

CHAPTER 2.

STORY-CHANGING WORK FOR STUDIO ACTIVISTS: FINDING POINTS OF CONVERGENCE

Alison Cardinal and Kelvin Keown

University of Washington-Tacoma

In *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces*, Rhonda Grego and Nancy Thompson (2008) offer an aspirational narrative of Studio's potential to transform students and institutions. They imagine Studio as a place where the teacher acts as a guide rather than authority, and students collaborate in a workshop-like environment. The Studio also provides space to critique the institution and challenge the assumptions about identity and ability that institutions and faculty impose upon students (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995). This liberatory narrative Grego and Thompson (2008) tell about the Studio is what John Paul Tassoni and Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson (2005) describe as the "utopian dream" of a subversive studio thirdspace.

It comes as no surprise that this counter-hegemonic studio narrative comes into conflict with the narratives of institutions concerned with "buildings and budgets" (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 28). With small class sizes and organic curricula, studios appear to operate in opposition to institutions' focus on measurable outcomes and efficiency. These conflicting narratives result in material consequences for studio programs, including programs being enervated, defunded and cancelled (Grego & Thompson, 2008; Warnick, Cooney, & Lackey, 2010). To further complicate matters, studio creators must contend with students' own engagement—and resistance—to our utopian studio narrative (Matzke & Garrett, this volume; Santana, Rose, & LaBarge, this volume). These localized narratives play out amidst the backdrop of larger cultural narratives of writing and writers. While several accounts describe studio programs (Grego & Thompson, 2008; Tassoni & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2005; Warnick et al., 2010), little has been written about how to strategically tell the story of studio work to administrators and students. This chapter, alongside Matzke and Garrett (this volume), address this needed area of theorization. We argue that strategically engaging in what Linda Adler-Kassner (2008) calls "story-changing work" will increase the likelihood of success for studio programs.

To illustrate this story-changing work in action, we (Alison Cardinal, a full-time lecturer; and Kelvin Keown, a staff TESOL specialist) narrate our studio story to demonstrate how the interaction of narratives played out in our context. Through an analysis of our experience piloting several iterations of Studios at a small urban university, we illustrate how our engagement with institutional narratives shaped our studio program. Gleaning insights from our experience, we offer story-changing strategies for reframing studio work.

THE IMPORTANCE OF STORY-CHANGING WORK

In popular culture, the narrative of an ongoing literacy crisis persists (Holland, 2013; Leef, 2013). These stories, however wrongheaded, carry weight. They can lead to legislators determining basic writing's place on college campuses (Grego & Thompson, 1996, pp. 62-63; Ritola et al., this volume) and administrators deciding to fund writing programs. These stories also determine students' perception of the value of their writing courses (Bergmann & Zepernick, 2007).

How exactly do we begin transforming these stories? Adler-Kassner (2008) argues that any story-changing work must start from a place of principle, which she describes as a set of strongly held values that serve as the basis for action (pp. 22-23). Studio pedagogy is motivated by the post-process ideals of democratizing the classroom and critiquing hegemonic power structures (Grego & Thompson, 2008; Paul-Tassoni & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2005). As Adler-Kassner (2008) points out, however, strongly held principles are not enough: "Ideals without techniques, values without tactics" result in "a mess" (p. 127). To avoid the mess caused by unmoored ideals, Adler-Kassner (2008) encourages Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) to preemptively engage with dominant narratives as they play out in one's local context.

In many ways, studios already employ story-changing strategies that work from ideals. Beginning locally, studios seek to challenge and reshape dominant stories about writers and writing through interactional inquiry. This method, where studio participants collectively explore what writing is and how it is defined, could even be called a story-changing pedagogy. While Studio has had great success enacting story-changing work in the classroom, studios have had difficulty effecting lasting change on the institutional level (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 171). Considering the challenges of starting and sustaining studio programs, communicating studio work to outside audiences benefits from a strategic approach.

