Introduction

In the decade since the 2011 publication of “Transfer-Ability: Issues of Transfer and FYC,” WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 18 (Snead), the body of research on transfer has grown exponentially. Though the first edition addressed foundational work on transfer and its relationship to first-year composition, this bibliography offers a more comprehensive collection of research on writing transfer (as distinct from conversations on learning transfer in general) specifically in the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition. Most of this work has been published since the first edition of this bibliography, apart from a few publications excluded from the first edition as they did not focus on first-year composition. As such, this edition is intended to be read as a companion piece to – rather than a replacement of – the first edition. Readers interested in formative work on transfer from Education and Educational Psychology, as well as earlier work on transfer in Writing Studies, are encouraged to consult the first edition of the bibliography.

The works covered in this bibliography situate transfer within relevant, ongoing scholarly conversations in the discipline, including topics of composition pedagogy, curriculum development, genre, rhetorical knowledge, threshold concepts, writing about writing, teaching for transfer, multimodality, multimedia composing, writerly dispositions and perceptions, writerly identity and agency, reflection and metacognition, professional development, tutor training, writing center studies, and multilingual/second-language writing. Early research on transfer in writing largely focused on three questions:

1) Are there generalized writing knowledge and practices that can be taught in first-year composition?
2) Do students perceive similarities and differences between writing situations that lead them to apply prior learning appropriately?
3) Are there effective ways to teach for transfer?

Even as none of these questions are settled and though they continue to be pursued through research, new questions have arisen. One question centers on the use of the term “transfer,” which is now regarded as a simplistic figure of speech. Specifically, the metaphor of “transfer” occludes the complexities inherent in recognizing when prior learning might be applicable and understanding how to transform, adapt, coordinate, or remediate that prior learning for a new writing situation (Wardle, 2007; DePalma and Alexander, 2015; DePalma & Ringer, 2011; Alexander et al., 2016). A second question asks whether there are threshold concepts across disciplines that we might focus on to aid transfer (Adler-Kassner et al. 2012; Adler-Kassner et al., 2017). Third, researchers are considering the importance of reflection and metacognition for transfer (Allan & Driscoll, 2014; Walwema & Driscoll, 2015; Beaufort, 2016; Gorzelsky et al., 2017). Fourth, a growing body of scholarship examines connections between writer identity as well as writer dispositions and perceptions (Driscoll, 2011; Driscoll & Wells, 2012; Wardle, 2012; Driscoll & Powell, 2016). Finally, researchers have raised questions of research methods and methodology, for instance, what methods and theoretical frames are best able to help us recognize various types of transfer (Moore, 2012; Elon Statement on Writing Transfer, 2013; Moore, 2017; VanKooten, 2020)?

Research on transfer (or transfer-related research) plays out across a range of both academic and non-academic contexts. For instance, this research considers how writing knowledge and practice transfer into and from first-year composition, as well as what can and should be taught in this course (Clark & Hernandez, 2011; Downs & Robertson, 2015; Robertson & Taczak, 2017). Research also considers the vertical curriculum: general education courses, upper-division courses, other academic sites such as writing or multiliteracy centers, service-learning contexts, and internships (Roozen, 2012; Frazier, 2018). Studies examine the transition from university to workplace writing, including apprenticeship situations. Additionally, there is a focus on self-sponsored writing and writing that happens outside of both academic and workplace spaces as sites of transfer (Roozen, 2014), including writing that happens in digital and multimodal spaces (DePalma & Alexander, 2015; Monty, 2015; Alexander et al., 2016; Mina, 2017; Rosinski, 2017; Shepherd, 2018; Bowen & Davis, 2020; VanKooten, 2020).

This bibliography reflects the growing body of scholarship on transfer that we hope will be useful to readers in various roles.

- For **writing program administrators** of all kinds, this bibliography provides background research on transfer from an array of institutional locations, including both individual and multi-institutional studies focused on programmatic transfer implementation, curriculum development and adaptation, professional development, and assessment.
- For **writing center and multiliteracy center directors**, the bibliography offers studies focused on how centers support transfer, how tutors might be effectively trained to tutor for transfer, and how writing center work affects tutors’ perceptions, knowledge and practice, skills (including the development of soft skills), and perceptions.
- For **instructors**, the research included here offers pedagogical approaches and justifications for teaching for transfer, assignment design, and guidelines for adoption and adaptation between assignments, courses, and print-based and multimodal writing contexts.
For researchers, the annotated studies offer a wide range of short-term and longitudinal methods and methodologies for examining transfer, including case studies, ethnographies, surveys, analysis of artifacts, interviews, focus groups, and observation. Numerous theoretical frames are engaged as well (e.g., activity theory, genre theory, situated learning/practice, communities of practice, distributed cognition, semiotic theory), which speaks to the breadth and depth of the ways that transfer is being studied and conceptualized.

We have categorized sources based on their primary contribution, though admittedly many sources contribute across these categories.

- Those sources in the **Theory Building and Research Methods** category establish theoretical frameworks, synthesize related theories and theoretical approaches and discuss research methods for studying transfer.
- Those sources in the **First-Year Composition** category focus specifically on that context, and focus on pedagogy, FYW curriculum design and connections between reflection and transfer.
- Sources in the **Transfer in and across Academic Contexts** category include research focused on transfer into and out of first-year composition, discussions of vertical curriculum, and WAC/WID focused studies. That this is the most robust category in the bibliography is evidence that our field has answered the call to broaden transfer-focused research beyond the context of First-Year Composition courses.
- **Transfer in and from Writing and Multiliteracy Centers** focuses on research situated in writing or multiliteracy centers including transfer research focused on tutors and tutor training. While these centers are academic contexts, the specific focus on tutors and their work warrants a separate category.
- Sources in the **Workplace Writing, Apprenticeship, and Learning to Write in Professional and Other Contexts** categories focus on writing and learning to write in professional settings and other non-academic contexts.
- Finally, sources in the **Literacy Development and Writerly Life** category focus on writer dispositions, mindset, and epistemologies; habits, routines and practices; self-sponsored and extracurricular writing; and literacy development.

### Theory Building and Research Methods


Adler-Kassner et al. define the term “threshold concepts,” consider the usefulness of threshold concepts for understanding transfer and define five threshold concepts of writing that are essential for transferring writing knowledge across contexts. The authors demonstrate how these concepts meet the characteristics of threshold concepts established by Meyer and Land, provide examples of the threshold concepts from empirical research studies, and argue that instruction based on threshold concepts provides a basis for transfer.

This article argues for threshold concepts as a way to think through questions of transfer, education, and writing through a linked analysis of writing and general education courses. By examining threshold concepts in two disciplines–writing and history–the piece seeks to explore “whether there are concepts that exist within specific disciplines, like composition and history, that then can also span across disciplines.” The authors find that the disciplines have sometimes disparate and sometimes overlapping threshold concepts (like discourse, genre, and context), which constitute a kind of “troublesome knowledge.” This troublesome knowledge provides a productive “tension” for thinking about general education programs more broadly.


This collection emerged from the 2011-2013 multi-institutional Elon Research Seminar of the same name. It focuses on the Elon Statement on Writing Transfer and includes chapters that ask what transfers, how we might recognize that transfer, and the significance of these questions and answers. Further, the collection examines strategies for supporting transfer across contexts and critical transitions.

Anson and Moore outline three literacy orientations toward transfer: the autonomous orientation, the learner-centered social-practices orientation, and the context-centered social-practices orientation and discuss their implications. They assert that transfer is an issue of the relationship between writing context and the writer, and research should focus on that relationship. Finally, they argue we have an opportunity, or an imperative, to communicate what we know about transfer and learning to write with those in other disciplines, policy makers, parents, and the general public to dispel the myth that writing is a “skill to be learned once and deployed well thereafter” (336).

Blythe suggests that some researchers do not recognize transfer because their theoretical frames fail to adequately consider the subject and their capabilities for adaptation. To address this gap, he draws on screen-capture data from student-interns to show how utilizing a model focused on 1) knowledge across the domains identified by Beaufort, 2) problem-solving, and 3) affordances (including a writer’s beliefs and habits of mind) reveals transfer. Students apply and adapt previous knowledge, self-monitor and revise when needed, and draw on social affordances by seeking feedback. Given this, Blythe argues for an ecological approach to research on transfer.
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Brent synthesizes research at the intersection of writing studies and learning transfer, finding “three overlapping stages” in professional discourse on learning transfer (397) that do not constitute “a clear linear progression” (403). The first stage, “closing the gap” is characterized by a “move beyond thinking that all we have to do is teach a series of idealized forms” to facilitate transfer (398). The second stage, “glass half empty” occurs at the intersection of rhetorical genre studies, activity theory, and situated learning, and leans toward transfer skepticism. The third stage, “glass half full,” is characterized by an “acknowledgment that knowledge transfer is neither simple nor inevitable, [but] that it can happen under certain pedagogical conditions” (404). Finally, Brent outlines several implications of this tripartite synthesis: 1) future research should be anchored in a complex conception of prior knowledge; 2) studies should separate of learner perceptions and transfer evidence (410); 3) both researchers and instructors should think long-term regarding the development of expertise; 4) teachers wanting to facilitate transfer should teach mindful abstraction (as metacognition) and should cue both forward and backward-looking transfer (413-5).
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Asserting that both general knowledge and local knowledge are important for writing development, Carter argues for a pluralistic theory of expertise that encompasses both in a continuum. General knowledge is important to help novices begin the path toward expertise, while local, domain-specific knowledge becomes increasingly important as the writer develops. General knowledge remains useful for the expert when she is writing outside of her domain of expertise or is confronting an unusual situation. Carter argues
that the goal of writing teachers is to assist students in gaining general knowledge about writing while moving them toward the domain-specific local knowledge of a discourse community. Just as writing development follows a continuum, so too should writing instruction, with the writer progressing from novice through advanced beginner and competent writer stages to expert. Though Carter does not discuss transfer at length, implicit in his pluralistic theory is that some general skills of writing do prove useful to both novice writers and expert writers working outside of their own domains.
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This article introduces the theoretical construct of “adaptive transfer” for understanding transfer as more than reuse of prior knowledge. Arguing that conceptualizations of transfer in composition in L2 writing have been too narrowly focused on direct application of past learning with little consideration of writer agency or adaptation, they offer adaptive transfer. Defined as “the conscious or intuitive process of applying or reshaping learned writing knowledge in order to help students negotiate new and potentially unfamiliar writing situations” (135), adaptive transfer has six features. It is dynamic, idiosyncratic, cross-contextual, rhetorical, multilingual, and transformative. The benefits of adaptive transfer are that it is fluid, it allows for reshaping of knowledge, it emphasizes agency, and it offers a way to include the many types of transfer in the discussion. After defining the construct, DePalma and Ringer note connections to existing research to show how adaptive transfer is seen empirically, particularly in the work of Parks (2001). They conclude with implications for first-year writing and L2 research and pedagogy.
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This chapter draws on literature from Psychology, Sociology, Education, and Composition Studies to “trace the main threads of transfer research” (145), to suggest directions for future research, and to discuss pedagogical implications for Composition courses. Donohue reviews the trajectory of transfer research including the relationship between the cognitive/individual and the situated/social concepts, notions of the novice and the expert, the contributions of activity theory and research into communities of practice, issues of metacognition and reflection, failures of transfer, and the growing attention to transfer in Composition Studies. She notes the different research methodologies for studying transfer and suggests that research should be focused on the “deep questions” (145) of effective writing instruction and what enables transfer.
Donohue suggests instructors should create connections across courses and disciplines, engage in analyzing boundary-crossing scenarios with students, and deconstruct the genre conventions of a field.
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Donahue offers a synthesis of the global (non-US) conversation about transfer to situate US conversations in a broader context and to fill gaps in our knowledge. She notes themes in the European scholarship, discusses issues with the term “transfer,” and addresses alternative terms used and how these represent different conceptualizations of transfer. She asserts that transformation is the “real activity of transfer” (129).

KEYWORDS: transformation, global, Elon Research Seminar


Emerging from the two-year (2011-2013) Elon University Research Seminar (ERS) focused on transfer, the Elon Statement on Writing Transfer synthesizes the state of transfer research at that specific point in time. The statement defines the terms used to describe transfer and calls for new terms to be “explicitly reconcile[d]” within this “existing vocabulary.” It outlines the learning and transfer theories from multiple disciplines that have been used “as frameworks for studying and describing” writing transfer. Widely held principles are listed: transfer does occur, students do not expect transfer and will encounter challenges, it is possible to teach for transfer, prior knowledge and dispositions affect transfer, transfer may be routine or transformative, and successful transfer involves repurposing and transforming rhetorical knowledge for a new situation. Three practices are suggested for teaching for transfer. The statement notes the benefits of research across institutional, disciplinary, and cultural boundaries and calls for both new and replication studies with a variety of methods and study lengths to add to our understanding of transfer. Finally, the statement includes principles “in development” – those for which additional research is needed.
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This chapter offers a taxonomy, developed out of a mixed-methods longitudinal study, aimed at helping students to develop constructive metacognition, a critical reflective stance that aids transfer and the construction of writerly identity. The taxonomy includes subcomponents of person, task, strategy, planning, monitoring, control, and evaluation which are defined and connected to transfer. The authors discuss implications for instructors and WPAs (e.g. using the taxonomy to design reflective assignments) and offer specific strategies for researchers (e.g. the use of think-aloud protocols).

KEYWORDS: mixed-method, metacognition, reflection, writer identity, disposition, taxonomy, Elon Research Seminar

*College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 258-264.

