote, statistic, etc. -- you have to contextualize it for your readers first.”

On Zella’s rough draft of Project 1, the introductory paragraph is a sentence in length:

When asked why he decided to join the Marine Corps, of all the U.S. Armed Forces, [John] said that all he knew was that they had the toughest boot camp, and since he had already decided to join the military, he was going to go all out to do it.

Zella took Andrew’s feedback into consideration and made the paragraph longer by contextualizing John’s experience in the military for the final draft:

In life, people go through a lot of decision-making about doing the right thing, based on their understanding of their roles and duties towards their country as well as their families. And these decisions have a huge impact on them and their surrounding loved ones. [John] is one of the inspiring examples of such people.

The decisions that have brought him where he is today, the resolution to join the Marines, the experiences he had there, then his reasons for leaving, to be with his family, have altogether helped him turn out a better person than he started off with. *“It’s got my priorities straight, and helped me become a more rounded person,”* he said, when I asked him how these past years affect him and his life, as a civilian, now.

Jean’s instructor did not have a Writing Fellow, but the instructor could provide feedback on this second cycle. Jean received feedback from the instructor on the More Feedback draft on Project 1, but she did not seek feedback again from the instructor for Project 2.

Writing Center Support. Jean was the only student in the study to utilize the university writing center. In this case, she worked with the online writing center. After finishing the first round of the feedback cycle on Project 1, Jean turned to the writing center “to work out the finishing details.” She says that “the first peer review prompted questions that were later addressed in the writing center (online).” The experience was more enjoyable because Jean had more confidence in the writing center tutor. The online writing tutor told Jean that her Project 1 essay was “very good, especially in its timeline events” and that “it gives a great answer to the ‘so what?’ question.”

Even though the experience was time consuming “with all the typing,” Jean’s experience with the writing center was a positive experience. “It was very thorough.” A student who uses the online writing center’s services also receives a hard copy of the conversation between the student and tutor. Jean was able to incorporate the tutor’s comments in her portfolio reflections.

For Project 2, Jean turned to the online writing center and worked with a different tutor. The tutor commented that Jean's APA citations, research, and analysis were solid. However, the tutor wrote that contractions are not usually used in formal writing. "So I would suggest changing those to 'it is' and 'he is.' I mean, when it's a quote, you should definitely leave the contraction there, but otherwise, it's best to avoid them."

The tutor was also concerned about tone. The tutor noticed this in Jean's draft and wrote, "I can see that is an attempt to engage the audience, but it does sound much less formal." While Jean does not give context to this particular quote on her ePortfolio, one can assume that the tutor was talking about Jean's use of "I" in her analysis. The draft she shared with the tutor contained the following informal passage:

I am drawn to the Mendoza family photo, like you would be drawn to the beauty of a rainbow. At first glance, my thought is: that's how I want to eat. The entire photo is fresh fruits, vegetables, grains, spices, and very little else. [...] They are the epitome of what I would call a flexitarian (only periodically eating meat).

The same passage reads more formal on Jean's final draft:

The viewer is drawn to the Mendoza family photo, like you would be drawn to the beauty of a rainbow. At first glance, you may think: that is how I should eat. The entire photo is fresh fruits, vegetables, grains, spices, and very little else. [...] They are the epitome of what is called a flexitarian (only periodically eating meat).

Other Outside Editors. Students may also utilize a trusted friend or family member at any time during the feedback cycle. Jean and Zella asked family members. For Project 1, Jean sent the draft to her sister, "who is a very good sounding board." Jean's

sister “tends to be more detailed than I am and I thought she provided some very good feedback. She wrote that I needed more for my conclusion.” Her sister agreed with Jean’s peer feedback about the R.E.M. song mentioned in the concluding paragraph. Her sister also added that Jean needed “to provide better evidence to tie into [the] opening thesis.” Jean’s thesis explores how her brother’s life story “provides eye-opening contrasts to the technologically advanced world we reside in today.”

One paragraph in the rough draft discusses that the computer industry was changing in the 1980s and her brother’s high school classrooms “had Apple II’s that sat at the back of the room, waiting for their next command, ironically collecting dust. Nobody knew what to do with these machines yet.” To tie the thesis to this statement, Jean added the following sentence to the same paragraph on the final draft: “Attending [college] will concretely integrate [her brother] into the computer science realm and reveal more changes in technology.”

Zella also sought help from another source: her husband. She received feedback on both drafts from her husband. For Project 1, Zella writes that she produced a draft “which underwent different sources.” This included herself (self-revision), her husband, peers, and the Writing Fellow. These sources checked “for issues like first impression, effectiveness of title and intro, maintenance of focus on intended purpose throughout, sufficient examples and references, proper APA citations, etc.” Zella feels that the extensive feedback from peers, the Writing Fellow, the instructor, and her husband “greatly helped me produce a final draft that was better than I could have managed alone.”