A story-changing approach begins with understanding how institutional change works. Drawing from his observations about moments when black people made gains in civil rights, critical race theorist Derrick Bell (2004) argues that change only happens when the interests of "white folks" and "black folks"

converge and that granting rights to black people somehow also benefits whites (p. 49). While some of this convergence is out of our control, Bell suggests that activists can harness interest convergence by using “interest-converging arguments,” which he argues “can extract a measure of victory from what otherwise would be almost-certain defeat” (2004, p. 159).

Studio activists can also use this strategy by preemptively demonstrating how studio interests converge with the interests of administrators to make the success of the program more likely. However, in order to have a more transformative effect, studio administrators should strive to reframe the conversations around writing. Appropriating institutional arguments is the first step, and the second is to use that appropriation to redirect the argument by reframing the interests of the institution in ways that reflect studio values. Steve Lamos (2011), who also uses interest convergence, suggests that finding places of convergence as the basis of story-changing work “can help us both alter old stories and to tell new stories” about writing programs to demonstrate to our institutions that these programs “remain relevant and important—even essential—to the success of both under-represented minority students and mainstream institutions themselves in the present day” (p. 163).

It is important to acknowledge that finding story convergence is not cut and dry. When we talk about changing the stories of “the institution,” we are actually discussing a complex mix of interests represented by individual departments, administrators, legislators, teachers, and students (Ritola et al., this volume). And as Matzke and Garrett (this volume) describe, studio activists can begin this story-changing work by first “interacting with community stakeholders, accumulating resources from different locations, and situating claims and appeals within local discourses.” Making Studios successful relies on first being attuned to the various discourses, locating multiple points of convergence among stakeholders, and then working from these convergences to begin story-changing work at those intersections.

STORIES ABOUT WRITING AND WRITERS

Before addressing possible points of conversion or diversion of interests among the various players involved in higher education, we describe two stories that Studios seek to tell that we find most salient for finding points of interest convergence. Following a description of the story-changing efforts already present in studio work, we will describe institutional stories of higher education that are pervasive on a national scale that most, if not all, studio activists will need to contend with. Finally, we will offer two examples of the way compositionists have already attempted to find places of convergence between studio’s interests

and the interests of larger institutional and societal forces in an effort to advocate for the ideals Studios inhabit.

THE NARRATIVE POSITIONING OF STUDIOS

Studios have gained in popularity in the last ten years, partly out of a need to promote new stories about so-called “basic writers.” Studio, like other recent models (Adams et al., 2009; Glau, 1996; Ritter, 2009), resists characterizing students as “basic writers,” since this term implies a deficiency (Horner & Lu, 1999). Because Studio is a supplement to other courses rather than a course taken prior to “real college,” Studio reframes the story of students from deficient to novice writers. This shift in narrative is important: “Basic writer” is a fixed identity, but novice is a role all writers necessarily inhabit when learning something new. As Gutierrez, Rymes, and Larson (1995) argue, a thirdspace such as a studio is uniquely positioned to challenge the “normative patterns of life” (p. 449) inherent in traditional classroom spaces by creating the conditions necessary to create counterscripts about student identities. And because Studio can be placed at any point in the curriculum, not just as a basic writing course (Miley, this volume), Studio emphasizes that students need support whenever they encounter new writing situations. For students, the repositioning of one’s writing identity to novice can have powerful effects on learning (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2011; Sommers & Saltz, 2004). Studio has a potentially transformative narrative effect on how institutions and students understand how one learns to write in ways that benefit student learning.

In addition to the narrative of novice writers, Studios emphasize the importance of metarhetorical awareness. Grego and Thompson (2008) position metarhetorical awareness as an essential tenet to studio work, since it encourages students to develop a greater awareness of the stories the institution and the larger society tells about them. In addition to helping students develop a classroom-specific awareness of genre, disciplinary norms, or academic discourse, metarhetorical awareness “encourages us to attend . . . to the complexity and influence of the institutional location” (Grego & Thompson, 2008, pp. 63-64). By collectively identifying the “gaps and fissures” (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 25) where change is possible, students and studio facilitators become co-partners in story-changing work (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995).