The authors consider the confluences between transfer and translingualism and then reflect on the ways that each term might benefit from considering the other’s research questions, theoretical frames, and methodologies. The authors give an extensive definition and overview of the scholarship for each term, highlighting the possible avenues of mutually beneficial connection. They define transfer as dynamic and “emphasizing the potential for disruption and transformation,” with “terminological history in applied linguistics” and “behaviorist notions that a known language can ‘interfere’ with the acquisition of another” (259). They note that translingualism focuses on the ideological status of language in writing, challenging the view that writing is neutral. While translingualism challenges assumptions about how to recognize and evaluate transfer, the transfer literature demonstrates the value of fine-grained, long-term, naturalistic studies of writing, a value productively taken up in research on a translingual approach. The authors suggest that translingualism can affect transfer scholarship by promoting “more tolerant attitude[s] toward[s] language varieties” (260) in writing classes and reevaluating the way transfer success is measured (due to the translingual focus on progress and motive rather than a success/failure dichotomy). Likewise, they argue that transfer can affect translingualism methodologically, not just theoretically, by highlighting cross-institutional and cross-classroom student experiences. The authors conclude that both transfer and translingualism might best be understood not as prescribed pedagogies or policies but as terms with “explanatory value: small theories that help open up changing practices in our writing lives” (262).
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This chapter introduces the collection and uses the wealth of writing transfer research to offer a basic set of principles that scholars can agree on when it comes to writing transfer. The author demonstrates that college writing classes are built on the premise that writing knowledge can be transferred and offers these principles as a means to facilitate that
transfer. The first principle is that writing transfer requires that learners transform their prior knowledge, reshaping it to new contexts they encounter. The second principle is that writing transfer is complex, taking many forms such as assemblage and remix. The third principle is that student identity shapes their writing transfer experiences, which involves students’ backgrounds and dispositions toward learning. The fourth principle is that it’s possible to teach for transfer. The author uses this principle to make a call for explicit pedagogy built to teach for transfer and implores university programs to work together toward this goal. The final principle is that research transfer requires mixed-methods research. Moore says that transfer is tricky and not always easy for researchers to find.
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Moore provides an overview of research questions, methods, contexts, and theories presented in published scholarship on writing-centered learning transfer. This article provides a representative sample of the types of research in the field. Moore then uses these data to set up a means to expand that knowledge through a multi-institution research project that aims to sketch in the field’s “map,” the Elon Research Seminar. Moore maps out the ways in which the Elon group has expanded upon and will expand further upon areas of research in the field of writing transfer.

**KEYWORDS:** research method, Elon Research Seminar, cross-institutional


Anson and Moore introduce the learning and transfer theories focused on connections between learner actions and processes, context and situations for writing, and knowledge that inform not only the chapters but the Elon Statement on Writing Transfer. They establish the questions that frame the collection (what should transfer, how we recognize transfer, and the significance of understanding transfer) and conclude by noting two themes that emerge from the chapters: the language we use for transfer matters and can be limiting, and we can teach for transfer provided we establish an appropriate curriculum, incorporate metacognitive strategies, and model transfer.
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Nowacek et al. explore the concept of “transfer talk” in the writing center context. The authors define transfer talk as “the talk through which individuals make visible their prior learning or try to access the prior learning of someone else.” They find that students refer to prior knowledge through discussing memories, asking questions, and comparing prior knowledge to the tutor’s knowledge. Based on data from 30 sessions with writing center clients, they make two propositions about the nature of transfer of learning. The first is that transfer may be more social and collaborative than previously proposed and may even be co-constructed. The second is that so-called low-road transfer may be as important to transfer of learning as reflective practice. The authors recommend actively attempting to draw on these ideas in future research and classroom practice.
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Building on the visual from the Elon Statement on Writing Transfer, Qualley creates a detailed conceptual map of “the transfer terrain” (69). Starting with the three spheres (learner, context, and knowledge) of the Elon figure and using Western Washington University’s FYW program as an example for analysis, Qualley engages significant theories and concepts related to transfer and the development of expertise and maps them onto the Elon visual “to forge more detailed linkages” (101) between well-known scholarship and “less explored territory” (101) Additionally, she introduces the concept of “retrospective understanding,” a learner’s conscious awareness of building on prior knowledge (78).
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Tarabochia and Heddy argue that transfer doesn’t happen at a massive level, especially in a short period of time. They propose Transformative Experience (TE) as an alternative framework that teachers can use to make smaller transfer happen, which over time, accumulates to great transformation. They argue that TE is a more comprehensive approach to writing transfer because it considers the cognitive, behavioral, and affective aspects of learning, thus allowing students to experience the effect of learning in various parts of their life. They report on a case study of early career academics who were writing for publications and participating in a writing group. They particularly examined how
those faculty writers used the concepts from the writing group in other daily writing situations, whether their perception of writing has changed, and whether their value of writing has changed based on their participation in that group. Their findings demonstrate that participants practiced active use of the writing concepts in new writing situations, had an expanded understanding of writing and their writer identity, and were able to see the impact of writing on their other life experiences. They conclude that TE can facilitate more meaningful low-road transfer because it spans different aspects of students’ lives.

KEYWORDS: Transformative experience, low-road transfer, case study


After reviewing the various approaches to Writing about Writing (WAW) and the curricula and courses that resulted from these approaches, Whicker and Stinson created an axiological heuristic for all these approaches to account for the differences among them. Their goal was to provide WAW instructors with a typology of the differences among those approaches and to question the validity of claims about WAW’s ability to facilitate transfer. They categorize those approaches as “inner-directed,” or approaches that focus on the individual student writer, and “outer-directed” approaches that pay more attention to writing context. Inner-directed approaches, such as students’ writing process and language or literacy, tend to focus on individual students’ use of their prior knowledge and writing processes, the development of metacognition through reflective activities, and dissecting language and literacy practices and the possible inherent inequities in those practices. Meanwhile, outer-directed approaches address academic discourse and context analysis in courses that teach academic research and public writing. Whicker and Stinson conclude by presenting a number of questions that resulted from their axiology that they hope will be direct future transfer research.

KEYWORDS: WAW, metacognition, transfer, disposition, context analysis, literacy, language, politics

First-Year Composition


This article traces the integration of reflection and reflective writing into the assignments of a first-year writing general education course as a way to 1) build and bolster research-based program-wide assessment, 2) track and develop students’ perceptions of writing and research process development, and 3) develop their metacognitive abilities toward self-assessment of learning. Reflection, here, is “a powerful process that allows students to review and evaluate their writing and research processes, demonstrate their metacognitive awareness, and build connections to prior, current, and future learning contexts” (39). Its inclusion in first year composition assignments results not only in
transfer thinking (and negative transfer), but also in insights into faculty development needs relative to designing for and teaching reflective writing.
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Tracing the incorporation of a Teaching for Transfer (TFT) curriculum into three community college contexts, Andrus et al. find that a) the TFT curriculum does facilitate transfer in community college writing classrooms but b) some parts of the curriculum require careful adaptation that “meets the needs of our students in our local contexts” (82). In particular, the authors report some necessary core elements of TFT—key terms, reflection, and four specific major assignments; however, the authors here adapt the curriculum by finding more suitable readings, carefully scaffolding the major assignments (such as the research inquiry assignment), and reframing the theory of writing to make room for “the pathway toward a transferable theory of writing [that] likely will be twisty and full of dead ends—even for the most prepared writers” (87).

KEYWORDS: teaching for transfer, community college, curriculum development, FYC, assignment-writing


Beaufort argues that the CWPA Outcomes Statement, a multi-authored synthesis of goals for first-year composition programs, could be improved with the inclusion of two key issues in writing studies: writing expertise and transfer of learning. On the point of writing expertise, she maintains that the field’s research on the nature of writing expertise (what separates novice from expert writers) could help make more distinct, empirically-grounded, and measurable outcomes. Second, she argues that the Outcomes Statement should articulate the goal of writing transfer—how students transfer the skills and knowledge they learn in FYC to other writing situations. She recommends that the Outcomes’ major categories be defined in their relationship to one another. Clearer definitions and connections would lead to educating students in the knowledge domains the students need to attend to in order to become more expert writers. Focusing on how the outcome categories can be applied to other contexts would help students grow as writers. She offers five new knowledge domains, or sets of knowledge, around which to organize the outcomes: subject matter knowledge; genre knowledge; writing process knowledge; discourse community knowledge; rhetorical knowledge. According to Beaufort, organizing in this way would help teachers and administrators identify gaps in student writing performance. She ends by proposing that the Outcomes Statement document be developmentally appropriate, or accessible for both novice and expert writing teachers, and it should avoid assuming readers’ background knowledge on writing theory and research.

Beaufort describes how reflection and metacognition can be implemented into FYC pedagogy to focus on teaching for transfer and help aid transfer of learning. She gives an overview of the literature on transfer and trends in FYC literature, such as the complex dilemma of how to prevent negative transfer and facilitate successful transfer across discourses. She then outlines four guiding principles of curriculum and pedagogy that could further efforts at teaching writing for transfer and extend our understanding of reflective practice. The first principle she suggests is to broadly frame the course content as “knowledge to go” (31) where instructors make explicit references to broad applications for the course content in other areas of life. That is, instructors should make explicitly clear that FYC content is meant to be transferred to other classes and beyond the classroom. She suggests helping students’ motivation by implementing journaling reflections to create personal connections to the assignments and classroom experience. The second principle focuses on reflection strategies in the classroom that guide learners to structure specific problems and learnings into more abstract principles so they can apply appropriate problem-solving tools to new situations. In the third principle, the focus is on “deep learning” or assignments that incorporate “practice, repetition, reflection, and more practice” (36). The final principle suggests that teachers invite students to reflect on the skills gained in one assignment and have them apply them to another assignment, such as the final paper or reflective memos. Emphasis is placed on “real-world” contexts and use in this fourth principle.


This piece takes on “the transfer of reading knowledge specifically” (9) through Carillo’s hypothesis that “to prepare students to read effectively in courses beyond first-year composition, we need to encourage the development of metacognitive practices through [...] mindful reading” (10). As a construct, mindful reading is distinguished from both metacognition generally and from rhetorical reading strategies as “a particular stance on the part of the reader, one that is characterized by intentional awareness of and attention to the present moment, its context, and one’s perspective” (11). It is an approach to teaching reading that is about texts, contexts, assignments, strategies, and ways of being (toward texts). The goal of mindful reading is to “help students recognize at what moment in their reading process they need to relinquish a particular reading approach and use an alternative one, and why” (14). In this model, “first-year composition becomes about preparing students to productively engage with texts in a range of disciplines” (15).
by “intertwining the construction of both generic and specific knowledge” (16) which, ultimately, are tied together through “close reading” as a kind of metaconcept across disciplines. Mindful reading practices take shape, here, through a reading journal assignment that makes reading visible through an inquiry-driven set of reading questions (which are on page 19) that hearkens back to the double- and triple-entry notebooks popularized by Ann Berthoff and others since.
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Carillo, Ellen C. Securing a Place for Reading in Composition: The Importance of Teaching for Transfer. Utah State UP, 2014.