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine how the components of the writing process evolved for students in the FYC Workshop process model. Qualitative analysis was used to interpret the data from multiple online FYC artifacts. The study drew upon Yin's (2014) description of a descriptive, multi-case study to explain how the components of the writing process evolved for three participants. Data collected for this study included various documents (online FYC artifacts): ePortfolio reflections, discussion posts, short writing assignments, and drafts from both major writing projects.

A process-based course encourages students to plan, draft, and revise. However, there needs to be time spent on giving students the tools to plan, draft, and revise. Much has changed since Applebee's (1981) work *Writing in the Secondary School*. Kiuvara, et al. (2009) found that only 2% of Language Arts teachers they surveyed were not having students engage in prewriting activities at the high school level. At the middle school level Graham, et al. (2014) found that 33% of teachers across subject areas (language arts, science, and social studies) were not engaging in extra planning instruction. The three studies showed that the teachers were doing the composing. Students were instead "writing without composing" "with students completing many more pages of exercises and copying than they do of original writing of even a paragraph in length" (Applebee & Langer, 2011). Students still seem to bring this mind-set into college.

The FYC Workshop is a process-based course and it is the hope of the course that the curriculum will provide insight into how students used the writing process components in the course to evolve their existing processes. The findings seem to be

consistent with Graham and Sandimel (2011) who wrote that the process approach could play a significant role in reforming writing instruction. Three major themes emerged from the data: participants made changes to their general writing process by conducting more invention work and finding it worthwhile, by producing more drafts than they had on previous writing projects, and by reflecting more about what the collaborative and social aspects of writing mean to them.

Answering the Research Question

The writing process follows a basic approach: plan, draft, revise. Participants in this study shared how they planned and conducted invention work; how they produced multiple drafts throughout the course; and how they revised by collaborating with peers, the Writing Fellow, the university writing center, and/or with other support. The data seems to show that students experimented with new approaches to their writing processes and added the components that worked for them to their repertoire.

Participants' Writing Process Knowledge Baseline

In Week 2, students complete an assignment about their existing writing processes. Both Jean and Zella write about having little to no experience with writing. In Jean's case she hasn't written an essay "in a long time." Zella responded to a peer's writing process post and wrote, "I myself don't have a lot of experience with writing." Magnus finds that he is "always thinking about writing, even if I'm not actively writing something." However, the subject line of his existing writing process discussion board post included the phrase: "writing process (or lack thereof)." Magnus is "not sure" he has

a writing process. This is consistent with Lassonde and Richards (2013). The researchers write that one reason why students do not plan their writing is that “they do not recognize what they do is planning” (p. 203). This may also explain why they feel they do not have a writing process or feel inexperienced because the three participants discuss some form of planning, drafting, and revising components. These components can be broken into process-based themes from the FYC Workshop course: invention work, production of multiple drafts, and the collaboration and social aspects of writing.

Invention Work. The three participants show that they plan a project before beginning to write (Emig, 1979; Flower & Hayes, 1981). Prior to the course, Zella and Magnus may use different, yet similar strategies for invention work based on the writing assignment. All three participants wrote that they would conduct research and read before starting a writing project. Both Zella and Magnus may begin this way, but it seems to depend on the writing project. For Zella, conducting research will happen first if she does not have knowledge about the subject. If she has some prior knowledge, Zella will bullet out ideas in a brainstorm. Magnus may begin with conducting research, but he may also begin by brainstorming ideas instead. Since Jean is more “intuitive,” her first sequential step is to conduct research and read. Jean is the only student who mentions putting ideas into an outline, which she will revise before beginning to write a draft.

Production of Multiple Drafts. All three participants write a rough draft after the initial invention work. Jean and Zella seem to write from the middle and leave the other parts for last. Jean may write the introduction at the end. Zella will write the introduction and conclusion last. Magnus opens up a new document on his computer or works in a physical notebook and will freewrite. He does not specifically note that he begins with

the introduction or begins in the middle like Jean and Zella tend to. After the initial draft is complete, the three participants self-revise and seem to complete at least two drafts before submitting their work. They show that they are able to be multi-draft writers as opposed to writing one draft and feeling finished (Harris, 1989).

The Collaborative and Social Aspects of Writing. In week 3, students complete a short writing assignment about how they feel about peer review. All three participants have had previous experiences with receiving feedback from others. Zella had once asked a homeroom teacher in secondary school to help revise a speech. Magnus had experience providing and receiving peer review in both professional and academic settings. Jean has also worked with peer review in a professional setting, but she seems to have only received feedback at work. In art school, Jean received and provided feedback anonymously on classmates' art work.