NATIONAL/INSTITUTIONAL STORIES: EFFICIENCY

There are many stories about education that Studio must contend with, but we will focus on the pervasive educational narrative of *efficiency* that we argue most

impacts studio work at both public and private institutions. Efficiency, according to Williamson (1994), is rooted in the capitalist value of return on investment and pervades every aspect of American education, from teacher training to assessment. Williamson (1994) argues that the efficiency narrative emphasizes efficient use of funds, efficient teacher labor, and efficient student achievement (p. 58). These efficiency narratives are naturalized and easy to overlook. After all, who would claim that higher education should be less efficient? This narrative, however, belies the complexity of learning to write. As composition research has shown, students' writing development is a complex process and does not progress in a linear, efficient fashion (Haswell, 2000; Sternglass, 1997). However, the idea that writing is a general skill that can be learned efficiently and uniformly assessed persists (Williamson, 1994). The focus on financial efficiency, and even learning efficiency, seems at odds with studio programs that rely on small course caps and emphasize the difficult-to-measure aspects of learning. The challenge for studio programs is figuring out how to contend with efficiency narratives without sacrificing the progressive principles Studio espouses.

CONVERGING INTERESTS

In this section, we describe strategic ways Studios can engage with efficiency narratives to further the interests of studio programs without sacrificing their principles. By finding points of convergence between Studio and efficiency narratives, studio programs can engage in story-changing work. We specifically identify narratives of acceleration and transfer of learning as useful narratives that frame studio work around narratives of efficiency while also reframing efficiency on our own terms.

Acceleration

In the last 20 years, the interests of Studios, institutions, venture philanthropy, and students converged to shorten the developmental pipeline common at many institutions. This convergence has led to the expansion of studio-like programs nation-wide, replacing traditional BW sequences with other models. However, none rival the wide-reaching influence of the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) out of the Community College of Baltimore. The Accelerated Learning Program is a notable example of how harnessing the converging interests of studio principles and efficiency narratives have led to story-changing about basic writers.

At first glance, ALP appears vulnerable to the critique of financial inefficiency. In their model, students take a studio-like course, capped at 11, alongside first-year composition (FYC), both of which are taught by the same instructor.

Despite the appearance of an expensive program, Adams et al. (2009) have been able to argue that ALP increases financial efficiency. Adams et al. (2009) use pass rate statistics to tell the story that eliminating the traditional sequence is cheaper for institutions. Because more students are retained, tuition dollars increase, and this makes student time in studio courses an efficient use of students' time and money. They also frame ALP in terms of efficient student achievement. The term *accelerated* suggests a slow, inefficient curriculum has been replaced with a sleek, streamlined model. Here we see how progressive ideals of access to education and capitalist ideals of financial efficiency converge. Harnessing a narrative of efficiency, ALP reframes basic writers as capable of handling college-level work, which upholds the studio ideals of treating students as novices.

It is important to note, however, that not all ALP courses use studio pedagogy. While there are significant overlaps between ALP and Studio, ALP's argument for replacing the traditional BW sequence does not advocate for a particular pedagogical approach (Adams, 2013). In contrast to Studio, ALP does not promote itself as a counter-hegemonic space that challenges institutional norms. This points to some of the dangers of interest convergence: How do studio programs find convergence of interests without sacrificing ideals? Ritola et al.'s (this volume) description of the Segue program at Georgia Gwinnet College is a notable example of the blending of these two approaches. While a focus on financial efficiency and retention has been successfully used as a point of interest convergence in studio program development (Fraizer, this volume; Ritola et al., this volume; Matzke & Garret, this volume), Studio needs to find ways to re-frame student learning in addition to using quantitative and monetary measures of student success.

Transfer of Learning

Another possibility for finding convergence between efficiency narratives and studio work comes from transfer of learning. Transfer, the ability to take something learned in one context and repurpose it for use in another context, has gained prominence in composition research in the last seven years. One of the key motivators for researching transfer of learning is to figure out how to help students make efficient use of their writing knowledge. In a time of shrinking budgets, it makes sense that composition would be drawn to research that helps WPAs make First-Year Composition (FYC) as efficient as possible.