Securing a Place begins by positioning the absence of reading as a focal point in the discipline as resulting from a move away from interpretation—that is, as seeing both reading and writing as co-constitutive of the construction of meaning in composition (5). This bifurcation of reading and writing is documented in several ways: first, in a convenience sample survey (n=100) of instructor attitudes about reading in composition classrooms (chapter 2), which is supplemented by a survey of students (n=100) and interviews with both groups. Second, it is documented in careful readings of scholarly texts in the field (chapter 3) with specific attention to the period of 1980-1993 (chapter 4). These years mark a period in which models of reading-engaged scholarship emerge and fall victim to the fight over disciplinary identity (76). Even so, the “theoretical and conceptual continuities” of this period might inform a re-emergence of reading in the current moment (79). Ultimately, these early chapters serve as the backdrop for the articulation of a mindful reading, “a framework for teaching the range of ways of reading [...] so that students can create knowledge about reading and about themselves as readers” (110). Through explicit teaching of reflective reading and by helping students connect self and context through reading, Carillo asserts that mindful reading can help students transfer their knowledge across contexts including, but not limited to, other academic disciplines. Further, the book provides a set of reading assignments—a passage-based paper and a reading journal—and a set of readings designed to both enact mindful reading and to facilitate the transfer of reading knowledge and practice (chapter 6).
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Clark presents findings from a study investigating students’ transfer of rhetorical and genre knowledge from writing alphabetic texts to composing multimedia texts in the context of first-year writing. Results indicate that students who capably write traditional academic arguments were not successful in producing a text that met academic standards while incorporating new media. Issues included a lack of coherence and the inclusion of irrelevant material. The author considered whether the genre assigned (a blog) was the best choice for the assignment and questioned whether students’ media experience outside of academia led them to believe that coherence and explicit relevance were not
important. Clark concludes that instructors and students should make careful choices of new media genres based on rhetorical suitability, and students need additional focus on genre awareness not only in print genres but also in multimedia genres.
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Responding to the debate over first-year writing courses, Clark and Hernandez question whether a FYW curriculum focused on developing genre awareness might facilitate transfer of writing knowledge from one context to another. Pre- and post-course surveys were conducted in a class of twenty-four students who also wrote end-of-semester reflections. Noting issues inherent in self-reporting, the researchers found no clear conclusions in their data on the issue of transfer. In their surveys, students steadfastly maintained the usefulness of the five-paragraph essay structure, reported the genre of argument to be “useful” or “very useful,” and indicated that learning about genres had reduced their writing anxiety. The reflections indicated that few students increased their awareness of audience, and that fewer understood the concept of author persona. They did not understand that different genres could have the same purpose or that research reports could present an argument, and, while they were overly focused on issues of structure and form, they did not understand structure as connected to rhetorical purpose. While increasing genre awareness may offer promise for transfer, Clark and Hernandez suggest that genre awareness is itself a threshold concept that proves challenging for students. Further research into genre awareness and reduced writing anxiety is suggested.
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Case-study analysis of two students’ writing in a first-year writing course, including a literacy history narrative and responses to three “meta-writing” reflective writing prompts, revealed that marked differences in genres, style, and rhetorical traditions between previous writing instruction and current assignments hindered transfer of prior learning in L2 learners. However, reflective writing evidenced metacognitive thinking that aids transfer. DasBender asserts the importance of guided reflection assignments, curricular and instructional continuity, and a “situated approach to transfer” (295) for L2 writers.
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While first-year composition should be considered an “exploratory moment for writers” (50) this is not how it is often seen by stakeholders who consider FYC to be a service course (other professors, the public, parents) or a burden (students). In this book chapter, Downs traces the historical roots of the various perceptions of FYC then contrasts those perceptions with research on writing and writing pedagogy which “suggest that public notions of writing are critically flawed” (56). He outlines the principles that are the “heart” of FYC: access, interaction, voice, textual production, and rhetoric. Finally, he defines six ways that WPAs and instructors might work within the tension between public expectations and our principles: Establish our expertise, focus on declarative knowledge about writing as the content of our courses, write outcomes that clearly establish what students should learn, push back against misconceptions of and about writing, develop assignments that require production of “real texts for real readers” (60), and maintain an emphasis on rhetoric. The topic of transfer is not explicitly addressed within the chapter; however, the suggestions he makes for FYC courses reflect much of what is known about teaching for transfer.
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In this chapter, Downs and Robertson argue that first-year composition (FYC) courses have two goals: helping students to “examine and ideally reconsider prior knowledge about writing,” and to teach for transfer. Threshold concepts offer both content and a conceptual frame for meeting these two goals and therefore should be the focus of FYC. They identify four categories as specifically important (writing as human interaction, textuality, writing as knowledge-making, and process) and name specific threshold concepts within each category. They assert that developing a theory of writing —“a set of knowledges and beliefs about writing” (110)— is at the core of FYC, and that threshold concepts offer a framework for this work. Teaching and learning threshold concepts require confronting and rethinking prior knowledge that hinders new learning. The shift from procedural knowledge (how to write) to declarative knowledge about writing represented in the threshold concepts promotes mindfulness, which they say is a key to transfer. Instructors should expect dissonance, should be aware that this type of learning takes time, and should understand that reflection is a necessary component of a course featuring threshold concepts. Downs and Robertson offer suggestions about specific readings and activities for courses.
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This mixed-methods study investigated the beliefs about transfer and the classroom practices of eight graduate students teaching first-year writing. Through interviews, observation, and a review of instructional materials and course content, Driscoll found a disconnect between instructors' stated beliefs about transfer and their classroom pedagogy. While all participants indicated that “transfer was a critical goal in FYC” (65), only two—both teaching in learning-community-linked courses—utilized connected teaching approaches to include bridges and connections or offered students opportunities for reflection. Three instructors with no training in Rhetoric and Composition beyond a required TA mentoring course all felt that general writing skills instruction is possible and believed that transfer is “effortless” (66), requiring no specific pedagogy. Three other instructors expressed skepticism about transfer, noting that it is “difficult” (66), but did not engage in connected teaching approaches. Driscoll concludes that more professional development is needed to teach connected teaching strategies, particularly for instructors who do not have a Composition or Writing Studies background. She also suggests that where possible, students should be assigned to courses in a learning community or linked-course format where connections between course content could be emphasized.
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Prompted in part by an outside review but also new general education requirements that “emphasized the need to focus on broader, more transferable skills,” Fishman and Reiff sought to revise the curriculum for the two FYC courses at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville with an emphasis on rhetorical awareness, textual diversity (“multiplicity”), and transferability. This article describes the process of that revision, which included a faculty survey, focus groups, and separate pilot semesters for the two courses, with revisions beginning in the English 102 course. In the revised curriculum, English 101 focuses on rhetorical strategies, analysis, and argument, while English 102 focuses on inquiry and research in themed courses that introduce research as situated within communities. As the authors note, rhetoric serves as the foundation and bridge between the two courses, the first of which emphasizes analysis and the second emphases production. Early transfer-oriented research since the program revision is promising, with Fishman and Reiff finding high levels of student engagement and evidence of transfer between assignments within each course as well as between 101 and 102.
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This article reports on a cross-institutional study of three universities that tested whether Writing about Writing (WAW) strategies can be adopted in the classroom for universities that cannot adopt a strict WAW curriculum. Two universities in the study used a WAW approach and one university that did not allow for the implementation of a WAW curriculum used a theme-based approach in FYW (with two subgroups that employed rhetorical pedagogy rarely and frequently). The researchers collected post-writing assignment student reflections and sought to know whether students who were taught writing via a WAW curriculum would reflect on transfer-related factors more or less frequently than students who were taught using theme-based course readings. They were also concerned with students’ understanding of genre analysis, audience awareness, and metacognition. Results show that the different pedagogical approaches did not affect the frequency of metacognitive reflection, which suggests that metacognition can be learned through a wide variety of FYW teaching approaches. The theme-based approach, however, yielded low results for genre analysis in that students in the theme-based course reflected less frequently and in less sophisticated ways than students following a WAW curriculum, prompting the researchers to conclude that genre analysis requires “explicit instruction grounded in course texts and/or assignments” (83). Finally, all types of WAW pedagogy successfully taught audience awareness. The authors conclude that WAW concepts can be taught through a variety of approaches, but they implore scholars to consider unorthodox approaches to teaching genre analysis.
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This article examines the influence of ESL students’ perceptions of the similarities and differences of various tasks on learning transfer. To answer this question, James conducted a study on 42 ESL students enrolled in a first-year composition course who completed an out-of-class writing task. Half of the students were given a prompt that was assumed to be objectively similar to their composition course work, and the other half received a dissimilar but freshman-suitable prompt. James expected the familiar prompt to be the least challenging for the students, but the results indicated no conclusive correlation between student performance and (assumedly objective) similarity of prompt. Instead, the data revealed that students' perceptions of task similarity/difference did influence learning transfer. James concludes that educators should encourage students to identify their own subjective similarities between writing assignments, thus promoting far transfer that occurs across disciplines. Implications of these findings for theory, practice, and future research are discussed.
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This critical, mixed-method study empirically examines how writing teachers incorporated three iconic social media platforms–Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube–in their first-year composition classes. Mina highlights the digital divide between the ways writing teachers tend to use social media in teaching writing, students’ actual use of these platforms, and the affordances of these sites. Mina calls for more capitalization on the multimodal affordances of social media sites in teaching writing. She argues that using social media in teaching writing should play a larger, more integral role in facilitating transfer of students’ digital writing practices beyond the FYC classroom.
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In one of the few studies that focuses on how prior writing knowledge affects first-year writing, Reiff and Bawarshi use survey and interview data to develop two groups: boundary crossers and boundary guarders--essentially, those who are able to adapt genre information across writing contexts and those who tend to only use that information in the context in which it was learned. Reiff and Bawarshi offer suggestions for how to encourage boundary crossing practices, such as through metacognitive reflection and discussing genre directly.
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Two of the three authors of Writing across Contexts offer an overview of Teaching for Transfer research in order to determine what methods are most effective for teaching first-year writing. The authors use student interviews, writing samples, course materials, and instructor interviews to explore student perceptions of writing in university versus the ways in which they are actually asked to write. Robertson and Taczak begin by demonstrating that these perceptions about first-year writing are often misguided: students think that the course is a space to perform writing and get a grade, and assume that if they did well on standardized testing they will do well in the course. Many students thought they already learned all they needed to know about writing in high school. The authors advocate for a Teaching for Transfer model that avoids pitfalls in first-year writing such as classes with no particular content. The pedagogy they advocate includes keywords, reflection, and a theory of writing, much like the model in Writing
The authors state the benefit of this model is to put students back into a novice mindset so that they are more open to learning and adapting their knowledge.
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Skeffington argues that assigning shorter but more essays in FYC classes increases the possibility of writing transfer to happen between those assignments. She suggests that assigning 600-word essays in the first half of the semester and a longer one in the second half helps students notice the similarities between these assignments, which facilitates transfer of their writing strategies across them. She asserts that working on two short assignments of the same genre and purpose fosters near transfer, then when they move to another type or genre of writing, they practice far transfer which is likely to extend beyond the FYC classroom.
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Stinnett argues that writing knowledge transfer from first-year courses is more likely to happen when students pursue activity-specific objectives. He critiques the assumption that students use their prior knowledge in new writing situations because students aren’t always successful at identifying new situations as writing. He notes that current pedagogical practices around writing transfer overlook the important question of how students recognize situations to which they may transfer their writing knowledge. He therefore proposes the use of activity or objective as the means of transfer. He asserts that noticing a new writing objective or activity as similar to an older one facilitates writing transfer. His theory suggests that writing instructors need to connect the rhetorical knowledge to the achievement of particular objectives and activities, particularly if those activities are not automatically identified as writing goals. This approach shifts the focus from the production of a text to the objective of text production, which, as he strongly suggests, is easier to identify by students.
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Taczak and Robertson extend Yancey’s theory of reflection and the recent work on writing transfer to argue for a rhetorical reflection framework that aims to help students reflect intentionally on their writing practices. They claim that in order for the reflection
model to be effective, it should be part of a first-year writing course that aims for writing transfer. They used case studies to examine the role of the rhetorical reflective framework in two different first-year writing courses at a regional comprehensive four-year university where the majority of students are first-generation. One of the courses was a literature course that included much reflective writing, while the other was a TFT one that used the reflective framework. Their findings demonstrate the importance of reading about and studying writing as the course content in transfer.
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Tinberg argues that switching the focus of first-year composition courses from writing quantity and writing genres to the development of writing theory allows students to form a habit of mind that serves them in new writing contexts. He discusses his approach to integrating teaching for transfer in his first-year composition course through writing vocabulary, teacher comments, and reflection. He particularly emphasizes the incorporation of metacognition that makes students more aware of their writing practices, which is the first step in their ability to transfer those practices beyond the course. He incorporated reflection at various points and forms throughout the semester as a vehicle for students to construct their own theory of writing. One of these forms was a weekly blog that engaged students in a reflection on the writing concepts they explored in their assigned readings. Tinberg discusses how he changed the research paper assignment in his course to be an inquiry-based process and concludes by noting a few implications of the TFT curriculum for community college students “beyond the classroom” (20). For example, having participated in the TFT curriculum with its emphasis on metacognition, students might be better equipped to adjust to the varying challenges of workplace writing.
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VanKooten develops a new framework for meta-awareness in FYW courses that consists of four concepts: composition process, composition techniques, rhetoric, and intercomparativity, or the similarities and differences of these concepts. The framework emerged from a case study that aimed to answer whether and how meta-awareness is developed in FYW courses and the role new media and video composing may play in that development. Based on interview, class observation, and student writing data, she found that students appreciated the composition process, were able to explain the composing techniques they used, understood and practiced rhetoric while composing, and applied their new-found knowledge of similarities and differences between composing genres and modes. VanKooten thus proposes the use of those four concepts of meta-awareness in
teaching FYW courses to help students develop more meaningful meta-awareness about composition. She also calls for more research to further develop and expand her theory.
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In this eBook, VanKooten uses video data from 18 first-year writing students to theorize transfer across media for writing teachers and scholars. She defines transfer across media as “a process of considering, (re)using or choosing not to use, applying, and adapting compositional knowledge through various digital and non-digital technologies and within the surrounding practices and norms of the compositional context” (1.2). Through her use of various types of video data, VanKooten discusses and “model[s] a reciprocal, participatory, and interdependent digital research methodology” (0.1). Her findings show the importance of using video production, reflection, and feedback in facilitating transfer of learning and knowledge across media in first-year writing courses. VanKooten concludes the eBook with by presenting five best practices for teaching transfer across media as well as advice and tips for teaching video composing for teachers interested in incorporating video production in their first-year writing courses.
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Wardle and Downs revisit their arguments about teaching writing-studies content in first-year writing courses. While they address some of the critique their earlier argument garnered, they are still committed to the essence of that argument about the value of teaching FYW courses as “reading and writing scholarly inquiry” in which the field’s knowledge should be taught because that knowledge impacts students’ knowledge about and practice of writing and facilitates transfer. They suggest that the first step is to determine that foundational knowledge that should be included in FYW courses, or what they call threshold concepts (defined as research-based concepts about writing). Their logical second step is to choose pedagogical practices to teach those concepts. With an eye on improving the teaching of writing about writing, they question the ability of instructors who were not trained in writing studies to teach courses grounded in writing studies knowledge. They also challenge the assumption that writing about writing in FYW would lead to student boredom, which wasn’t reported by instructors adopting WAW in their courses. They argue that WAW in fact gives students a better understanding and practice of rhetorical situations that, in turn, make students more
engaged and invested in their writing courses. They conclude by expressing their hope for the field to embrace its knowledge and use it in teaching FYW courses at a larger scale.
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*Writing Across Contexts* begins with two questions: first, what the content of composition courses should be and, second, “how a curriculum designed to support students’ transfer of writing knowledge and practice might function” (4). To answer these, the book first outlines the design of a transfer-oriented curriculum, the Teaching for Transfer (TFT) curriculum, which emerges from a careful reading of the scholarship on learning and writing transfer, a comparative reading of transfer-related curricula (44), and a commitment to keeping writing (and writing knowledge) and reflection at the heart of transfer-oriented curricular design (56-7). The TFT model, which is based in key terms, reflection, and theorizing writing (the full set of course materials are available in the Appendices of the book) is then studied with respect to two other common models for first-year writing content: an expressivist course and a themed course focused on media and culture. The mixed- and multi-methods comparative study of the three courses focuses on transfer “between assignments within each section” and “between the first-year composition course and other curricular writing contexts in college” (65). The results were that the expressivist and themed courses did not support transfer: students in the former demonstrated “negative transfer” (82), which happened despite the course content, and students in the latter turned to models and process as ways of dealing with the lack of writing content (87). The TFT course, however, did facilitate transfer of writing knowledge and practice and resulted in three typologies for how students made use of prior knowledge: assemblage (a grafting on of new knowledge onto prior); remix (integrating new knowledge to transform the prior); and critical incident (an impactful failure resulting in openness to thinking about writing anew) (112). The implications of the study for teaching for transfer – for assignment and curricular design, especially – include: be explicit about what students should learn; build in expert writing practices; tap prior and concurrent knowledge; link writing process, key terms, and a guiding framework; ask students to reiteratively engage their own knowledge; and build in metacognition (138).
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Transfer In and Across Academic Contexts