There seems to be some trepidation when participating in peer review. Zella writes that peer review "is sort of new for me" and that she "was nervous about it, receiving it as well as giving it." Jean feels that it is "hard to understand connotation from digital print" since the courses are 100% online. Jean writes that she and/or possibly others need "to be very literal." She does not explicitly say who needs to be literal in digital print. Magnus has the experience giving and receiving peer review in professional and academic settings yet feels the experience has been mixed. He enjoys constructive criticism but believes that those giving feedback should be both positive and negative to help Magnus become a better writer.

Throughout the next few weeks in the course, students learned different tools for invention work, were expected to produce more than one to two drafts, and were

expected to collaborate with their peers and other outside support to produce a stronger piece of writing before it is graded by the instructor. The data from the portfolio reflections and drafts of writing projects seem to show an evolution in all three areas.

Evolution of Invention Work

Although students may continue to plan well throughout the production of the paper, the course offers invention work to help plan before the initial draft begins. Both Jean and Magnus found the invention tools from the eBook worthwhile for jumpstarting their work. Jean did not produce her usual outline and instead relied on the invention tools in the course to help get started. When she tried to produce an outline for Project 2, she was having trouble. Jean writes, “I had a lot of ideas in my head, but needed to organize them. I had all my research and attempted to make an outline. Somehow it wasn’t coming together. So I decided to use the clustering technique for gathering ideas.” Jean completed a clustering technique as part of her invention work on Project 1. By “operating the tools” she has learned in the course, Jean was able to “make a stronger and more connected outline.” She showed that one could use what has already been taught and recognized the clustering technique as a viable planning strategy (Lassonde & Richards, 2013). Magnus wrote that the freewriting assignments allowed his “jumbled and random” thoughts to begin forming. He found that the results were “tangible” to use.

Zella found the audience analysis assignment to be most useful. She feels that she was able to “pinpoint the purpose of [her] writing fairly accurately.” With Project 1, Zella had difficulties meeting with her subject for the profile she would write. Therefore, she could not write a clear intention of the focus of her profile paper. Zella saw the steps

leading up to the initial draft as hierarchical (Flower & Hayes, 1981). When she was able to talk to her subject, “I was able to contextualize his life. I was quite quickly able to ascertain what direction I wanted to take, and hence, was able to produce a focused, exploratory, and informative piece.” She was then able to use the audience analysis to build a solid statement of purpose: “My project focuses on the journey of a young man’s life from being a civilian to joining the US military service, and then transitioning back to becoming a civilian.”

Evolution of the Production of Multiple Drafts

One of the WPA outcomes for Processes reads: “Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text.” It seems the three participants find that it is important to return to the draft and make changes to further improve and develop ideas. Jean alludes to creating multiple drafts, by writing that “[I was] surprised by how much editing that I did.” Magnus and Zella discussed the creation of multiple drafts in more detail.

Magnus writes that he would continue editing his work until the submission deadline. This shows a resistance to closure, a trait of multi-draft writers (Harris, 1989). He may have written his projects at least four or five times. Magnus writes that “I honestly don’t feel that my writing is ever finished” because he would continue to make additional edits to the work after it has been submitted and graded. Unfortunately, there may not be a record of these additional changes. A writing project is turned in for instructor grading on the portfolio. When the student is ready to submit, he or she will submit a link to their ePortfolio. Therefore, Magnus’ final draft papers may not be the

papers the instructors graded if he continued to make edits after the grades were finalized. After all the rewriting, he is still not sure if the results would be “flat or overwrought work.” He writes that he would “need a few months away from the final iterations before I can really judge the work.” Believing that if he needs to judge his work, it may show a correlation between what he did before in terms of the writing process and how the process evolved over the course.

For the first project, Zella learned that multiple drafts are essential for “attaining a proper, ‘good’ piece of work.” She began freewriting and felt freedom in creating the first draft, knowing that the piece could continue to be worked on throughout the next couple weeks. She wrote the first draft for herself “to see what [she] would come up with.” She seems to understand that the initial draft can be “abandoned (with dignity) for a fresh start” (Graves, 2004). Then, Zella went back to re-write again and again. The process of fine tuning and working with others facilitated the taking of “about five drafts to finally come up with a final piece, that I felt, was satisfactory enough” to submit. Writing five drafts “was a first for me, as the maximum I had done [before] was maybe 1 or 2 drafts for a single writing work.” She found that Project 2 helped firm the idea that “it is not possible to produce a final piece of work without multiple drafts.” She found much value in producing many drafts.

Evolution of the Collaborative and Social Aspects of Writing

Peer review resulted in mixed feelings for all participants. Jean felt that on Project 2, a peer had made a suggestion that she did not agree with. She felt the suggestion “was to write it more like a report.” It made her wonder if the point of peer review was to

defend what was written. It seems Jean's beliefs parallel how she felt in the week 3 "Introduction to Peer Review" assignment. In the week 3 assignment, she wrote that "you wouldn't want to give feedback that tries to change the writer's style." It seems that was happening with the peer review experience for Project 2. This is consistent with the findings from Brammer and Rees (2007) who found that many students did not find peer review helpful.