In convergence with Studios, transfer scholarship has identified metarhetorical awareness as a key component to helping students transfer their writing knowledge across contexts (Beaufort, 2007; Yancey, Robertson, & Taczak, 2014). Transfer research has also shown the unique power of thirdspaces for helping students see and make connections across contexts (Fraizer, 2010).

However, most transfer research focuses on using metarhetorical awareness (also referred to as metacognition or reflection) to move between contexts rather than critique them. However, some theories, like DePalma and Ringer's (2014; 2011) adaptive transfer, account for how the dynamic process of repurposing knowledge plays out amidst the unstable power dynamics within an institution. Similarly, Nowacek (2011) offers a model of transfer that emphasizes using metarhetorical awareness not just as a tool for writing efficiency but also as a means for selling one's rhetorical choices in a new writing context that may or may not value a writer's chosen approach. Both of these orientations towards transfer can potentially be used to harness narratives of efficiency while also offering ways metarhetorical awareness can be used for resistance within new learning contexts rather than just encouraging only assimilation. By harnessing the convergence of efficiency and metarhetorical awareness, Studio can use transfer of learning theories as an avenue for story-changing work.

STORY-CHANGING WORK IN ACTION

Finding points of convergence necessitates grappling with local stories alongside national conversations. Writing programs contend with intersections of a multitude of stories, some of which may echo national stories and others which represent the positioning of the institution. In this section, we describe how this mix of stories played out at our university and how we, like Matzke and Garrett (this volume) and Ritola et al. (this volume), used available resources and discourses to develop and evolve our Studio program. Our goal in describing the interplay of narratives is to demonstrate how we negotiated these stories to begin our own Studio program.

HISTORY OF UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA

At our institution, stories of efficiency played out within local stories of *excellence* and *access*. Our institution, the University of Washington Tacoma (UWT), is a small urban university that has historically promoted itself as providing quality, affordable education to an urban population. From its founding in 1990, UWT has narratively framed itself in mission documents as a regional university that sought to offer students *access to excellence*.

UWT's mission statement on diversity states that the university "seeks out and supports individuals who may experience barriers in gaining access to college" (UW Tacoma, 2015, sec. "Diversity"). UWT has taken its commitment to access seriously throughout its history and accepts students from a wide range of backgrounds and educational experiences. This move on the part of admissions has not

been without controversy, and many faculty see this focus on access as a threat to the excellence promised by the institution. Students, both transfer and first-year, are commonly described as deficient, and professors find themselves teaching what they consider “remedial” skills to students who they thought should have entered college more prepared. In the meantime, the institution, for the sake of monetary efficiency, increased enrollment to compensate, further reinforcing the perception of an increase in “underprepared” students, many of whom are multilingual. As the mission statement promises, access would be coupled with support. In the current moment where efficiency and access appear to threaten excellence, Studio found a moment of interest convergence to capitalize on. While an increase in students helped with the budget, with limited support, students were struggling, leading to fewer tuition dollars in the long run. In this climate, Keown advocated for a studio course by harnessing the narratives of access, excellence, and efficiency.

PILOT STUDIO MODEL 1: DISCOURSE FOUNDATIONS

As the number of multilingual (ML) students has grown on our campus, so has a chorus of dichotomous, contentious narratives about ML writers at UWT. Multilingual writers add to “diversity,” but they aren’t “ready”; faculty complain that they don’t have time to teach “language skills,” but more often than not will grade on “perfect grammar.” In piloting the first Studio, Keown found that the Studio soldered together the competing narratives of access, excellence, and efficiency. Discourse Foundations, a Studio conceived in response to the institutional inefficiencies faced by ML students at UWT, told a new story on campus: that the prerequisite to excellent academic writing for ML students is, in part, the explicit instruction of novice writers in the grammatical and lexical features of a new discourse.