Adler-Kassner argues that Common Core standards are based on two essential myths about writing: that there is a standard of “good writing” across writing contexts and that this “good writing” does not change based on context, purpose, or audience. Adler-Kassner notes that this mentality assumes that “good writing” is just variations on a simple common theme and that the three common categories used for Common Core (argumentative, informative, and narrative writing) are not clear categories and so cannot exist as standards. For example, there is no standard “argumentative” writing that remains the same across writing contexts. She notes that this rigidity in defining good writing impedes writing transfer because it interferes with students’ flexibility and their ability to adapt writing knowledge to diverse writing contexts.
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The foreword sets up the collection and offers a connecting insight for the chapters: that good writing includes the ability to use writing knowledge in new contexts. The authors also call for writing transfer to be considered across all university classes, not just in a single class or context.
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Bass uses the coda to summarize and draw together content from other chapters and comes to four ultimate conclusions from the collection: institutions should be learner centered, networked, integrative, and adaptive.
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Beaufort contends that college-level writing courses are ineffective in helping students develop adaptable skills, arguing that FYC courses often present writing as devoid of authentic context, teach students that the purpose of writing is to be graded rather than to communicate effectively with an audience, and present writing as is a generic skill that applies wholesale to any situation, all of which leads to negative transfer. However, she claims if FYC were to focus more on transfer of learning and view itself as a social practice, it would become a useful program that helps students with writing in a variety of other contexts. Beaufort offers a theoretical framework of five distinct yet interactive and overlapping domains of situated knowledge involved in acts of writing—discourse community knowledge, subject matter knowledge, genre knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, and writing process knowledge. She then applies her framework in a longitudinal study of one student writer, Tim, an engineering and history double-major. Beaufort followed Tim over a six-year period, from his first year to two years after college, and observed how Tim’s college writing classes did not adequately prepare him to adapt what he had learned in FYC to new writing contexts and applying writing knowledge from his majors to the workplace. She suggests multiple revisions for college writing, including more of an emphasis on producing students who can write in multiple social contexts. She also includes an appendix with suggested pedagogical tips and assignments to help teach transfer aspects such as genre awareness, abstract concepts, and meta-cognition in the college writing classroom.
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This retrospective follow up to Beaufort’s College Writing and Beyond offers a revision to the book’s curriculum more specifically oriented to promoting positive transfer. That revision proceeds from 4 “considerations”: (1) acknowledging values about academic writing; (2) addressing course themes; (3) making explicit the teaching of writing concepts; and (4) rethinking the number and types of assignment in a writing course. She also recommends replacing the genres she used in the genre analysis assignment in the Appendix with genres that are more “widely [used] in other academic disciplines,” and proposes fewer assignments and genres to analyze. In the Coda, she offers four steps for designing writing curricula more generally: develop focused and contextualized subject matter knowledge; plan the genre, rhetorical, and writing process knowledge aspects of the course; apply sound learning theory principles; and teach for transfer.
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Blythe and Gonzales explore post-FYC disciplinary writing by using screencasting software and coded transcript data to study undergraduate students in a writing-intensive biology course (n=20). Specifically, the study looks at “writing coordination” – the movement between texts and platforms while composing (617) – in addition to students’ perceptions of transfer and their source use during research. The screencasting evidence shows that: 1) students coordinate multiple texts while composing, often in patchwriting fashion; 2) students choose sources rhetorically, even with limited disciplinary and content knowledge; 3) students did not perceive their FYC courses as influential in their writing development. Nonetheless, the study does show that students are transferring: they are able to adjust to disciplinary writing expectations in biology because of the metagenre of “research from sources” (Carter 2007, 398) through a hybrid professional/patchwriting composing process. Two implications emerge for the teaching of writing: the first, that students might benefit from explicit engagement in metagenres for transfer; the second, that – much like professional writers – students work within “networks of information” (607) and information collection and might therefore benefit from specific instructional attention to concepts like affordances and practices like meta-awareness.
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Boyd suggests the practice of reverse outlining to help encourage writing transfer. She suggests that having students create an outline after completing a draft can help students better understand the purpose of each paragraph and its specific role in the argument of the text. This practice helps facilitate low-road transfer but it perhaps could facilitate high-road transfer as well, such as when students adapt the reverse outline practice into new writing contexts.
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Cleary presents findings from a research study focused on how adult students transfer process knowledge. Focusing on case studies of two adult learners with different profiles from a larger sample of twenty-five students, Cleary finds that more varied “high stakes”
process experience in their writing background leads to students using more apt analogical reasoning to describe their processes. Use of analogous reasoning is known to aid transfer. More high stakes writing experience also corresponds to more success with academic writing. The results also showed that a student’s sense of identity and beliefs and attitudes toward failure impacted transfer. Peer feedback and cueing of known strategies were shown to be significant. Cleary concludes that instructors could aid students by explicitly teaching analogous thinking about process, encouraging peer feedback, and using visual thinking strategies to map processes.
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This chapter presents findings from three studies at different institutions focused on students’ attitudes and perceptions in the transition from L1 to L2 writing. Findings indicate that while students see writing as connected to their identities, because they view L2 writing primarily as translation, they do not see this as a way to develop new identities. The authors assert “the realization that language is a carrier and a creator of identity and culture is a threshold moment” and therefore needs to be purposefully and explicitly addressed in the pedagogy for these courses (327).
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Davis et al. argue that we need to reexamine kairos and invention, considering how composers “discover and deploy” available means of persuasion. The body of the article develops in three parts, each situating an aspect of available means in a different setting within the university: a composition course in online writing and editing (part I), a multiliteracy center (part II), and a course focused on software languages and the relationships between “rhetorical and computational principles,” (part III). Ultimately, the article argues that given that the curriculum and specific assignments for our courses, and the contexts we establish, shape students' understanding of the available means of persuasion and composing, Composition instructors should broaden focus to consider all available means of composing.
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Utilizing the construct of adaptive transfer (DePalma and Ringer 2011) as a theoretical frame for analysis, DePalma presents findings of a qualitative study investigating what students transfer and adapt from print-based composing when remediating essays into digital stories. DePalma first notes revisions to the adaptive transfer framework, including the reformulation of the cross-contextual and rhetorical dimensions into cross-contextual reshaping and rhetorical reshaping, and he provides revised definitions. He then moves into a discussion of two representative case studies from an advanced writing and rhetoric course focusing on writers’ perceptions of the role of print knowledge and literacies when remediating. Findings indicate that the process of remediation encourages the integration of multiple literacies and knowledge domains as a means of arrangement. The process of remediation also enhances rhetorical awareness including a consideration of range and coordination of semiotic modes and an increased understanding of audience. DePalma introduces “tracing” as a strategy and heuristic to aid student reflection. Tracing asks a writer to consider the function of segments of their text and think specifically about the range of semiotic resources that might be utilized.
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DePalma and Alexander present findings of a study investigating how students transfer rhetorical knowledge and knowledge of composing processes learned in the context of print composing to multimodal composing. Specifically, the researchers were interested in what prior knowledge and experiences were relevant to multimodal composing, what knowledge and experiences needed to be “reshaped,” and how instructors might “cultivate” useful frameworks and processes through pedagogical approaches (184). Their sample included 24 students, fifteen undergraduates and 9 graduate students from four courses, who submitted multimodal projects and reflections and participated in 90-minute focus group interviews. Students faced challenges conceptualizing an audience for their multimodal work as they struggled to see this work as scholarly and did not understand how their audiences would engage with their texts. They also faced challenges with fully utilizing semiotic resources, viewing this work as more complex and finding it difficult to coordinate the interaction between various modes. Finally, technological challenges often drew significant attention away from invention. DePalma and Alexander offer specific suggestions for helping students navigate a transition from print to multimodal composing, including using reflection and examples to confront assumptions about audience, using Bawarshi’s framework for genre analysis (2004) to interrogate relationships between print and multimodal genres, the use of low stakes
remediation assignments, and a semiotic mapping activity to consider available rhetorical and semiotic resources to achieve purpose.
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Driscoll “examines the relationship between students’ perceptions of transfer from first-year composition (FYC) into disciplinary coursework and their beliefs and attitudes towards themselves, their writing, and their educational environments” (2). Based on analysis of data from surveys at the beginning and the end of the semester in FYC and interviews conducted the subsequent semester, four main findings emerged. Students’ perceptions of transfer and the usefulness of FYC declined over the course of the semester in the class. Students can be classified into four categories based on their attitudes about future writing and the possibility of transfer: the explicitly connected, the implicitly connected, the uncertain, and the disconnected. Students have limited definitions of writing and more specifically of good writing; their definitions seem to be drawn from literature-focused middle and high school courses. Further, students have limited understanding and expectations about future writing. Overall, the author concludes that negative perceptions, attitudes, and expectations can have a dampening effect both on learning in FYC and on transfer from FYC. Driscoll suggests encouraging metacognitive reflection, explicitly addressing transfer in our teaching, making connections between past and future writing experiences and situations, and aiding students in understanding “how skills can be generalized and applied across contexts” (22) are important to teaching for transfer.
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The authors focus on students' transition from high school to university writing. They use survey data to explore three very different contexts in South Africa, Ireland, and the United States. The majority of students surveyed were confident in their writing abilities and preparedness for college, although this could not be confirmed through actual writing. The authors end by suggesting that writing scholars and administration need to actively work on finding out what writing knowledge and experience students are bringing into the university.

Felten focuses on practices that have a high impact on student learning in writing classes, including collaboration, service learning, and learning communities. Felten relates these practices to proactive learning, which is the application of knowledge when the parameters of a problem are not clear. Learners in these situations must identify a problem and consider what knowledge they will apply to the problem. Felten notes that most writing situations outside of the classroom require proactive knowledge and so do most high-impact practices. Because these practices require metacognitive consideration of application of knowledge, Felten suggests high-impact practices may facilitate learning transfer. Felten suggests incorporating similar strategies into writing classes in which teachers challenge students to adapt knowledge to new situations.


Placing greater importance on instructors’ responsibilities in the practice of transfer, Frazier argues that there is often a “distance between student assumptions and instructor values” in writing assignments, especially post-FYC. To bridge this gap, Frazier proposes a model that promotes better communication between instructors and students and helps instructors “improv[e] their writing assignments and evaluation tools.” In this model, Frazier implements reflection assignments before, during, and after a writing assignment for the participating classes, focusing on student assumptions of an assignment and how they might apply previous writing knowledge, and then he shares the results with the instructor so that s/he might address areas of miscommunication with the class. Frazier gives examples from three classes on which he has experimented with this model: American Civil War, Health and Healthcare Disparities, and Therapeutic Interventions. In all three classes, Frazier concludes that a “third party” mediator (like himself in this model) is needed to help faculty sort the data from the student reflections. He also concludes that “being explicit about expectations, exploring the value of key terms (including disciplinary threshold concepts), and building on existing student frameworks of knowledge remain as important in upper-level coursework as in FYC.” This model enables faculty to communicate whether (or how) previous knowledge can be implemented in the new assignment. The author outlines a practical model of how to promote transfer after FYC, and his focus on the instructor’s role in facilitating transfer awareness is an important addition to existing transfer scholarship. The appendices are
especially useful in providing examples of the kinds of reflective questions to ask throughout the writing process.
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Gere et al. address an area that has been overlooked in previous transfer studies: the transfer capabilities of students who have transferred into a university, or what they call “transfer across postsecondary institutions” (334). The authors explain that their focus on transfer students emerged when they noticed that transfer students in upper-level writing requirement (ULWR) courses at their own institution, the University of Michigan (UM), performed significantly worse than their peers. In individually interviewing 15 representative students from a larger transfer student survey, the team discovered five unique ways that transfer students struggle to transition their writing skills to a new institution: adjusting to workload, navigating instructional differences, understanding expectations, negotiating peer relationships, and identifying resources. In response to these results, the authors report on how UM launched a one-credit elective writing workshop for transfer students and a “transfer directed-self placement (DSP)” (334) to aid transfer students in assessing their writing skills and testing whether the workshop would help them in ULWR courses. To assess the success of these tools, the UM team conducted a second round of interviews with fourteen participants (both in the writing workshop and not) and found that the workshop helped transfer students significantly with developing skills such as genre analysis, rhetorical awareness, and time management that may be applied differently at UM than at their previous institution. The authors advocate an approach of “mutual adjustments” (353) where the adaptation isn’t only one-directional (where transfer students must adapt to the institutional environment) but is instead a recursive movement between research and programmatic response where the institution also adjusts to become more receptive to transfer students.
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Goldschmidt focuses on the transition from first-year writing to science writing. Her interview data suggests that students in the sciences often have a particularly hard time transitioning from a humanities-based first-year writing course to writing in their majors. She found that students who had more experience writing in their major or who had changed majors were able to see genre more flexibly than those who did not have as
much writing experience or who stayed in the same major. The author suggests a focus on teaching genre as an action and not as a template to help make this transition smoother. She warns particularly against seeing humanities genres as universal.
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Gorzelsky et al. focus on two consequential transitions in writers’ lives: from high-school writing to first-year composition and then from first-year composition to disciplinary writing. The research team collected student writing samples and reflections and found that the first transition (high school to first-year composition) went fairly well but the second one (from first-year composition to disciplinary writing) did not: students’ writing effectiveness improved after first-year composition but declined in their second year of university. This result might be due to students being confused as they transitioned to disciplinary writing, and this was an especially strong effect if students referred to their high school knowledge or emphasized formulaic writing in their reflections. However, if the students showed metacognitive awareness in their reflections, their writing improved instead of declined. The authors advise making students more aware of how genres change across writing contexts.
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The authors argue that quality undergraduate training in chemistry requires an intentional and systematic approach to developing writing knowledge and skills. Prompted by instructors’ “general sense of dissatisfaction with the quality of students’ work” at their university (107), and Macalester College’s new WAC program, Green et. al. share their experience integrating and synchronizing two approaches in chemistry: “writing to learn” and “learning to write.” They overhauled the curriculum of a chemistry course that most first-year students take by integrating writing pedagogy. The team (the writing director, chemistry instructors, and a postdoctoral fellow in writing) met and drafted learning goals that included concepts and curricula such as multimodal texts, multi-drafted lab reports, metacognition, Excel usage, genre analysis, and peer-review sessions. The team emphasized the use of “scaffolding activities [that] required teaching materials that would successfully bridge students’ in-class and out-of-class learning and understanding of both the chemistry and the communication concepts that [they] were trying to inculcate” (113).
At the end of the semester, the team tested the success of the General Chemistry I curricular revision by interviewing the instructors, surveying the students, observing the post-doctoral fellow’s class observation field notes, and assessing the students’ written work. The team noticed an overall improvement in the level of work that students produced and overall student performance in chemistry, and a significant increase in positive course surveys that indicated students’ understanding and appreciation of the integrated writing curriculum. The team concluded that instructors do not need to be “trained writing pedagogues” (119) to practice teaching for transfer, and their model can be replicated throughout the university curricula, potentially increasing the retention of historically underrepresented students (120). The authors encourage others to follow their model of team diversity in various disciplines.