It seems Jean's work with the university writing center was a better experience due to the "confidence in what the writing center had advised." She also trusted her sister, who offered some of the same ideas a peer did, but it seemed to make Jean feel like those ideas were worth something when her sister advised to revise certain sections. Jean describes her sister as "more detailed than I am" and it seemed that her sister's feedback was more helpful because she may trust her own family member more than a stranger in the online course.

With peer review, Magnus feels that "as students we're new to constructive feedback and there's definitely an art to it." He has strong opinions when he provides feedback and but resists feedback from peers. On Project 2, a peer had suggested that the first paragraph was too long. He agrees, but at the time, he did not want to hear it. He writes, "I think a lot of my resistance has to do with the quality of the message itself." His portfolio reflections on the feedback cycle seem to lean toward taking a peer's feedback into consideration, but respecting the Writing Fellow as more of an authority to judge the work.

Magnus also finds a more authoritative figure in the work with the Writing Fellow, Andrew. He respected Andrew's knowledge. Magnus includes email messages

between Andrew and himself over the course of the semester while receiving feedback on the projects. Both Andrew and Magnus ask probing questions to clarify parts of the essay and push each other to get at the details that Magnus needs to pursue. Andrew remarks that the analysis of the actual photograph should be pushed further and asks questions such as, “Why are the Kelloggs boxes hidden behind milk?” “Why is the water so far in the background?” and “What does the table in between the family represent?” Part of the Project 2 assignment is to analyze the photograph itself. Magnus wonders if “it is crucial to spend significant time analyzing staging and positing of the people?” He goes on to write “This is really uninteresting to me as a writer” yet he understands that he needs to meet the requirements, but he finds “an analysis of the setup of the scene just isn’t inspiring.” For the final draft, Magnus would add more about the staging of the photo with attention on the colors of the room and the foods and the significance of the colors red, orange, and yellow as stimulating color combinations often found in fast food restaurants. Magnus’ experience seems to parallel Regaignon and Bromley’s (2011) study that found Writing Fellow programs do seem to make a positive difference in students’ writing since he took Andrew’s feedback into account.

Zella felt that she was taking more effort into peer reviews than the feedback she received. On Project 1’s multimodal assignment, both peers “just rushed a ‘great work!’ response of a few lines and that was it.” Zella was disappointed because she understands that “there is always room for improvement and another individual’s perspective helps a lot so I was counting on it.” Yet, Zella found that peer review was helpful to produce a final draft to its fullest potential.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Teaching

Research shows that writers approach the writing process in a multitude of ways (Atwell, 1998; Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Graves, 1983; Murray, 1990; Ziegler, 1981). However, the parts are usually the same. There is a catalyst for beginning the writing process, idea formation, the actual writing of the piece, and revision of the writing. How and when these components happen are up to the writer to decide. The FYC Workshop course gives students tools to use and add to their repertoire. Their processes seem to evolve due to the process-based curriculum and the end goal: the portfolio reflections. Students are aware from the beginning of the class that all writing projects and their writing process development lead to their learning of the WPA outcomes and the eight habits of mind from the *Framework*. The outcomes should provide a measurement of achievement for FYC that is crucial for their future success throughout college and beyond.

More could be done to ensure that students take these new practices and leave with future goals after the course is finished. Since the writing process can encompass various definitions, students should be made aware that what FYC Workshop asks students to do is one way of meeting the goals of the course. While all students plan, draft, and revise, the language of the components should reflect one of the WPA Processes outcomes: “Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading.” Students should understand that the components of the course are flexible. The FYC Workshop does not stop at ENG 101. Many students will continue into ENG 102 in the FYC Workshop program where the invention work opportunities are

different. The students should be aware that invention work takes on many different forms and while the course asks them to practice with the tools provided in the class, they should understand that they should find what works for them.

In terms of the feedback cycle, there is virtually no instruction in the course that shows that writing must be revised, edited, and proofread before the submission. This reflects the developing of flexible strategies in the WPA Processes outcome, but this idea also reflects in the Knowledge of Conventions WPA outcome (i.e. Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling (CWPA, 2008)). Instructors use their judgement when grading for grammar and mechanics, but the idea of editing is not emphasized. Peer review may ask students to respond to specific feedback prompts, but some peers may also try to be peer editors instead of reviewers (Graff, 2009). Since the peer reviews are the first step in the feedback cycle, the focus should be on revision. The More Feedback drafts are also treated as revision feedback, but Writing Fellows, writing center tutors, and other outside support may provide editing feedback at this stage. The final proofreading stage is not discussed in the course. A final self-proofread should be incorporated so that students meet the Processes and Knowledge of Convention outcome goals of the course.