In the spring of 2011, Keown, the staff TESOL specialist in UWT’s Writing Center, proposed a Studio that specifically focused on the needs of ML novice academic writers. The concept for the course came out of Keown’s concern that student struggles with grammar and vocabulary in academic discourse could not be addressed only by visits to the Writing Center. About one-third of UWT students are ML writers, but at the time Keown proposed the Studio, there were no courses with the stated goal of teaching the grammar and lexis of academic discourse. Though interaction and feedback in the Writing Center is a productive opportunity for ML writers to test their hypotheses about how English works (Aljaafreh & Long, 1994; Goldstein & Conrad, 1990), it was clear to Keown that the campus should be doing more to augment its support for ML writers. Thus, proposing the Studio capitalized on the convergence of student narratives and institutional interests.

It was (and remains) our conviction that offering credit for the study of academic language addresses the fairness gap that occurs when students are welcomed into academia as they are in accordance with the narrative of access and financial efficiency. However, written feedback from faculty signals that many of these writers do not meet faculty expectations of “excellence.” Keown hoped that a studio model would promote the more efficient transfer of academic discourse knowledge, so that UWT could “stop punishing students for what they do not bring with them” (Matsuda, 2012, p. 155). Keown used the available discourse of efficiency to argue for serving ML students, thus contributing to excellence through the support that the Studio offered.

For many writers new to academia, especially non-native speakers of English, one of their most pressing needs is an orientation in the linguistic features of academic discourse (Hinkel, 2004; Holten & Mikesell, 2007). This pulling back of the veil on the lexical and grammatical details of academic writing is crucial work because students’ relative lack of linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 657) plots for them a more treacherous course through the academy. Practically speaking, novice writers benefit from a tour guide through academic discourse, or what Powers (1993) referred to as a “cultural informant” (p. 41). A thirdspace specifically for ML writers, therefore, would profit from a facilitator trained in applied linguistics. For Keown, trained in TESOL, the focus on developing metarhetorical awareness through interactional inquiry naturally gravitated toward analysis of language features that academic writers use as a means to accomplish their rhetorical objectives. Leading students in this kind of inquiry necessitates facilitator awareness of the lexicogrammatical features of academic discourse, thereby engaging students in the noticing of those features with inductive teaching approaches, and prompting students to connect discourse conventions to their own writing.

The major challenge of the course, from Keown’s perspective, was the lack of students’ common, concurrent writing experiences. The Studio was not tied to any one course, so students came from a broad range of courses, some that required writing and some that did not, which made discussions of writing difficult. In addition, because the Studio was only offered as a two-credit course with no letter grades, Keown did not feel there would be sufficient student incentive to produce new writing; besides, the original idea was for students to improve writing external to the Studio. However, the disparate nature of student writing assignments in external courses, combined with no collaboration with the instructors of those courses, rendered the Studio difficult to manage. For Keown, those were the fundamental weaknesses in the course’s design. Despite these weaknesses, the first iteration of the Studio confirmed that multilingual and novice writers at UWT can benefit from a studio that encourages interactional

inquiry into academic discourse. Furthermore, Discourse Foundations helped to spark a shift away from the narrative at UWT that faulted multilingual writers for lacking college readiness towards a narrative about institutional responsibility to students beyond mere access. The momentum for Studio at UWT generated by this narrative shift is apparent in the subsequent growth and adaptation of Studio within the writing curriculum.

PILOT STUDIO MODEL 2: WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

During the 2011-2012 academic year, when Keown was developing and piloting the first sections of Discourse Foundations, Cardinal was in her first year as a full-time lecturer at UWT. Keown and Cardinal decided that she would develop a curriculum more targeted towards all students while Keown would continue his ML-targeted curriculum.

Cardinal's version of Studio could be taken by any student at any level, from freshman to senior, as long as they were enrolled in a writing-intensive (W) course. We thought offering the Studio to any student helped to change the narrative of the basic writer, since all writers, regardless of their experience, are novices when faced with unfamiliar writing contexts. It was our hope that this model would offer the support needed by freshmen and incoming transfer students, two of the groups that struggle the most as they transition into our university.