KEYWORDS: pedagogy, TFT, peer review, interview, survey, WID, science writing, collaboration, genre analysis, metacognition


Grijalva reports findings from a three-part, mixed-methods study focusing on the effects of a bridge program and service learning on transfer in the transitions from high school to college and from first-year writing to other writing situations. Students who described engaging in boundary crossing of activity systems demonstrated stronger writing knowledge and skills. Students cited the role of experience and peer collaboration as well as engagement with different activity systems in helping them learn to write and to transfer their learning. Grijalva concludes that students who engage in experiential learning and who engage in boundary crossing experience greater transfer.

KEYWORDS: Activity theory, mixed-method, service learning, bridge program, transitions, collaboration, Elon Research Seminar


The authors introduce the idea of “dynamic transfer,” a concept from the field of education that involves the “coordination” of prior knowledge and available resources to build “new understandings” (182). They draw on a mixed-methods study conducted at UC Davis to show that transfer is successful when students engage in this coordination in productive ways. They argue that writing programs that are explicitly transfer-oriented and offer expansively framed contexts aid in this coordination and facilitate transfer.

KEYWORDS: WID, mixed-method, prior knowledge, pedagogy, transfer facilitation, curriculum design, Elon Research Seminar

Hendricks analyzes intersections between transfer and WAC/WID scholarship to demonstrate how these two areas can merge to offer transdisciplinary views of academic writing. Hendricks defines transdisciplinarity as “an understanding of writing and knowledge formation not bound to disciplinary epistemologies alone: an intellectual openness to new perspectives and methods from outside of one’s discipline that does not preclude disciplinary difference or expertise” (48-49). Hendricks initially searched six journals and discovered few explicit overlaps between WAC/WID and transfer scholarship. Hendricks then broadened the investigation using key terms to search within a peer-reviewed database. She identified articles that successfully engage with both fields and suggests further ways this partnership would benefit both fields, including breaking “silos of specialization” (54) and being more student-centered. She highlights the potential consequences of a failure to cross disciplinary silos. The author concludes, “[b]ringing transfer and WAC/WID together can result in models of academic writing that embrace—as opposed to erase—the complexities of students’ lived experiences without sacrificing the disciplinary capital transfer studies often afford” (58). Hendricks calls for scholarship merging WAC/WID and transfer in order to offer insight into a transdisciplinary approach to academic writing that can also promote nuanced understandings of transfer. Hendricks provides a thorough literature review and ideas for extending her research.

KEYWORDS: WAC, WID, transfer, interdisciplinary, quantitative data, academic writing, metacognition, prior knowledge, repurposing


This article evaluates the experiences of upper-level students at the University of Hawaii enrolled in required writing intensive (WI) classes in their major. The authors seek to answer two questions: (1) How does disciplinarity affect students’ understanding of writing tasks?; and (2) What do students nearing completion of the university’s WI requirements report that they know about writing? Pre- and post-course interviews were conducted with 34 junior and senior students who had completed at least three of the five required WI courses. As part of the research, students also chose a focal writing assignment to reflect on between the two interviews. The authors found that students were confident in their major-specific writing skills, they valued being able to research topics of interest, and they put greater effort towards writing assignments in their major; they also expressed confidence in career-related success in writing. Their research also showed that students particularly valued research-related writing assignments in the major as opportunities for professional skills development and identity building. These results reflect the assumptions surrounding WAC studies: “writing should be used frequently, and experience with writing should occur throughout a student’s college career” (344). However, results also show that there was a deficiency in the students’ understanding of genre and suggest that instructors make connections between inquiry
methods clearer and perhaps departments offer greater coherence in the curricula of certain majors. The authors argue for greater attention to students' readiness to make connections across assignments, courses, and disciplines; they also suggest greater attention to a field's inquiry methods and strategies for solving problems.

KEYWORDS: WAC, WID, writing-intensive courses, interview, disciplinarity, genre, curriculum design, self-assessment, pedagogy, reflection, psychology, behaviorism, cognitive, social constructivism, portfolio, process, writing prompt


Lindenman contributes to genre analysis research by challenging the scholarly consensus that students only rarely forge meaningful connections between the genres they compose in different domains of writing. She argues instead that students are able to demonstrate connections between genres when they are allowed space to categorize their own writing experiences. Lindenman draws from focus group interviews and interviews with ten college juniors and seniors who were prompted to compare and contrast their own writing from various contexts (such as blog posts, scholarship essays, and academic research papers). Lindenman chose four students who offered a range of clearly articulated examples to highlight in this article. Lindenman found that students forged idiosyncratic, action-oriented metageneric connections that are not limited by domains. The idiosyncratic nature of the categories does not discount the students’ transfer skills even though they are not necessarily using formal academic terms. Lindenman concludes that when students are allowed to draw their own conclusions about writing connections, they are not worried about being correct; rather, they use critical thinking and problem-solving skills and think metacognitively about their own work. She elaborates on three benefits of this research for students, teachers, and researchers: (1) it enables students to access prior genre knowledge that they may not have otherwise considered relevant; (2) it enables students to re-envision their goals as writers; and (3) it offers researchers and teachers insight into ways we might foster transfer by attending to students’ idiosyncratic metageneric connections.

KEYWORDS: genre analysis, metagener, genre studies, transfer, metacognition


Lindenman replies to two questions that Yancey et al. raise in response to her article “Inventing Metagenres: How Four College Seniors Connect Writing Across Domains.” Lindenman agrees with the response that differences are just as crucial as similarities in identifying genre categories for student writing and explains that her larger dissertation project focuses on similarities and differences in metageneric categorization. She also corroborates the suggestion that investigating younger college students (as opposed to or along with the upper-level student population in her research) might affect the results.
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She concludes by offering practical application of her article’s research findings, suggesting that upper-level classes provide a space for students to draw useful connections that help them transfer successfully across writing contexts.

KEYWORDS: praxis, metagenre, transfer, genre analysis, genre studies


Moore and Bass present a collection of chapters focusing on a broader understanding of the idea of “writing transfer”--learning transfer as it applies to writing studies. The collection is divided into a section on connections to classroom practice and a section on case studies. The first section covers the failings of Common Core Standards with respect to writing transfer (Adler-Kassner), digital literacies outside of classroom spaces (Davis), writing transfer and eportfolios (Yancey), high-impact teaching practices (Felten), international students and global thinking (Barnett et al.), and students’, teachers’, and admins’ perceptions of writing knowledge (Werder). The second section covers transfer as it takes place between high school and university writing (Farrell et al.), defining Teaching for Transfer pedagogy (Robertson and Taczak), reverse outlining (Boyd), the transition from first-year writing to disciplinary writing (Gorzelsky et al.), genre and science writing (Goldschmidt), and struggles through university students’ writing careers (Wardle and Clement). The collection ends with four broad recommendations for institutions to facilitate learning transfer.

KEYWORDS: research method, case study, curriculum design, transfer facilitation


Nowacek follows a cohort of students taking three classes together and explores how students adapted writing knowledge across the three writing situations. To understand this adaptation, she attended the classes, viewed student papers, and interviewed both teachers and students. She explicitly seeks the ways in which students connect learning from one context to learning in another and tries to find specifically when students were able to connect one learning domain to another as well as how teachers were able to facilitate those connections. Among many findings in the book are that there are multiple paths for transfer to take place, that transfer involves both application and reconstruction of knowledge, that transfer can be both positive and negative, that transfer has an affective component, and that genres provide an important means for transfer. Nowacek finds that meta-awareness may help transfer but is not necessary for transfer to take place. She demonstrates various levels at which transfer can take place, the final of which she terms successful integration. This happens when a student is conscious of connections and integrates the connections into new contexts well. Nowacek notes that teachers can be “agents of integration” by seeing and selling connections. Ultimately, she believes that teachers can help students become their own agents of integration. The end of the book offers suggestions for how to facilitate transfer in university and specifically in first-year
writing settings, such as helping students understand their own agency in rhetorical situations and encouraging students to question genre knowledge.

KEYWORDS: case study, learning community, WAC, transfer facilitation


Read and Michaud adapt Writing about Writing pedagogy to a professional writing context using literature from both areas of study. Their approach actively attempts to connect writing for university to workplace writing contexts directly, and they offer two pedagogical approaches to do so. The first is to teach workplace writing through research about and within it. The second approach is to focus on lifelong learning about writing. In both approaches, the authors attempt to provide students with adaptable approaches to workplace writing.

KEYWORDS: WAW, professional writing, WAC, workplace writing, lifespan writing, adaptation


This chapter reports findings from a study examining student perceptions of the transfer of rhetorical knowledge from self-sponsored, digital writing to academic writing. Rosinski found that while students demonstrate audience awareness, sense of purpose, and an understanding of how to gauge effectiveness of self-sponsored writing, this rhetorical knowledge does not transfer to their academic writing. The lack of a real audience and authentic contexts for their academic writing and the belief that self-sponsored writing is not valued in an academic setting hinder transfer. Reflection could be useful in helping students to consider the rhetorical strategies they engage in self-sponsored writing and applying those strategies to their academic writing.

KEYWORDS: rhetorical knowledge, self-sponsored writing, academic writing, reflection, Elon Research Seminar


Rounsaville explores how students take previous genre knowledge and use it as a filter for current writing situations. She explores the creation of an uptake model for transfer, which builds on this idea of filtering. Rounsaville uses the concept of uptake to look at how students make, sort, and process new writing knowledge. In the end, Rounsaville makes the case that prior writing knowledge, and especially genre knowledge, is
important for students as new genres are encountered. Rounsaville’s work is connected to transfer concepts such as adaptation, the changing and repurposing of writing knowledge across contexts.

KEYWORDS: Uptake, prior knowledge, genre, transfer, adaptation


Russell and Yañez use principles of activity theory (Engeström) and genre-system theory (Bazerman) to demonstrate the inherent contradictions in writing for general education. On the one hand, students are writing in “general” or lay ways within a discipline. On the other hand, students have to abide by rules—sometimes tacit—associated with writing for a specific system (i.e. the academic discipline of the course). The authors use the example of an Irish History course to explore this contradiction and suggest imagining courses as cultural-historical activity systems in which writing serves to expand understandings of the genres and genre systems. They conclude by offering possible ways to approach writing and writing knowledge more effectively, such as thinking more “big picture” (358) and embracing activity theory and genre theory approaches.

KEYWORDS: activity theory, genre, WID, disciplinary writing, general education (GEN-ED)


Scherff and Piazza provide an early precursor to writing transfer research that is less about writing transfer and more about the need for writing transfer research. The authors surveyed high-school students about their writing experiences, models provided by teachers, and writing process in the classroom. They conclude that students engage with few writing contexts and with little writing process. They believe this is a result of teachers attempting to meet guidelines for standardized tests.

KEYWORDS: high-school writing, process, model essay, standardized testing, survey data, curriculum design


Shepherd uses survey and interview data from first-year writing students to explore connections between students’ experiences writing for school and writing outside of school, especially on social media. He found that students rarely connect these writing contexts even though there is overlap between them and that students tended to limit their definitions of writing to focus on print-based genres. He offers suggestions for how to
broaden those connections, through expanded definitions of writing and embracing multimodal composition, in order to build a broader theory of writing that includes writing both for and outside of school.

KEYWORDS: multimodality, FYC, social media, prior knowledge, digital writing, extracurricular writing


Shepherd et al. offer a curriculum that builds on Teaching for Transfer pedagogy and adapts it to graduate education. They use the three tenets of TFT but modify them for the graduate context: key terms become key concepts, reflection remains a major component, and the theory of writing is shaped into a theory of composition studies. The authors get insights from students in the course to offer methods for how to adapt this model for other graduate courses in rhetoric and composition and offer ways to improve the curriculum presented.

KEYWORDS: Teaching for Transfer (TFT), graduate writing, curriculum design, threshold concepts, adaptation, reflection, key terms, theory of writing


Shepherd et al. build on a previous article (2020) to offer a more theoretical analysis of graduate education and learning transfer. They interview graduate instructors and students about experiences in graduate classes and offer points of departure for how to make graduate pedagogies in rhetoric and composition more effective. The authors find that many professors engage in activities that might be useful to facilitate transfer in graduate education but also find that few instructors are intentionally teaching for transfer. They suggest actively trying to shape graduate instruction in the same way composition studies shapes undergraduate instruction. They offer one possible model for graduate education, based on a Teaching for Transfer model, that involves an expanded role of threshold concepts, reflection, and creating a theory of composition studies. The authors also suggest that other instructors design and test alternative models to graduate education.