Peer review also helped the participants consider their practices of self-revision. Receiving someone else's opinion is part of building one's own self-revision process. Writers make the final choice whether the second opinion is worth considering. They must realize that someone else's feedback should inform their writing and not change the writer's style. Yet, it may help them realize the times when they are weaker and need to improve. Magnus writes about not including a description of something if he feels it is

obvious. However, it may not be obvious to others. Zella found that a second opinion helps her self-revise by thinking of questions to ask herself. Asking questions of oneself may help find these weaknesses as well.

In the past, FYC Workshop instructors have allowed students to revise writing projects after the final submission. While instructors may still practice this at their discretion, it is not a set part of the course. Since the multi-draft writers in Harris' (1989) study proved that they are willing to further reflect and work on their drafts past the due date, this could be incorporated into the course. A future research study could be done to compare and contrast the multiple drafts throughout the course. The course would require students to upload each draft as they were submitted before making changes in order to study the progression of initial draft to after-the-final-grade revision draft.

Lastly, reflecting on the WPA outcomes and habits of mind are important for a student's critical thinking skills. One of the habits of mind is "metacognition." Reflecting on one's work and ideas is new to many students, including the participants. Asking students to think about why they make the particular decisions to adapt parts of a writing process or write in a certain way will help them understand the choices they make when writing. When reflecting on their processes, they can see how they may have evolved their writing practice.

Implications for K-12 Writing Education

While state standards have included the writing process in the past, more could be done to teach the components that students need to be successful in college and beyond.

Prior to Arizona adopting its College and Career Ready Standards (Arizona's name for the Common Core State Standards) for English/Language Arts, the state articulated three strands for their writing standards. The writing process standards laid concepts such as prewriting, drafting, revising strategies, editing strategies, and presenting a final copy for the intended audience. The College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing includes a writing process standard that reads that students should be able to understand and are able to “develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach” by the end of each grade level (AZED, 2013).

At the college level, CWPA released the “WPA Outcomes Statement 3.0.” A task force began work in March 2012 to understand how the WPA outcomes were being used at universities. They solicited inquiries and received twenty-seven responses from WPAs and faculty members from a variety of colleges and universities that are private, two-year, and four-year. The task force's inquiry found that the outcomes “legitimizes and justifies writing pedagogies and the work of the local WPA; it facilitates conversations about writing instruction and values; and it guides curriculum design, teacher development, and assessment practices” (Dryer, et al., 2014). Changes were made to the third version to refer to writing as composing and technology is integrated through the four outcomes: Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Composing; Processes; and Knowledge of Conventions. The Processes outcome begins with a statement:

Writers use multiple strategies, or *composing processes*, to conceptualize, develop, and finalize projects. Composing processes are seldom linear; a writer may research a topic before drafting, then conduct additional research while

revising or after consulting a colleague. Composing processes are also flexible: successful writers can adapt their composing processes to different contexts and occasions (CWPA, 2014, p. 146).

The outcome contains multiple drafts; “reading, drafting, reviewing, collaborating, revising, rewriting, rereading, and editing”; the collaborative and social aspects of the writing process; and giving and acting upon feedback (CWPA, 2014, p. 146-7).

If K-12 employs the Common Core State Standards (or other state standards for writing) and many universities are using the WPA Outcomes Statement from 1999, 2008, or 2014 and/or the *Framework*, partnerships between K-12 administrators, K-12 educators, university instructors, and university support staff should exist to bridge the practices of teaching the writing process. If educators across K-16 share their experiences with teaching writing and their respective goals for writing, progress could potentially be made to teach students what they need to know. Students need to practice writing in order to improve. If teachers at K-12, particularly at the high school level, understand what is expected in college and hear it from college instructors and support staff, they could better prepare their students for the future.

Implications for Future Research

Other opportunities for research may include more parts of the feedback cycle, particularly future studies on the opportunities afforded on the More Feedback board. The More Feedback draft board is mainly for the use of the Writing Fellow to provide feedback on a particular amount of drafts uploaded to the board. However, this board

provides information on seeking the assistance of the university online writing center. While a (writing center or professional) tutors' feedback has been proven effective by Bell (2002) and Gordon (2008), Gordon (2008) cautions against instructors forcing students to use the writing center because they may enter the tutoring center with a hostile attitude. A future study could include a FYC Workshop course section that requires the use of the online writing center versus a course section that "highly recommends" students use the online writing center. The online environment could provide different insights than a face-to-face course requiring (or recommending) the use of the physical writing center due to the population of students in the course. The online environment caters to students all over the world and therefore, timing issues arise.

Many instructors in the courses across the FYC Workshop program do not have a Writing Fellow. A comparison study of feedback provided by the Writing Fellows in one section and the feedback provided by the instructor (who does not have a Writing Fellow) on the More Feedback board may provide insights into the types of feedback each party provides. The Writing Fellows are trained, but they are expected to work closely with their instructor (Regaignon & Bromley, 2011). While the instructor can provide feedback to their Writing Fellow in terms of what they will expect from the final drafts, the Writing Fellow will provide different feedback from their instructor.