The curriculum also played into the institution's efficiency narrative, since we framed the two-credit class as a transitional course that would require minimal class time. We imagined a course where students of all levels could gain a deeper metarhetorical awareness of writing across the curriculum, experienced writers could mentor novices, and all would benefit from a weekly discussion of the wide variety of genres written in the academy. In the spring of 2012, Keown and Cardinal were able to convince the department to offer six sections of the Studio the following year, two each quarter.

Drawing on recent research on transfer of learning (Fraizer, 2010; Nowacek, 2011; Reiff & Bawarshi 2011; Wardle, 2007) Cardinal developed a studio model that was rooted in both studio principles and transfer of learning scholarship. This allowed her to capitalize on the story convergence of efficiency and metarhetorical awareness. She hoped that by designing a transfer-inspired model, the Studio could fulfill its promise of helping students more efficiently repurpose their prior writing knowledge. Cardinal developed several assignments that emphasized metarhetorical awareness, including a weekly reflective journal, along with a genre taxonomy in which students categorized the types of writing they have done in the past. Cardinal envisioned a utopic thirdspace marked by engagement, vitality, and co-construction of writing knowledge

(Winzenreid et al., 2017). She imagined a studio where one student brought a paper from psychology, another from biology, and yet another from a FYC course, and students collaborated to develop a deeper metarhetorical awareness of academic discourse.

What she did not anticipate was how much students' own ideals of efficiency would determine the effectiveness of the curriculum. Because 14 students self-selected to be in Studio, Cardinal assumed her students would be a highly engaged group. This was not the case. She found that efficiency narratives pervaded students' attitudes towards learning. Students thought workshopping was an *inefficient* use of time, and they were more concerned with their own projects and were not invested in the work of the other students. She thought students would be intrigued by the writing done in other disciplinary contexts, but in reality students saw discussions about an assignment in another discipline from their own as irrelevant or, at worst, a distraction from their own writing projects. The portfolios revealed that students were able to use principles from genre awareness to analyze their own work, but the engagement Cardinal tried to encourage through interactional inquiry was met with ambivalence. This problem occurred in part because Cardinal's utopic studio narrative diverged from student interests.

In winter quarter, five freshmen enrolled in Cardinal's section. Cardinal found that students' concurrent enrollment in FYC was vital to the Studio's successful functioning. With shared content, students saw interactional inquiry as an efficient use of their effort, and this convergence of interests led to a more fruitful writing community. This time around, Cardinal and her students did their own story-changing work by becoming more metarhetorically aware of how language in academia influenced the identities of learners. The winter course convinced Cardinal and Keown that WAC Studios are difficult to make successful because most students don't see the value in studying writing in other disciplines outside of their own.

In preparation for arguing for a more extensive studio program the coming year, Cardinal attended the 2013 Conference on College Composition and Communication, including the Studio Special Interest Group led by Rhonda Grego, to gain a better national perspective on the story-changing work around studios and basic writers currently under way. We found that conversing nationally with other studio activists provided an important way to discover which narrative strategies were effective for sustaining studios.

Ultimately, we decided to retool the Studio for freshmen to take with FYC to better negotiate the stories of efficiency coming from students and administrators. Because the problems of student engagement were a result of the Studio's placement in the curriculum, we made the argument that we needed a more

coordinated rollout of the class for first-year students. In meetings with administrators, we argued that first-year students were the ones who would benefit the most from developing metarhetorical awareness since they would use this awareness for the remainder of their college career. We were able to capitalize on these converging interests with the hopes that Studio would accelerate the learning of freshmen while also helping with retention. Using the quantitative data provided by the ALP team that showed the model's efficiency, we were able to capitalize on this institutional exigency when making our case for a more expansive studio program.

STUDIO MODEL 3: FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION

The administration asked Cardinal and Riki Thompson, an Associate Professor in the Writing Studies department, to design and roll out a writing support program for first-year students. The program had two components: a two-credit pre-autumn writing-intensive course and a Studio taken concurrently with FYC. Unlike ALP, each studio contained students from many FYC sections. We retained some elements of the WAC studio model by requiring students to bring in writing from all their courses. To avoid the stigma attached to support classes and help students make the best choice for themselves, UWT used Directed Self-Placement. With a total of around 400 incoming freshmen, 40 students chose the Studio that autumn.