KEYWORDS: Graduate education, Teaching for Transfer (TFT), pedagogy, curriculum design, interviews, transfer facilitation

This quasi-experimental study explores whether instruction activates upper-level professional writing students’ prior knowledge about documentation and source-use and enhances their writing and reflection. Instruction in the experimental sections focused on activating students’ prior knowledge about citation practices from their first-year writing courses. Upon completion of the assignment, all students were asked to write a reflective essay in which they reflected on a number of questions pertaining to source use and documentation practices. Analysis of students’ assignments and reflective writing revealed that instruction that activated students’ prior knowledge on citation practices did not result in statistically significant difference in citation practices between control and treatment groups. However, students in the treatment group discussed their prior knowledge more in their reflective writing than students in the control group, which demonstrates students’ metacognitive awareness of the role of prior knowledge in their current course. They attributed this finding to their instruction that may not have been significant or sustained enough to result in major difference. They also found that students in the treatment group tended to discuss their theory of writing with less emphasis on citation practices and more on rhetorical moves they used in their writing. They suggest introducing professional writing concepts and terms and to continue to activate students’ prior knowledge and engage them in reflective writing.

KEYWORDS: professional writing, prior knowledge, metacognitive, writing transfer, source, documentation, FYC


Wardle worked closely to document co-author and co-researcher Clement’s writing struggles throughout her university career. Wardle notes that most university classes are not designed for transfer and uses Clement’s case as evidence. Wardle believes that most writing transfer is far transfer—that is, connecting dissimilar situations. Based on this case-study, the co-authors provide three take-aways for the chapter: (1) students need specific rhetorical strategies to be able to write well; (2) students can’t write well if they don’t have content knowledge; and (3) students need feedback that does not simply focus on correctness. Clement found that she often received higher grades when teachers focused on correctness, but she understood the content less clearly.

KEYWORDS: Student researchers, WAC, far transfer, rhetorical awareness, feedback

Werder interviews and surveys students in first-year composition and other writing classes, teachers from those classes, and university administration to find out what each group thinks students need to know to be proficient writers. Students’ perceptions of these needs changed dramatically before and after writing courses. Teachers and students saw these needs as very different as well, although students’ perceptions more resembled teachers’ after finishing the writing course. Administration focused on poorly-defined concepts such as “basic writing” or surface-level writing knowledge. Metacognition was not mentioned as a student need by any of the three groups. Werder suggests knotworking – or the practices of addressing challenges to learning across multiple activity systems – as a method to improve communication between the stakeholders.

KEYWORDS: administration, metacognition, FYC, interview, survey


Yancey makes a case for keeping eportfolios for a student’s entire college career in order to build metacognitive thinking and learning transfer. This also may help to more clearly demonstrate connections between writing contexts inside and outside of writing classes. Yancey makes the case that eportfolios may help to connect general education classes to major classes and on to extracurricular activities and workplace writing. Yancey ends this chapter with a step-by-step approach to using eportfolios successfully in college writing.

KEYWORDS: portfolio, metacognition, WAC, general education (GEN ED), extracurricular writing, workplace writing


This short response corrects two aspects of Lindenman’s “Inventing Metagenres” and poses two “alternative lines of reasoning” relative to the responders’ book, Writing Across Contexts. The corrections first address students’ sense of “expression” in transfer research (a perception the response notes is a function of students’ writing inside–rather than outside–school). Second, the response notes the importance of both similarity and difference in student writers’ responses to composing situations (in this case, as exemplified by Rick, whose composing is enabled by recognition of both). The alternative lines of reasoning include, first, an admonition that transfer research attend carefully to where students are in their academic careers and, second, a question about
how that attention might inflect our interpretations of the role of genre– in the form of “wild genres” or metagenres– in instances of transfer.

KEYWORDS: metagenre, metacognition, transfer


Emerging from a third generation of Teaching for Transfer (TFT) research (dubbed the Writing Passport Project), this article reports the results of an eight-campus study of TFT with special attention to upper-level students engaged in writing in professional writing or internship courses. Through a mixed- and multi-methods study (46), the article shows how students developed a “writing-transfer-mindset” comprising “(1) a conceptual vocabulary, based in the TFT curriculum, for articulating writing knowledge; (2) an ability to draw on that knowledge to frame new writing tasks in multiple contexts; and (3) access to writing contexts . . . and (4) a sense of agency” that linked specificity and context (43). More specifically, the results are exemplified by the case studies of Julie, Kyle, and Cassidy, each with specific and dynamic interrelations of writing context, key term development and revision, and agentive uptake of the TFT curriculum. The piece concludes with three suggestions for teaching TFT in writing across the curriculum contexts: identification of key terms for the course; opportunities for students to engage dynamically with key terms; opportunities for students to write in concurrent writing situations and to think comparatively about them (61).

KEYWORDS: teaching for transfer (TFT), upper-level writing, professional writing, case study, growth mindset


Emerging from a second generation of Teaching for Transfer (TFT) research (dubbed the Transfer of Transfer Project), this article reports the results of a four-campus study of TFT by focusing on how participants transferred “(1) concurrently, that is, while enrolled in the TFT courses; and (2) multiply, that is, into a diversity of sites, including the academic but not exclusive to it” (270). Based on a mixed- and multi-methods study, this article reports findings through seven case studies of students who evidence concurrent transfer, transfer “from in-school contexts into out-of-school contexts with facility,” and “just-in-time” transfer. This last category designates transfer that occurred not after the TFT curriculum was complete, but during the semester in which students were in the TFT course (271). The findings suggest that student writers’ networks develop at the intersection of opportunity, authentic audiences–that is, “audiences that mattered to them” (290)–and their agentive action at the porous boundaries between in-school and out-of-school writing. A more nuanced sense of writerly networks–and the dynamic ways
they develop and change–has implications for both assignment and curricular design (291).

KEYWORDS: teaching for transfer (TFT), case study, concurrent transfer, extracurricular writing, curriculum design

Transfer in and from Writing and Multiliteracy Centers


Through a case study of one student’s remediation work, Alexander et al. address three interrelated questions involving transfer across media: how multiliteracy center consultants can help students draw on their print knowledge for multimedia composing; how meta-awareness can help students create remediations; and how multiliteracy center consultant training can help them to facilitate this process (33). The answers are structured around a series of “challenges” that composers face and “a set of strategies composers can draw on in order to adapt or reshape composing knowledge across media,” including charting, inventorying, coordinating, and literacy linking (34). These four strategies constitute “adaptive remediation” – a structure to help both composers and multiliteracy center consultants meet the challenges of remediation with rhetorical awareness and flexibility (34).
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The authors consider how Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak’s Teaching for Transfer (TFT) curriculum can be expanded to writing centers and tutor education. The authors give an overview of the TFT curriculum and examine how writing center tutorials contend with three components of tutor learning: power, multilingualism, and multimodality. In terms of power, they argue that tutoring methods should examine “the politics of tutoring through the critical lenses of identity categories, such as race (Greenfield and Rowan), sex and gender (Rafoth et al.), sexuality (Denny), and disability (Kiedaisch and Dinitz. In terms of multilingualism, Bowen and Davis maintain that tutoring sessions should be framed as contact zone opportunities (see Louise Pratt). In terms of multimodality, the authors note that tutors need strategies for considering materiality, affordances, and “meaningfully integrating language with other modes.” The authors then connect these ideas to their theory of a “dual lens” of tutor education where tutors “see, interpret, and act dually, as both students of and tutors of writing.”. In this conception, tutors fill a dual role as they “simultaneously develop their own writing knowledge and practice and develop and employ tutoring strategies to guide others’ learning transfer.”.
This dual role leads to high-road transfer where tutors “learn to make meaningful, adaptable use of prior writing knowledge and writing practices” and correlates with the writing center goal of treating learning dynamically. Moreover, the authors claim that the TFT curriculum can be adapted to a tutor education seminar where tutors can engage in “multidimensional reflective approaches,” to help them develop such agility. The authors end by sharing areas for further research, including exploring the “dual lens of tutor education,” investigating how TFT can be designed as a non-course-based curriculum, and identifying ways that TFT and writing center pedagogy can inform, challenge, and expand each other.
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This introduction to the digital edited collection on transfer in the writing center outlines the three inquiries about transfer that recent criticism addresses: transfer-focused knowledge (the writing), transfer-focused thinking and dispositions (the writer), and transfer-focused structures and supports (the context). The authors note that the book is mainly concerned with how transfer can be supported and developed within the writing center context and argue that that the rhetorical triangle needs to be expanded to incorporate the experiences and interactions of tutors and writers by providing a unique environment for exploring “small moments of transformation.” The authors also describe areas for further research within the writing center and transfer relationship that the book does not address, including understanding what types of knowledge may be “easier or harder” to transfer, how tutors might be better prepared to support productive dispositions and metacognitive thinking, and how centers might “facilitate cultures of transfer” and “intervene in problematic university values” that inhibit transfer.
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Hastings asserts that transfer education for writing center tutors needs to be more “explicit, deliberate, and conscious” to help tutors view the “writer as learner” and therefore more effectively understand and teach transfer skills to writers. Hastings describes how she teaches the concept of transfer to students through a learning-by-doing approach with the domino game 42 in her own writing center at Texas A&M University. In this exercise, students are taught to reflect and think metacognitively while learning...
the domino game and in considering how or whether previous related skills are applicable to the new activity. Hastings uses the game 42 to underscore how moving from novice to expert requires learning new knowledge and then takes practice in applying that knowledge. After playing the game with tutors in her tutor education course, the tutors reflect on how learning dominos can be a metaphor for learning in the writing center. For example, the difference between high and low road transfer is comparable to the different difficulties novice and expert 42 players face: “If consultants have expertise with a different domino game, such as Chicken foot, transfer is more difficult than it would be if they had no prior knowledge of dominoes at all, since the only similarity between the games is the domino tiles themselves.” In her approach, Hastings emphasizes low road transfer strategies to make connections. Ultimately, this type of interactive game learning is a valuable way to teach tutors the complicated theory of transfer since the activity positions consultants as novice participants, provides opportunities for low road transfer, and includes reflective discussion.

KEYWORDS: writing center, tutor, metacognition, learning theory, transfer, pedagogy, reflection, high-road transfer, low-road transfer, consultant training


Hill argues that if writing centers are to be a key component in promoting transfer skills in collegiate writers, tutors need more preparation and knowledge about transfer and genre theory. Hill describes the introductory tutor education course in her writing center in hopes that it may be applied to other university writing centers. The focus of the chapter is to give some strategies for helping tutors gain a more accurate and sophisticated understanding of how writing works so that they can learn not only to facilitate transfer in their writing center sessions but also to transfer their own learning successfully. The author shares course textbooks and readings, along with questions that promote transfer and genre analysis that the tutors are taught to employ. The class also emphasizes reflection exercises and observations of veteran tutors. Hill suggests that more research is needed to measure the effectiveness of the introductory tutor education course and gives several adaptations of the course, such as one-hour staff meetings or workshops. Hill also offers pedagogical resources for teaching transfer and genre theory.
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The authors write about the Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project (PWTARP) they created that seeks to understand the benefits undergraduate peer tutors gain from their experiences in the writing center and to articulate “what they take with them” after they graduate. The authors surveyed 126 peer tutor alumni from three universities. Results
demonstrate that former writing center tutors develop a range of skills, including a new relationship with writing, analytical power, a listening presence, skills, values, and abilities vital in their professions, skills, values, and abilities vital in families and in relationships, earned confidence in themselves, and a deeper understanding of and commitment to collaborative learning (14). The authors argue that systematic tutor alumni research allows writing centers to resituate themselves as central to the educational mission of our colleges and universities. Writing centers are presented as a means of transfer education: peer tutors advance their own education and apply the learned skills, even 20 years after the experience.
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This article explores how transfer can have a transformative effect in writing centers, “especially in ways that address transfer’s messiness and variability.” Drawing on established theories of transformation, Johnson analyzes her writing center for “synchronic transfer,” or those “small moments of transformation in genres, language, understandings, dispositions, and processes” within a shorter period of time (like a semester with the writing center). To facilitate less explicit manifestations of transfer and intervene in their learning, Johnson acquaints writing consultants with transfer theory, has them reflect and identify moments of transformation in consultations, and asks them to analyze one of their own writing assignments through transfer theory. Johnson concludes that transfer can be encouraged more productively when consultants utilize principles of genre theory in their sessions, help writers transfer general knowledge to specific assignments, and focus on helping writers “connect their ideas to contexts beyond the classroom.” The article ends by encouraging other writing centers to use the methodology in analyzing small transformations facilitated by their own consultants.
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In this article, Mattison points out that previous research on writing center tutors show that they successfully gain and transfer skills from the writing center, yet most scholarship concerns the transfer of hard skills rather than soft skills, such as teamwork, collaboration, and interpersonal skills. Mattison argues that soft skills are often taken for granted and assumed to be present when tutors are hired, which he argues not only bypasses high-road transfer but also can hinder diversity by marginalizing students who
have not had an opportunity to develop these skills. Mattison cites research that shows that soft skills are disappearing for Generation Z college students due to the technological age and a decrease in high school students having summer jobs. The author thus calls for decreasing the focus on soft skills in the writing center—not to lessen their importance in the work of a writing center—but instead “to solidify the idea that they become a skill that should be explicitly taught as part of writing center practice.” To remedy this phenomenon and better bridge the writing center and future contexts, Mattison argues for more emphasis on these soft skills in tutor education to prepare tutors for future careers and improve the professionalism of the writing center setting. He outlines several strategies that his own writing center has incorporated, including lessons on professional introductions, tour speeches, tutor reflections, surveys, and interviews to encourage transfer to real world settings. Mattison concludes, “The more we can help tutors learn the fundamental principles of soft skills and cue them to make connections between our workplace situations and others, the better prepared they will be to take the high road and transfer those skills from one area of their lives to another.”
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Meade outlines the history of writing centers and investigates when, how, and why they emerged in higher education. He argues that “[t]hrough an ontological look at writing centers and transfer, scholars can gain additional perspective on contemporary discussions of supporting transfer in the writing center and keep the exigency of transfer in mind as they consider how their centers will attempt to facilitate writing-related transfer and disrupt the conditions of modern universities that inhibit it.” Meade explains how modernization and its emphasis on specialization created the need for the concepts of transfer and genre awareness, thus the need for writing centers. At the same time, writing centers are often in opposition to the modernization narrative of the university due to seemingly inefficient concepts that are crucial to the writing center such as “one-on-one tutoring” and “training tutors as generalists.” Meade describes how writing centers have responded to Universities’ emphasis on rationality, productivity, and efficiency, and suggests that a “more humanistic” and “dispositional approach” to transfer in emerging scholarship “provides an excellent opportunity for future writing center research” and seems to counter the widespread university modernization narrative.
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Workplace Writing, Apprenticeship, and Learning to Write in Professional and Other Contexts