I was also interested in the idea that two of the participants, Jean and Magnus, saw the writing center tutor and the Writing Fellow, respectfully, as authority figures. They both trusted the opinions and feedback from their respective support. Writing Fellows and writing center tutors are generally peers. They are trained and are considered "experts" at writing. Students seek them for assistance, but the authority in their class is

their instructor. An interview study may afford answers to why students feel that the peer review process does not afford the feedback they need, but the writing center tutors and the Writing Fellows meet their authoritative needs.

Finally, students who take first-year composition generally take two FYC courses: ENG 101 and ENG 102. Many, but not all, students in the FYC Workshop ENG 101 course will go on to take ENG 102 in the FYC Workshop program. The setup is the same in both courses. Students complete invention work, write multiple drafts, and participate in the same feedback cycle. A study of students' writing processes over both courses would provide a richer opportunity to see their evolution over the entire first-year composition experience.

REFERENCES

- Alber-Morgan, S.R., Hessler, T., & Konrad, M. (2007). Teaching writing for keeps. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30* (3), 107-128.
- Angelillo, J. (2005). *Making revision matter*. New York: Scholastic.
- Applebee, A. N. (1981). *Writing in the secondary school: English and the content areas* [NCTE Research Report No. 21]. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2011). A snapshot of writing instruction in middle schools and high schools. *English Journal, 100* (6), 14-27.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2004). *Writing standard articulated by grade level: Strand 1: Writing process*.
- . (2013). *Arizona's college and career ready standards – English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects*. Retrieved from http://www.azed.gov/azccrs/files/2013/11/azccrs-ela_literacy-k-12-standards-final11_03_2013.pdf
- Arizona State University's Stretch program. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.asu.edu/clas/asuenglish/composition/cbw/stretch.htm>
- Armstrong, S. L. & Paulson, E. J. (2008). Whither “peer review”? Terminology matters for the writing classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 35* (4), 398-407.
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- . (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* (2nd edition). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers Heinemann.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13* (4), 544-559.
- Bell, J. H. (2002). Better writers: Writing center tutoring and the revision of rough drafts. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 33* (1), 5-20.
- Berne, J. I. (2004). Teaching the writing process: Four constructs to consider. *The NERA Journal, 40* (1), 42-46.
- Blanchard, R. R., D'Antonio, A., & Cahill, L. (2002). Group portfolio presentations. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for*

- teaching first-year composition* (pp. 195-202). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Blasingame, J., & Bushman, J. H. (2005). *Teaching writing in middle and secondary schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Bordelon, S., Wright, E. A., & Halloran, S. M. (2012). From rhetoric to rhetorics: An interim report on the history of American writing instruction to 1900. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A short history of writing instruction: From ancient Greece to contemporary America* (3rd edition) (pp. 209-231). New York: Routledge.
- Brammer, C., & Rees, M. (2007). Peer review from the students' perspective: Invaluable or invalid? *Composition Studies*, 35 (2), 71-85.
- Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities (11-18)*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Burch, C. B. (2002). Portfolio requirements for writing and discourse. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 186-188). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Burton, L. D. (2009). Lessons from Nanowrimo. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 18, 1-10. doi: 10.1080/10656210902752006
- CCCC '97 outcomes forum (Session L.17): The continuation WPA conference '97 session: First draft of outcomes statement for discussion. (n.d.). In CompPile. Retrieved from <http://comppile.org/archives/WPAoutcomes/ofdraft1.html>
- Clark, I. L. (1985). "Leading the horse: The writing center and required visits." *The Writing Center Journal*, 5.2/6.1, 31-34.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. (1999). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition: A modest proposal. *WPA*, 23 (1/2), 59-70.
- . (2008). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition. Retrieved from <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/files/2014/05/f3.6-wpa-outcomes.pdf>
- . (2014). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition (Revisions adopted 17 July 2014). *WPA*, 38 (1), 144-148.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, & The National Writing Project. (2011). The framework for success in postsecondary writing. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf>

