Not only can teachers use the analytic guide but so can students. In peer review groups, students can focus their writing efforts more directly with the six feature guide as "revision stations" for students to visit for specific feedback on their writing. In Spandel's experience, teachers welcome the use of this analytic guide for assessment and for teaching writing. Many teachers claim: "I'll never teach or think or writing in quite the same way."

READER-RESPONSE CRITICISM AS A MODEL FOR HOLISTIC EVALUATION

Speaker: Karl Schnapp, Miami University
Introducer/Recorder: Ann Hill Duin, University of Minnesota

Karl Schnapp's session focused on the application of reader-response theory to large and small scale holistic assessment. Schnapp began by citing the work of Stanley Fish, David Bleich, and Norman Holland as working models for the holistic evaluation of student writing. He then said that his own work is also based on Edward White's theories of composition as a socializing and individualizing discipline. From these theorists, Schnapp concluded that the best composition pedagogy views students' writing from both social and individual perspectives. In short, the interpretation and evaluation of writing depends on qualities of the community in which the writing was created and was evaluated.

Schnapp then described his specific project. His model is based on three reading theories that lead to a model for the holistic evaluation of writing. The first theory is the "top-down" model of reading as discussed by Holland and Bleich, the second is the "text-reader interaction" theory (from information-processing theory) as discussed by Rosenblatt, and the third is the "communal association" theory as discussed by Fish. Schnapp described his model in detail. Then he asked conference to fill out a survey identical to that used in his study. The survey asked us to complete questions regarding our perceptions and understanding of composition/language arts. Next we read an essay written by a freshman student and rated the student essay. Finally, we completed a second survey in which we gave information on the criteria we employ when holistically evaluating student writing. As with Schnapp's results, we had about 75% agreement in terms of the common goals of the composition instructors present. Schnapp stated that his research shows that writing teachers see writing as helping students on more of a practical level than on an aesthetic level.

The remainder of the presentation was a discussion between Schnapp and the conference. Key points that emerged included: the need to ask readers about what influences them as they evaluate papers; the need to determine the evaluative standards for one's discourse community; and the extent to which readers are influenced by what they are thinking about while evaluating writing.

THE DISCOURSE OF SELF-ASSESSMENT: ANALYZING METAPHORICAL STORIES

Speakers: Barbara Tomlinson, University of California, San Diego
Peter Mortensen, University of California, San Diego

Introducer/Recorder: Anne O'Meara, University of Minnesota

Barbara Tomlinson and Peter Mortensen gave conferences attending this session an opportunity to become students of their own writing processes. Much of the session was devoted to composing, sharing, and analyzing our own metaphorical stories about how we write. Tomlinson and Mortensen feel that using metaphorical stories in the classroom provides a means for students to take responsibility for their own writing, to balance personal with external assessment, and to center attention on the writing process rather than the product.

Tomlinson began by sharing some of her own metaphors for writing as well as some of those she found in her study of over 2000 professional writers. Handouts gave further examples from both professional and student writers. The metaphors were sometimes relevant to for the process of writing as a whole and sometimes symbols focusing on one aspect of writing. They ranged from clear analogies (e.g., building, giving birth, cooking, mining, gardening, hunting, getting the last bit of toothpaste) to metaphors that needed elaboration like a "guisette" (a small, irregular piece of material necessary for the construction of a garment, but hidden) and the "lost wax process" (a way of making a mold which then melts away when the product is finished). Tomlinson stressed that metaphors can reassure and guide her through composing problems as well as help her describe these problems.

The speakers then simulated their techniques for using metaphorical stories in the classroom. As the participants began to compose their own metaphorical stories, Peter Mortensen asked some guiding questions to get us started, encouraging us to think of metaphors we might use for beginning writing, finishing writing, writing under pressure, writing badly, writing well, generating ideas, and so on. He suggested students could also use the guiding questions (distributed on the handout) in interviews or in collaboration to get started.

In the discussion that followed, Tomlinson and Mortensen stressed that metaphors should be accepted and explored, rather than judged. They may be original, adopted, or enforced; they may be idiosyncratic, contradictory, or even strike us as "bad." The important
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