This article asks: “how could a successful academic whose professional life involves copious amounts of writing [...] encounter the kind of composing challenges usually associated with inexperienced writers?” (531) The answer reveals itself through a case study of Martin, an accomplished academic writer, whose efforts at providing short summaries of youth football games for the local newspaper have proven frustrating and inadequate to his editors’ expectations. Analyzing Martin’s difficulty through Beaufort’s knowledge domains, Anson argues that Martin had sufficient subject matter, genre, and discourse community knowledge that one might expect him to transfer successfully. The trouble was “the fragmentation of actors, a lack of response or collaboration, partially settled or moving genres, and highly idiosyncratic purposes layered over otherwise familiar kinds of texts.” (539) Taking this into account means that transfer research would consider a new set of highly contextualized and specific “writerly factors” that can contribute to transfer— or lack thereof.

**KEYWORDS:** negative transfer, case study, public address, nonacademic writing, knowledge-domain, discourse-community


This article asks why some students more effectively transfer writing knowledge into work-to-learn settings and what individual factors influence that success—or lack thereof. (688-9) Drawing two case studies from a larger longitudinal and ethnographic research project, this article presents Ford and Mitchell as contrastive examples of how student dispositions affect writing transfer into internships. Mitchell struggles to make connections between writing contexts, and his sense of ownership stymies attempts at flexibility with respect to writing challenges. Mitchell’s “difficulty seeing the differences between lateral curricular experiences and far less structured work-to-learn environments persisted, hindering future success up to the point when we ended the study” (697). Ford, however, was able to value and link his prior experiences with ongoing writing challenges— particularly the weekly reports of his internship— and see them as spaces for growth. The implications are two-fold: first, that writing faculty should leave internship preparation open to a range of prior knowledges and dispositions; the second, that students often draw on prior knowledge that is not effective for current writing tasks— Ford’s success in those tasks, however, was linked to his disposition to “quickly recognize[e] the need to adapt his prior knowledge” (709).

**KEYWORDS:** disposition, internship, prior knowledge, case study

Beaufort argues that the educational writing done in FYC courses does not adequately prepare students for writing in the workplace. She summarizes existing scholarship on workplace writing, transfer of learning, and Writing Across Contexts (WAC), insisting that three current practices in composition instruction encourage the combination of general and local knowledge and can foster rhetoric flexibility: (1) metaknowledge, or “thinking about writing as a series of problem-solving activities” (183), (2) writing in multiple genres, and (3) an emphasis on the social context of writing. These three aspects of writing pedagogy can help writers bridge the gap between academic and workplace writing. Drawing on observations and interviews with Ursula, an administrative assistant to the Executive Director of a nonprofit organization, Beaufort considered Ursula’s writing issues through the lens of these three aspects of writing pedagogy. Findings show that Ursula’s college writing experience helped her in some ways, such as evidence of a rudimentary rhetorical problem-solving schema, but that Ursula would have had an easier transition from school writing to workplace writing if she had been taught about metacognition, the difference between general and local knowledge, and genre awareness.

KEYWORDS: FYC, metacognition, learning transfer, skill transfer, knowledge transfer, WAC, workplace, genre-awareness, rhetoric, literacy, local knowledge, case study, interview


Drawing on an ethnographic study of four college graduates working at a job resource center, Beaufort tracks their switch from academic writing to workplace writing and considers how they tackle unfamiliar tasks. The workers practice advanced writing literacy and expertise in their daily writing of grant proposals, requests for proposals, press releases, and other highly specialized genres of writing. She proposes five specific knowledge-domains that need to be addressed in college writing pedagogy: writing process knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, genre knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. Beaufort derives these categories from work-related writing and the knowledge domains it draws on. She asks what rhetorical knowledge workplace writers transfer from writing courses and other college learning versus what they have to learn for the first time. She concludes that the college writing courses were successful in preparing students for writing outside school only insofar as they help students think in rhetorical terms—but that their writing instruction did not particularly focus on these outcomes. Rather, what her subjects reported learning in such courses was broad analytical ability. Her theory of the five knowledge domains and her observations on transfer led to two major conclusions: (1) the importance of mindfulness for a writer—self-monitoring what they are doing versus what they could be doing and what they might have encountered elsewhere to help them now (186); and (2) the reality
of very limited transfer from writing courses that did not emphasize metacognition, which would have facilitated mindful transfer of learning (188-89).
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Beaufort explores the relationship between discourse communities, social roles and writing environments, especially in apprenticeship-type settings. She conducted an ethnography of writing in a workplace setting where she studied two new staff members of a nonprofit agency whose jobs involved writing at least fifty percent of their work time. She interviewed them weekly for a year, observed their work environment, collected their writing, and interviewed their executive directors. The data reveal 15 different writing roles assumed by members of the discourse community that depict a continuum from novice to expert writing behaviors, thus revealing the interconnections between discourse community goals, writers’ roles, and the socialization process for writers new to a given discourse community. The agency’s apprenticeship model places emphasis on community goals and writing as a means to an end, which creates communal writing in the sense that the goal is not individual self-expression but participation in a community of practice. Beaufort suggests that this apprenticeship model can be adapted to other discourse communities, such as school-based writing, while recognizing limitations such as the student’s position as an outsider writing to gain entrance into real communities of practice. Beaufort’s framework for conceptualizing a social apprenticeship in writing in school or non-school settings provides a model for applying to other discourse communities.
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Brent traces “how students re-engineer their rhetorical knowledge to apply it to workplace situations” (559) by studying six students in a co-op work term. Interviews throughout co-op experience – which, Brent stresses, were not always connected to students’ experiences or academic programs of study – highlight how students demonstrate and engage in a rhetorical education, which Brent defines as “the sum of institutionalized practices in the postsecondary education system that help a student develop rhetorical knowledge and skill, whether or not those practices are located in specific ‘writing’ courses” (559). The piece links students’ performance and competence in these co-op writing settings, in part, through the frame of “learning transformation”—anchored in activity theory, situatedness, and boundary crossing—rather than “learning transfer” (565). The case studies of Amy, Celia, Irene, Emma, Christina,
and Leslie, provide seven themes in workplace writing: “clarity and concision” is enforced by “sense of rigor at the word and sentence level” (585); a general sense of professional format influenced students’ ability to read as much as it influenced their ability to write; students’ “flexible rhetorical knowledge” emerged from academics generally (as opposed to specific writing courses) (585); students worked productively from models; students conducted research very unlike academic research; audience awareness was key to success in workplace writing(587); students engaged in critical reading activities; and, finally, students demonstrated facility in juggling task scenarios in the workplace.
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Dias et al. offer findings from a seven-year investigation into the relationship between writing in the university and writing in the workplace. Utilizing a multiple-case study approach that compared university courses with related workplace settings in four disciplines (public administration, management, architecture, and social work), researchers utilized extensive and varied data-gathering methods and engaged numerous theoretical frames (Genre Studies, Activity Theory, Situated Learning, Distributed Cognition) to analyze the functions of writing as well as the impact of setting on writing practices. As the title indicates, university and workplace writing were found to be “worlds apart.” In other words, Dias et al. claim they are two different activities: university writing serves an epistemic purpose while workplace writing is instrumental. Workplace texts are more complex, intertextually dense, and more consequential; they serve more functions and have more longevity and reach and are more implicated in power relations. Dias et al. introduce the concepts of facilitated performance to describe most university writing and attenuated authentic participation to describe the closely supervised workplace learning that might take place in an apprenticeship or internship. Attenuated authentic participation is seen as important and necessary to “ease the transition” (223) as writers moving from the university setting to a workplace setting must redefine their goals for writing, their means of learning to write, and their understanding of writing as action. Rather than a process of transferring knowledge and skills, learning to write in the workplace is a “much more a process of enculturation” (231).
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This article highlights a case study of one professional communication designer as he constructs a proposal over several days to better understand how multimodal document
creation works in the workplace. As the participant developed a proposal, the researchers tracked his keystrokes, had him keep a logbook on the tasks he performed, and conducted a retrospective interview. The participant’s “resource switches” (316)—when he switched from his proposal to other digital sources—was sorted into nine main categories. The case study reveals three main findings: the professional communicator (1) searches through multiple sources for content and ideas, (2) constructs visual content (charts, graphs, photographs) as well as verbal content, and (3) manages his attention and motivation over this extended task. Results indicate that downtime can boost task motivation, and knowledge transfer is important in synthesizing and assessing other sources to create a multimodal text. Leijten et al. recommend that research in multimodal writing should place more emphasis on knowledge transformation, and they propose updates to existing writing models to better reflect key features revealed in professional writing contexts. The authors also advocate for use of the keystroke logging tool in research because of its versatility.
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This article attempts to understand the diverse (and divergent) perspectives on rhetoric in both academic and industry settings and at various career stages. To determine knowledge of rhetorical awareness in engineering writing, the researcher conducted interviews with eight participants—two instructors, two students, two clients, and two alumni—who had experienced writing in two contexts: a capstone senior design course and industry workplace engineering contexts. Findings show that participant perspectives fall along a rhetorical awareness continuum at points spanning from denial and acknowledgment to an accentuation of rhetoric as critical to individual and organizational success. Overall, there was an experience gap between the students and the rest of the participants in their rhetorical awareness and writer roles. Participant perspectives along the continuum also vary in terms of writer and reader roles, writer identity, career stage/organizational role, and objectivity. This study underscores the importance of “encourag[ing] reflection on current rhetorical mindsets and their accompanying values as a means of fostering their development and evolution for present and future praxis” (258). The study offers multiple applications of its findings in forms such as rhetorical development research on the individual and studies on knowledge transformation in practicing engineers.
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The purpose of this study is to understand professional writing students’ perspectives on their writing experiences as they complete an internship in a wide range of workplaces. Data from 24 undergraduate students include written artifacts, work logs, and interviews. Smart and Brown find that transformation of learning took place as students were able to use their classroom learning about writing in novel contexts and complete the writing tasks their workplace assigned them. Furthermore, they found that students continued to develop a professional identity of competent writers as they successfully completed each writing task despite the challenges they faced, such as new writing genres. The transformation of learning also meant that student writers developed different ways to engage with and complete writing tasks from those they learned and used in the classroom. Smart and Brown call this “reinvention of expert practices” that challenges the static notion of learning transfer. They conclude by calling for reimagining the relationship between writing in the college classroom and writing in professional and workplace settings to better prepare students for these contexts.
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Literacy Development and Writerly Life


The authors explore integrating international students and global thinking into university classes. They note that a focus on global learning is a means to facilitate communication and transforming knowledge. They suggest working specifically with international students to adapt prior knowledge from home cultures to American culture or American educational practices as a means of building learning transfer.
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The authors argue for an “integrated framework [of writing research] to understand lifespan development of writing abilities in its variation” (351) and lay out eight aspects to such a framework: Writing can develop across the lifespan as part of changing contexts; writing development is variable and there is no single path and no single endpoint; writers develop in relation to the changing social needs, opportunities,
resources, and technologies of their time and place; the development of writing depends on the development, redirection, and specialized reconfiguring of general functions, processes, and tools; writing and other forms of development have reciprocal and mutually supporting relationships; to understand how writing develops across the lifespan, educators need to recognize the different ways language resources can be used to present meaning in written text; and curriculum plays a significant formative role in writing development. The eight statements are strongly represented in extant transfer research and also suggest areas for strengthening such work: increasing longitudinal research frames; the importance of maintaining complexity in research design and interpretation, and the admonition to remember that transfer looks different within and across languages.
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Davis focuses on writing that takes place outside of the classroom and outside of classroom-focused spaces, such as learning management systems. Davis uses writing contexts such as an online model of Shakespearean London and Wikipedia to explore how writing transfer occurs in non-school contexts. Ultimately, she suggests that universities should create a more robust digital ecosystem for students in which they could explore multiple digital platforms, collaborate within them, and connect their experiences. She encourages universities to move beyond a single learning management system to instead use multiple digital spaces for learning.
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Noting that research in Composition Studies tends to focus on content first then only later self-corrects to include the learner, Driscoll and Wells argue that student dispositions and motivations need more emphasis in our research on writing development and transfer. Drawing on research from Education and Psychology, the authors describe five features of student dispositions. 1) Writer development occurs in the interaction between the person and his/her dispositions, the context, the learning process, and time. 2) Dispositions affect how an individual’s skills, aptitudes, and knowledge are utilized in a given situation. 3) Because dispositions can determine development, they are “key factors in preventing and allowing successful transfer to take place.” 4) Dispositions can be generative or disruptive. 5) Finally, dispositions are fluid and “may be context-specific . . . or broadly generalized.” After establishing these characteristics, Driscoll and Wells discuss four dispositions with specific connections to transfer: value, self-efficacy, attribution of cause, and self-regulation. The authors suggest further research into student
dispositions and the relationship between dispositions and transfer, and they recommend mapping the various theories
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Results from a longitudinal study over a five-year period with thirteen students show that learner epistemologies – which do change over time – affect not only engagement and learning within a course but also affect the potential transfer of learning from a course to future contexts. Using the “Box under the Bed” metaphor from the interview protocol of Bergman and Zepernick, Driscoll interviewed participants once a year for sixty minutes during their undergraduate careers. The analysis of this data revealed three primary epistemologies: the omnidirectional knowledge builder, the unidirectional knowledge builder, and the fatalist, as well as two hybrid epistemologies: the fatalist + unidirectional and the unidirectional + omnidirectional. Over time, the fatalist epistemology disappeared and unidirectional knowledge building became the most prominent epistemology, suggesting that what is connected to the major discipline is valued. The authors report a “direct connection” between epistemologies and transfer, with students in the unidirectional + omnidirectional category reporting the most transfer and students in the fatalist category reporting the least. There were also connections between epistemology and the students’ depth of understanding of genre. Usefulness, interest, and teacher influence were contextual factors that influenced epistemology, while the students’ sense of professional identity and perceived agency were personal factors. Driscoll and Jin see the BUTB metaphor as a tool to raise student awareness of their epistemologies.