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dryer, D. B., Bowden, D., Brunk-Chavez, B., Harrington, S., Halbritter, B., & Yancey, K. B. (2014). Revising FYC outcomes for a multimodal, digitally composed world: The WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition (Version 3.0). *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 38 (1), 129-143
- Elbow, P. (1973) *Writing without teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fletcher, R., & Portalupi, J. (2001). *Writing workshop: The essential guide*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Flint, A. S. & Laman, T. T. (2012). Where poems hide: Finding reflective, critical spaces inside writing workshop. *Theory Into Practice*, 51, 12-19.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32 (4), 365-387.
- Franklin, K. (2010). Thank you for sharing: Developing students' social skills to improve peer writing conferences. *English Journal*, 99 (5), 79-84.
- Gilles, R. (2002). The departmental perspective. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 2-10). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Gillespie, A., Graham, S., Kiuahara, S., & Hebert, M. (2013). High school teachers use of writing to support students' learning: A national survey. *Reading & Writing*, 27, 1043-1072. doi: 10.1007/s11145-013-9494-8
- Gold, D., Hobbs, C. L., & Berlin, J. A. (2012). Writing instruction in school and college English: The twentieth century and the new millennium. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A short history of writing instruction: From ancient Greece to contemporary America* (3rd edition) (pp. 232-272). New York: Routledge.
- Gordon, B. L. (2008). Requiring first-year writing classes to visit the writing center: Bad attitudes or positive results? *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 36 (2), 154-163.
- Graham, S., Capizzi, A., Harris, K. R., Hebert, M., & Morphy, P. (2014). Teaching writing to middle school students: A national survey. *Reading & Writing*, 27 (6), 1015-1042. doi:10.1007/s11145-013-9495-7

- Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104 (6), 396-407. doi:10.1080/00220671.2010.488703
- Grant, G. (1996, March 13). Program outcome statements [Msg 1]. Message posted to <https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9603&L=WPA-L&F=&S=&P=74357>
- Graff, N. (2009). Approaching authentic peer review. *English Journal*, 98 (5), 81-87.
- Graner, M. H. (1987). Revision workshops: An alternative to peer editing groups. *English Journal*, 76 (3), 40-45.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- . (2004). What I've learned from teachers of writing. *Language Arts*, 82 (2), 88-94.
- Grobel, L. (2000). *Conversations with Capote*. Cambridge, MA: De Capo Press.
- Hall, E., & Hughes, B. (2011). Preparing faculty, professionalizing fellows: Keys to success with undergraduate writing fellows in WAC. *The WAC Journal*, 22, 21-40.
- Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2011). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers* (2nd edition). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Haring-Smith, T. (1992). Changing students' attitudes: Writing fellow programs. In S. H. McLeod & M. Soven (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 175-188). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harris, M. (1989). Composing behaviors of one- and multi-draft writers. *College English*, 51 (2), 174-190.
- . (1995). Talking in the middle: Why writers need writing tutors. *College English*, 57 (1), 27-42.
- Hartwell, P. (1985). Grammar, grammars, and the teaching of grammar. *College English*, 47 (2), 105-127.
- Hayes, J. R. & Flower, L. S. (1986). Writing research and the writer. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1106-1113.
- Herrington, A. J. & Cadman, D. (1991). Peer review and revising in an anthropology course: Lessons for learning. *College Composition and Communication*, 42 (2), 184-199.

- Hillocks, G. (2002). *The testing trap: How state assessments of writing control learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- . (2006). Middle and high school composition. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Research on composition: Multiple perspectives on two decades of change* (pp. 48-77). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hillocks, G., & Smith, M. W. (1991). Grammar and usage. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English Language Arts* (pp. 591-603). New York: Macmillan.
- Hughes, J. (1991). It really works: Encouraging revision using peer writing tutors. *English Journal*, 80 (5), 41-42.
- Jackson, R. L. (2002). Writing center consultations. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 372-385). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kiuhara, S. A., Graham, S., & Hawken, L. S. (2009). Teaching writing to high school students: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 101(1), 136-160.
- Lassonde, C. & Richards, J. C. (2013). Best practices in teaching planning for writing. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.). *Best practices in writing instruction* (2nd ed.) (pp. 193-214). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Levine, M.D. (1987). *Developmental variations and learning disorders* (2nd edition). Cambridge, MA: Educators Pub. Service.
- Macrorie, K. (1970). *Uptaught*. New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc.
- Menzel, P., & D'Aluisio, F. (2005). *Hungry planet: What the world eats*. Napa, CA: Material World.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2011). No one writes alone: Peer review in the classroom, a guide for students. Retrieved from <http://techtv.mit.edu/videos/14629-no-one-writes-alone-peer-review-in-the-classroom-a-guide-for-students>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moneyhun, C. A. (1999). Response. *WPA*, 23 (1/2), 63-64.