Cardinal found that a smaller class size and linking the course to FYC improved the effectiveness of the Studio. Buy-in was higher due to the converging interests of students and studio leaders. Once students had common content, the interactional inquiry was more efficacious, and students were more willing to offer feedback on drafts to other students. The WAC portion of the Studio was also more effective. Because students were not yet solidified in a major, many students commented in their reflections how useful it was to investigate writing across the disciplines and that Studio gave them the opportunity to preview writing they would be doing in future disciplinary courses.

In the following year, Cardinal collaborated with several other writing faculty members to design a mixed methods assessment that engaged in story-changing work. By qualitatively describing metarhetorical awareness demonstrated in the portfolios, the assessment reframed basic writing students as novices on a journey to writing excellence. And following ALP's lead, we collected quantitative retention, which demonstrated the increased retention of students who took the basic writing sequence over those that did not. By combining qualitative with quantitative data, we gained a full picture of studio's impact on student learning and student success at UW Tacoma.

CONCLUSION

Our narrative illustrates how converging interests can help start and sustain a studio program. This requires attention to both local and national stories. From our experience, many of these points of interest convergence can be predicted prior to beginning a studio program by examining institutional discourse around support courses, including the statements by administrators, mission statements, and institutional histories that have local significance. As Ritola et al. (this volume) similarly argue, reading the “compositional situation” necessitates “attention to localized contexts as a necessary first step in studio design.” We suggest, however, that certain points of convergence are applicable across most contexts. Transfer of learning provides a nexus of convergence between Studios and efficiency narratives that every institution could employ for story-changing work. Because the transfer of writing ability across contexts is a fundamental justification for the existence of all writing courses and programs regardless of context, studio activists would benefit from its use. Acceleration, in contrast, is more institution-specific. This convergence is most likely more applicable to public, access-oriented institutions like our own where shortening the developmental pipeline is state or institutionally-mandated (Ritola et al., this volume).

Our narrative also points to the necessity of attention to the material conditions alongside the discursive as the basis of story-changing work. In our particular context, the story-changing work was targeted towards administrators and students. Because there was no established basic writing program at UW Tacoma at the time, we did not face the challenge of having to argue for a change in pre-existing courses. We also had the advantage of having a relatively stable workforce who, while contingent, held full-time contracted positions, which other authors in this volume did not (Matzke & Garrett, this volume; Fraizer, this volume). In other contexts, more energy might be needed to story-change with faculty more so than administrators. Placement into studios also emerges in this volume as a local issue (Fraizer, this volume; Santana et al., this volume). We encourage special attention to the stories that placement tells about students (Hassel et al., 2016). Without creating a carefully-crafted placement mechanism, Studio risks reinscribing students as deficient even as thirdspace principles require studio activists to do the opposite (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995).

It is important to note, however, that studio activists cannot perfectly predict all the stories they will encounter. As several chapters in this volume emphasize, studio activists must be attuned to the kairoic moments and exigencies that emerge and nimbly seize on those opportunities (Matzke & Garrett, this volume). Matzke and Garrett describe this process as *bricolage* where studio program developers piece together discursive and material resources for develop-

ment of Studio as they emerge. While we recognize that not every institution has the luxury of trying out several models due to administrative structures and local resources, the unanticipated kairotic moments point to the importance of piloting a studio to account for the dynamic landscape of shifting interests. Running several models allowed us to examine the points of divergence that affected the impact of studio work and make adjustments before rolling out our FYC studio program.