KEYWORDS: learner epistemology, genre, engagement, interviews, longitudinal


Driscoll and Powell share findings of a longitudinal study investigating how students learn to write, from which emerged the importance of emotions and dispositions in transfer and writing development. Over a five-year period, the researchers conducted annual interviews with thirteen undergraduate writers. Interviews included discussion of two writing samples from the year, one perceived as “easy” and the second perceived as “challenging,” which were then collected and analyzed by the researchers. Emotions were categorized as generative, disruptive, or circumstantial. While students experience more types of emotion categorized as disruptive than generative, they experienced generative emotions with more frequency. Emotional states varied in the length and severity of impact. Boredom, hate, and fear were shown to “actively inhibit transfer” long term, while pride, confidence, and enjoyment were shown to have a positive impact on transfer. Dispositionally, students were categorized as emotional interpreters, rational
interpreters, or emotional managers, and the ability to monitor and control emotions through metacognition were identified as a “key to long-term transfer.” Student emotions toward faculty also had an impact. Pedagogical strategies are offered for facilitating positive emotions and developing metacognitive control. The authors conclude that the impact of emotions on transfer helps to explain “at least some of the inconsistencies” in previous transfer research, with further study suggested.
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In order to enrich the diversity of composition studies, Michaud offers a glimpse into the literacy development and use of adult students. Drawing from David Barton’s ecological approach which situates literacy within broader social and cultural contexts and relations, Michaud investigates what adults returning to school carry with them and the role that literacy practices play in such students’ lives beyond the classroom. In this essay, he includes case studies of seven adults over the age of 24 pursuing bachelor’s degrees whom he interviewed to gather information on their school and literacy histories, everyday/vernacular literacy practices, workplace literacies, and literacy attitudes/values. Michaud shows the complexity and richness of the adult students’ literacy history and concludes that “honoring everyday and workplace literacies as legitimate forms of practice in and of themselves and as worthy of investigation … should go a long way towards giving adult learners … a language to think about and make sense of the transitions they are experiencing as they move between the various [literacy] contexts” (92).

KEYWORDS: literacy, adult student, case study, interview, academic setting, workplace, home literacy, community literacy, pedagogy


Monty focuses on the literacy habits of students living in border institutions, many of whom move across the US/Mexico border as part of their everyday lives. He draws data from surveys of students, end-of-course reflections, and student interviews to better understand the lived experiences of transnational students and uses this knowledge to better inform composition pedagogies. He offers insights into how multimodal pedagogies can complement students’ lived experiences of writing and how instructors can facilitate connection between scholarly and non-scholarly writing contexts. Ultimately, Monty calls for pedagogies that draw on the out-of-school writing experiences of these students, such as their uses of mobile devices, social media, and the multimodal practices therein. This article therefore contributes to research on knowledges students “transfer in” to academic and other forms of writing.

Despite the title, Pigg’s study has implications that relate to learning transfer in writing studies, particularly the connection between learning that takes place within different material situations. Pigg looks at the digital and physical study and writing contexts of two case studies as representative of a larger group of 21 total participants. She finds that the learners balance material spaces—in this case a coffee shop and an on-campus study space—with digital tools (such as social media and Wikipedia) and social interactions. Each space can offer both benefits and distractions. Ultimately, Pigg calls for a deeper exploration of material and social contexts in addition to the study of factors like study skills and time management when exploring writing practices.


In these two case studies that span six years of students’ undergraduate and graduate careers, Powell and Driscoll explore the role of mindset in writing revision and learning transfer. The authors use interviews, writing samples, and professors’ responses to writing to demonstrate the effects of a fixed versus growth mindset. A fixed mindset is one in which a learner believes they are either good or bad at a task. A growth mindset is one in which a learner believes they can improve with practice. The authors state that while no person is entirely of one mindset or the other, they often have a tendency toward a certain direction. One of the case studies demonstrates the effects of a growth mindset while the other demonstrates a fixed. Ultimately, the authors find that both case studies responded well to positive feedback and were able to use it to improve learning; however, each responded very differently to negative feedback. The growth-mindset student was able to use the feedback to improve and even engaged in direct learning transfer practices, while the fixed-mindset student struggled with the negative feedback, which appeared to impede learning. Powell and Driscoll offer three suggestions based on their study: teachers should recognize their role in socializing new writers into their fields, they should be aware of how students process feedback, and they should actively cultivate responses that encourage a growth mindset.
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In a follow-up his 2008 *Journal of Basic Writing* article, Roozen returns to the case study of Charles as he enters an upper-level kinesiology class. Roozen focuses on how Charles’s extracurricular writing informs the writing he does in that class. Roozen notes that when scholars focus on only school-based literate activities, we limit their literate lives and judge students only on their academic literacies. This may signal to students that their extracurricular literacies are not “real” writing or reading. He notes that the term “basic writer” may be problematic. It means the student is not experienced in academic literacies, but they may be very experienced with different forms of literate activity. He goes on to say that self-sponsored literacies and school-based literacies develop in connection with one another, and teachers should attend to that connection. This article specifically looks at writing transfer as it takes place between school-based writing contexts as well as between school-based contexts and out-of-school contexts.
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Roozen’s case study of Kate, a rhetoric and composition MA student, focuses on her experiences writing fan fiction. Kate has extensive experience in this area, and Roozen explores the ways that Kate draws on these experiences to inform creative writing, her decision to enroll in an MA program, and her decision to focus on rhetoric and composition. Roozen demonstrates that Kate’s experiences offer her affordances, such as new perspectives on writing, as well as constraints, such as limiting the focus of her studies. In the end, Roozen introduces the idea of “spin off” (p. 139), which is using knowledge in ways other its original purpose, to offer a view of the interplay between domains of literacy. In Kate’s case, her experiences with academia and fan fiction offered her broader ways of looking at both. Roozen suggests that researchers explore students’ writing lives more broadly than just their experiences with academic writing. This article explores an under-studied area of graduate student writing transfer in addition to exploring writing transfer between school-based and self-sponsored writing contexts, including writing adaptation.
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Roozen’s case study of Angelica attempts to better understand the role of private writing in literacy development. Roozen collects writing samples and interviews to demonstrate how Angelica’s long-term journaling practice led her to first major in English and then change her major to journalism. She first majored in English because she wanted to continue her passion for writing, but she changed her major to journalism when she realized that type of writing allowed her to use the rich descriptions and imagery that she enjoyed from her journaling. Roozen makes the case that this type of private, self-sponsored writing is important to writing development and does not need to conflict with the more public writing of school. In fact, he notes that Angelica’s journal writing was central to her development as a writer. Roozen opposes dividing these types of writing and encourages teachers to help students connect private writing practices to more public forms. He suggests that the various types of writing do often influence each other, even if they aren’t always immediately similar. This article offers insights into the writing transfer that may be taking place between informal journaling settings and school based English class writing as well as journalism writing.
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Roozen’s case study of Charles explores the interplay of writing within the curriculum and writing outside of it. Charles is placed in a basic writing course despite having a wealth of journalism experience from high school. He continues to write for his college paper but also takes up writing and reading poetry and writing and performing stand-up comedy. Roozen notes that Charles rarely draws on these extracurricular experiences in his writing classes, even noting that his high school journalism experience occasionally hinders his performance. Ultimately, though, Roozen asserts that these extracurricular writing experiences are deeply tied to writing for university and cannot easily be pulled apart from curricular writing experiences. He states that all writing is about drawing together multiple contexts, genres, and identities. This article explores the myriad ways that writing transfer happens within the life of one student, exploring connections to writing contexts from current and past school-based experiences as well as self-sponsored and out-of-school writing contexts.
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This second follow-up to the 2008 article from the *Journal of Basic Writing* focuses much more specifically on research methods. Roozen explores the assistance he received in writing the 2008 article and the lenses he used to analyze the data from his case study. Roozen’s article offers methodological approaches for future writing transfer research.
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Roozen’s case study of Lindsey, an MEd student, explores two literate practices: keeping a scripture journal and writing an academic paper. Roozen considers how these practices inform and shape each other. He notes that by creating pedagogical practices that attend to repurposing extracurricular writing practices, teachers may be better able to facilitate transfer. He goes so far as to say that this sort of “extradisciplinary practice” (p. 346) is one primary element in developing disciplinary writing. Roozen advises teachers to intentionally address the variety of literate practices students engage in, not just those that resemble academic writing.
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Roozen and Erickson’s multimodal digital book explores the lifeworld writing practices and disciplinary development of five case studies. Data is gathered primarily through interviews and writing samples. Three of the five case studies are explored in Roozen’s articles above. This book offers follow-ups on Charles, Kate, and Lindsey, going further into how lifeworld literacy practices influenced their disciplinary development. In addition, two new case studies are added for Terri and Alexandra. Each chapter builds on a specific focus. Charles’s chapter focuses on how his experiences with journalism affected his writing in school, including for a kinesiology course. Kate’s chapter focuses on how fan fiction and fan art informed her writing as an English graduate student. Lindsey’s chapter focuses on how her undergraduate experiences as a design major impacted her development in analyzing literary texts. Terri’s chapter focuses on how her various experiences with creative and literary texts—including multimodal texts—allowed her to develop writing patients’ charts as a nurse. Alexandra’s chapter focused on the
multimodal development of charts and other visuals as a civil engineer. Together, Roozen and Erickson draw several conclusions from these case studies, including that disciplinary development does not occur in the same way for all learners, that there may be both synergies and tensions between literacy practices, that literacy practices influence each other, and that disciplinary practices help to develop disciplinary identities. This book offers multiple ways in which writing transfer takes place among a variety of learning contexts—both formal and informal.
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The authors build upon previous scholarship on the connection between disposition and transfer, asking how writing centers can facilitate self-efficacy and self-regulation. They use a coding program to analyze the self-efficacy and self-regulation speech patterns in six tutoring sessions (chosen from a larger pool of 36), looking for correlations between these speech patterns and positive dispositions, or “motivational scaffolding.” The team coded the tutors’ speech patterns using the following categories: showing concern, praising, reinforcing student writers’ ownership and control, being optimistic or using humor, and giving sympathy or empathy. Through their use of examples of the motivational strategies that tutors use, the authors argue that motivational scaffolding and instructional scaffolding are interrelated and lead to a confident writer who expresses ownership and control in the tutoring session. However, the authors warn about subjectivity in coding and recommend post-session reflections with writers and tutors to understand their own perspectives on self-efficacy and self-regulation.
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Wardle starts by acknowledging the complexity of transfer and its studying. She also articulates the confusion at why some students seem to be able to repurpose their prior knowledge and work creatively on new writing tasks while others fail to do the same. She notes that while researchers have been using the term “transfer” frequently, there hasn’t been adequate theorization of the concepts or consideration of the contexts where teaching for transfer takes place. Accordingly, she suggests using other vocabulary and frameworks as the field engages in discussing and theorizing transfer. As she compares
students who respond to new writing situations creatively and those who refuse to modify their learning in response to the same situations, she concludes that prior knowledge is significant in shaping those responses. Wardle theorizes the dispositions students usually have as problem-solving or answer-getting. She elaborates that problem-solving disposition compels the student to be creative and reflective as they try repurposing their prior knowledge to solve the new writing situation. On the other hand, answer-getting dispositions make students seek easy, straightforward answers to new writing situation problems. Using Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus and doxa, she argues that educational systems foster the answer-getting dispositions in students, thus hindering students from exploring creative solutions to the problems they encounter. After discussing examples of an individual and institutional inhabiting the problem-solving disposition, Wardle calls teachers’ and scholars’ attention to the dispositions students bring to our writing classrooms from their educational systems because these dispositions can either facilitate or hinder creative repurposing and expansive learning.
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Noting the lack of transfer research considered through the lens of identity, this chapter offers a case study of the co-author, Clement, writing for an Honors seminar that challenged the writer in multiple ways; most importantly, the course asked her to theorize race, class, and gender in ways that were outside of her own experience – topics that conflicted with her family’s values. The student found herself in a “double bind”; her desire to be a student open to new ideas was in conflict with important aspects of her identity. This rendered her unable to engage successfully with the course and she actively avoided transferring and repurposing prior knowledge. This case offers a “caution to transfer researchers not to attribute too much to any single course or experience” (175). Methodology and study design are important in research, as is the consideration of personal dispositions.
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