- Murray, D. (1972/2009). Teach writing as a process not product. In T. Newkirk & L.C. Miller (Eds.) *The essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher* (pp. 1-5). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- . (1973). Why teach writing -- And how? *English Journal*, 62 (9), 1234-1237.
- . (1978/2009). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In T. Newkirk & L.C. Miller (Eds.) *The essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher* (pp.123-145). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- . (1979/1982). The listening eye: Reflections on the writing conference. In D. M. Murray, *Learning by teaching: Selected articles on writing and teaching* (pp. 157-163). Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- . (1980/2009). Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In T. Newkirk & L.C. Miller (Eds.) *The essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher* (pp.6-26). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- . (1984). *Write to learn*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.
- . (1985/2009). Getting under the lightning. In T. Newkirk & L.C. Miller (Eds.) *The essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher* (pp. 74-85). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- . (1990). *Shoptalk: Learning to write with writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Age range for compulsory school attendance and special education services, and policies on year-round schools and kindergarten programs, by state: Selected years, 2000 through 2011. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_197.asp
- . (2008). The nation's report card: Writing 2007. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008468>
- National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). *The neglected "r": The need for a writing revolution*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 475 856).
- National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges. (2004). *Writing: A ticket to work...or a ticket out: A survey of business leaders*. Retrieved from http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/writingcom/writing-ticket-to-work.pdf
- Neubert, G. A., & McNelis, S. J. (1990). Peer response: Teaching specific revision suggestions. *English Journal*, 79 (5), 52-56.

- Nobles, S. L. (2010). Bringing the year together: The digital process portfolio. In M. T. Christel & S. Sullivan (Eds.) *Lesson plans for developing digital literacies* (pp.61-71). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English* 46, pp. 433-446.
- O'Neill, P., Adler-Kassner, L., Fleischer, C., & Hall, A. (2012). Creating the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing. *College English*, 74 (6), 520-533.
- Olson, C. B. (2003). *The reading/writing connection: Strategies for teaching and learning in the secondary classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olson, W. (2013). The politics of pedagogy: The outcomes statement and basic writing. In N. N. Behm, G. R. Glau, D. H. Holdstein, D. Roen, & E. M. White (Eds.) *The WPA outcomes statement: A decade later* (pp 18-31).. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Painter, K. (2006). *Living and teaching the writing workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Paton, F. (2002). Approaches to productive peer review. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 290-301). Urbana, IL.
- Peckham, I. (2002). Teaching in an idealized outcomes-based first-year writing program. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 69-89). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Penn State University Composition Program Handbook. (2002). Sequencing writing projects in any composition class. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 134-136). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13 (4), 317-336.
- . (1980). Understanding composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 31 (4), 363-369.
- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13 (1), 5-22.
- Purdue OWL. (2014). OWL fact sheet. Retrieved from <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/612/01/>

- Rankins-Robertson, S. (2013). The outcomes statement as support for teacher creativity: Applying the WPA OS to develop assignments. In N. N. Behm, G. R. Glau, D. H. Holdstein, D. Roen, & E. M. White (Eds.) *The WPA outcomes statement: A decade later* (pp 58-70). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Ray, K. W. (2001). *The writing workshop: Working through the hard parts (and they're all hard parts)*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Regaignon, D. R., Bromley, P. (2011). What difference do writing fellows programs make? *The WAC Journal*, 22, 41-63.
- Rhodes, K. (1999). Response. *WPA*, 23 (1/2), 65-66.
- Richards, J. R., & Miller, S. (2005). *Doing academic writing: Connecting the personal and the professional*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Richardson, M. (2008). Writing is not just a basic skill. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55 (11), A47-A48.
- Roen, D., Glau, G. R., & Maid, B. (2009). *The concise McGraw-Hill guide: Writing for college, writing for life*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Ryder, P. M. (2002). A writing portfolio assignment. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 182-185). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Shaughnessy, M. F. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods class*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Smagorinsky, P., Wilson, A. A., & Moore, C. (2011). Teaching grammar and writing: A beginning teacher's dilemma. *English Education*, 43 (3), 262-292.
- Soven, M. (2001). Curriculum-based peer tutors and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 200-233). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.
- Thonney, T. (2011). Teaching the conventions of academic discourse. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 39 (4), 347-362.

- Villanueva, V. (2002). On syllabi. In D. Roen, V. Pantoja, L. Yena, S. K. Miller, & E. Waggoner (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 89-102). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Virginia Department of Education. (2005). Nine out of 10 Virginia schools now fully accredited [Press release.] Retrieved from <http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/NewHome/pressreleases/2005/oct25.html>
- . (2012). The standards & SOL-based instructional resources. Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/index.shtml
- Wardle, E. (2009). "Mutt genres" and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication*, 60 (4), 765-789.
- Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- White, E. (1996, March 13). Re: program outcome statements [Msg 8]. Message posted to <https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9603&L=WPA-L&F=&S=&P=80690>
- Wiley, M. (1999). Response. *WPA*, 23 (1/2), 66-67.
- Yancey, K. B. (1999). Response. *WPA*, 23 (1/2), 67-68.
- . (2001). A brief introduction. *College English*, 63 (3), 321-323.
- Yin, R.K. (2006). Case study methods. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 111-122). New York: Routledge.
- . (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ziegler, A. (1981). *The writing workshop* (Volume 1). New York: Teachers & Writers Collaborative.