As a final note, it's important to emphasize that this story-changing work is never finished but is an ongoing process that is continuously negotiated over time. Interests of institutions are in flux and shift depending on economic, political, and ideological circumstances. And while we have so far described interests between administrators and studio programs, campus-wide interests are much more complex. We must contend with a network of interests held by disciplinary faculty, students, and other writing faculty. With a strategic approach, however, we can feel empowered to pursue studio agendas on our campuses using interest convergence to engage in story-changing work.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P. (2013, March). *Thinking our way toward a pedagogy for basic writing*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Las Vegas, NV.
- Adams, P., Gearhart, S., Miller, R., & Roberts, A. (2009). The accelerated learning program: Throwing open the gates. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 18(2), 50-69.
- Adler-Kassner, L. (2008). *The activist WPA: Changing stories about writing and writers*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465-483.
- Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bergmann, L., & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 31(1-2), 124-149.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 645-668.
- The Community College of Baltimore County. (n.d.). *The Accelerated Learning Program*. Retrieved from <http://alp-deved.org>
- DePalma, M. J., & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of "transfer" in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(2), 134-147.

- DePalma, M. J., & Ringer, J. M. (2014). Adaptive transfer, writing across the curriculum, and second language writing: Implications for research and teaching. In M. Cox & T. Zawacki (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 43-67). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press/Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/12/>
- Fraizer, D. (2010). First steps beyond first year: Coaching transfer after FYC. *Writing Program Administration*, 33(3), 34-57.
- Glau, G. (1996). The "stretch" program: Arizona State University's new model of university-level basic writing instruction. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 20(1-2), 79-91.
- Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 443-460.
- Grego, R., & Thompson, N. (1996). Repositioning remediation: Renegotiating composition's work in the academy. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(1), 62-84.
- Grego, R., & Thompson, N. (2008). *Teaching/writing in thirdspaces: The studio approach*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445-472.
- Hassel, H., Klausman, J, Toth, C., Swyt, W., Griffiths, B., Sullivan, P., & Roberts, L. (2016). TYCA White Paper on Placement Reform. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 44(1), 135-157. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/TETYC/0423-mar2015/TETYC0423White.pdf>
- Haswell, R. (2000). Documenting improvement in college writing: A longitudinal approach. *Written Communication*, 17(1), 307-352.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Holland, K. (2013, November 11). Why Johnny can't write, and why employers are mad. *CNBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnbc.com/id/101176249>
- Holten, C., & Mikesell, L. (2007). Using discourse-based strategies to address the lexicogrammatical development of generation 1.5 ESL writers. *The CATESOL Journal*, 19(1), 35-52.
- Horner, B., & Lu, M. (1999). *Representing the "other": Basic writers and the teaching of basic writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lamos, S. (2011). *Interests and opportunities: Race, racism, and university writing instruction in the post-Civil Rights era*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Leef, G. (2013, Dec 11). For 100K, you would at least think college grads could write. *Forbes.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgeleef/2013/12/11/for-100k-you-would-at-least-think-that-college-grads-could-write/>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2012). Let's face it: Language issues and the writing program administrator. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 36(1), 141-163.
- Nowacek, R. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*.

- Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Powers, J. K. (1993). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *The Writing Center Journal*, 13(2), 39-47.
- Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication*, 28(3), 312-337.
- Ritter, K. (2009). *Before Shaughnessy: Basic writing at Yale and Harvard, 1920-1960*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sommers, N., & Saltz, L. (2004). The novice as expert: Writing the freshman year. *College Composition and Communication*, 56(1), 124-149.
- Sternglass, M. (1997). *Time to know them: A longitudinal study of writing and learning at the college level*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Tassoni, J. P., & Lewicki-Wilson, C. (2005). Not just anywhere, anywhen: Mapping change through studio work. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 24(1), 68-92.
- University of Washington-Tacoma Office of the Chancellor. (2015). *Mission, values and vision*. Retrieved from <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/chancellor/mission-values-and-vision>
- Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding "transfer" from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *Writing Program Administration*, 31(1-2), 65-85.
- Warnick, C., Cooney, E., & Lacky, S. (2010). Beyond the budget: Sustainability and writing studios. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 29(2), 74-96.
- Winzenried, M., Campbell, L., Chao, R., & Cardinal, A. (2017). Co-constructing writing knowledge: Students' collaborative talk across contexts. *Composition Forum*, 37.
- Williamson, M. (1994) The worship of efficiency: Untangling theoretical and practical considerations in writing assessment. In B. Huot & P. O'Neill (Eds.), *Assessing writing: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 57-80). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.