

A Basic Writing Course Design to Promote Writer Identity: Three Analyses of Student Papers

Barbara Bird

ABSTRACT: This article presents the results of three comparative analyses on forty-seven student papers in order to examine the effectiveness of a basic writing course in developing students' academic writer identity. The course curriculum, grounded in social identity theory, focuses on the core writing concepts and dispositions that promote writer identity. Since the curricular focus is writing, this course fits within the broad category of a Writing-About-Writing (WAW) course and specifically draws on David Bartholomae's "Inventing a University" article and Roz Ivanič's research on writer identity. These two scholars present pedagogy that draws on social identity either implicitly (Bartholomae) or explicitly (Ivanič). My comparative analyses demonstrate students' significant development and short-term transfer of textual writer identity, and the analyses reveal advanced textual writer identity compared with students who tested out of basic writing. This research contributes to writer identity theory and demonstrates the efficacy of writer identity content specifically and a WAW-type course generally for basic writing.

Key words: basic writing; curriculum; WAW; writer identity; qualitative research

Our colleges and universities, by and large, have failed to involve basic writing students in scholarly projects, projects that would allow them to act as though they were colleagues in an academic enterprise. (Bartholomae "Inventing the University" 11)

[P]eople learn by apprenticeship . . . and by taking on the identity of community membership among those who use literacy in particular ways. (Ivanič "Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write" 235)

Students need opportunities for the kinds of writing contexts that help them both understand and join the "academic enterprise" (Bartholomae 2, 11); such opportunities simultaneously help students understand and adopt the "identity" of academic writers (Ivanič "Discourses" 235). While having somewhat different emphases on student writing development, both

*A basic writer herself, **Barbara Bird** serves as Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center at Taylor University. The research in this article is part of a four-year study focusing on how basic writing students develop as academic writers and enact their academic writer identity across classes and years.*

© Journal of Basic Writing, Vol. 32, No. 1, 2013

Bartholomae's and Ivanič's work rely on social identity theory to explain how students learn academic writing. This theory, in its broad form, posits that successful behavior in any community stems from well-informed participation and self-identification with that community. Teaching academic writing from this theoretical standpoint, then, requires explaining core academic discourse concepts to equip basic writers with the "whys" behind academic writing conventions while also teaching and fostering dispositions that encourage basic writers' self-identification as contributors to academic discourse.

This focus on the fundamental purposes—the "whys"—of academic writing and on the core academic dispositions fits learning within a social identity perspective. This perspective foregrounds the interconnectedness of the learning process with the affective and holistic personhood of the learner. As Paul Prior explains, a social theory of learning addresses "the formation of a person's consciousness through participation in social practices, [and] stresses affect, motivation, perspective, embodied ways of being in the world, and identity as well as conceptual development" (22). Approaches to curriculum and pedagogy that only emphasize cognitive knowledge not only limit students' understanding as whole beings, but they also reduce the impact of learning since students may not internalize the community understandings. Approaches that engage students' participation in "social practices," however, involve ways of thinking and "embodied ways of being," both of which promote a deeper internalization of community knowledge. Thus, students can develop self-identities as academic writers since they have the basic knowledge (purpose of academic writing) and dispositions that are essential components of this social identity. Conceptually, these characteristics of "academic writer" are at a much higher level: instead of focusing curriculum and pedagogy on textual features like genre forms or topic sentences, this approach focuses on academic texts as conversations on important issues. So, within this framework, students understand the convention of "developing claims," for example, not as a rule but instead as the natural outcome of engaging their own intellectual work, a disposition essential for fulfilling the meta-purpose of academic writing—contributing to a conversation. Pedagogy and curriculum grounded in social identity theory emphasize the impetus—purposes and dispositions—instead of the result—discourse characteristics. This context gives students greater control and flexibility as writers: seeing the *why* improves the *how*.

One kind of basic writing curriculum that is well suited for applying social identity theory is a Writing-About-Writing (WAW) approach. I

define WAW as using writing as curricular content in a freshman writing class, which follows Elizabeth Wardle's definition: "a basic philosophical approach to teaching writing [. . . that] assumes that declarative and procedural knowledge about writing cannot be separated in a useful way" ("Re: WAW"). My basic writing course uses content on academic writers' purposes and dispositions, with a focus on developing students' own academic writer identities, drawing on both Bartholomae's and Ivanič's use of social identity theory. Identity involves the affective, and holistic-oriented teaching evidences improvement in writing performance both for the short-term and long-term (Bereiter 22; Geisler 208-209; Nelms and Dively 218; Wardle "Understanding" 76-77). Students' writing performances become more controlled and authentic as students understand how academic writing connects to their own identity. My research indicates that this WAW-type course on writing purposes and dispositions effectively equips students to develop an academic writer identity: their texts have several key qualities that the academic community expects, and their texts evidence key academic dispositions, even a semester after completing the course.

According to research in both social identity and learning theories, academic writing competence relies on internalizing core identity dispositions like confidence and motivation (Bereiter; Biggs; Geisler; Leamnsen). In their discussion of transfer, Gavriel Salomon and David Perkins argue that high-road transfer requires "*mindful abstraction*" (emphasis original, 124), arguing that "(a) the abstraction must be understood, and (b) the understanding requires mindfulness" (126). Dispositions and meta-purposes are conceptual abstractions that guide academic writing. Students who mindfully read, discuss, and respond to these concepts significantly improve their abilities and their willingness to transfer both their understanding of academic writing and internalizing of academic dispositions, especially when they simultaneously integrate their own identities into these abstract concepts of academic writing.

Bartholomae and Ivanič both recognize the critical importance of understanding academic discourse's conceptual meta-knowledge. Without this knowledge, Bartholomae notes, "the writer must get inside a discourse he can only partially imagine" (19). Our students don't have to try to *imagine* the inside, or purposes of academic discourse if we *teach* them core concepts that drive academic writing. Similarly, without understanding and integrating key academic identity dispositions, students would have a weak sense of their discursal identity as academic writers since "writers construct a discursal self from socially available discursal resources" (*Writing* 330). These

resources include students' "membership of, their identification with, the values [or dispositions] and practices of one or more communities" (*Writing* 83). If we teach our students how to integrate their academic community identification with their current identity memberships, they can develop their own academic writer identity. Both Bartholomae and Ivanič point out that what proceeds from the discursive resources of purposes and dispositions is controlled academic performance.

In what follows, I summarize Bartholomae's and Ivanič's appropriations of social identity theory before detailing my basic writing course that draws on their work. I then discuss the research I conducted after this course design had been taught for five years (by three teachers, including me). The three comparative textual analyses from my research show how this course enables students to demonstrate improvement in academic writer identity (first study); transfer of their expanded writer identity (second study); and evidence greater authority compared to students who tested out of basic writing and who are in non-WAW courses (third study).

TWO RELATED MODELS OF ACADEMIC SOCIAL IDENTITY

Though Bartholomae never discussed social identity theory in his "Inventing the University," his implied argument that students should be taught discourse community expectations aligns with a social identity perspective. He represents students' struggle with academic writing as their attempt to act like they are part of the academic community even before they understand the community's purposes for academic writing. But as we know, if basic writing students do not understand academic writing purposes, their efforts will be focused on mimicking the textual features instead of developing an authentic engagement with content.

Authentic engagement is further enhanced when students adopt some elements of the community identity. Roz Ivanič and other scholars who view writing as identity performance focus on the negotiation of one's identity within a community. Amy Burgess and Roz Ivanič believe that when students work to acquire the social identity of academia, holistically engaging it, they can be "positioned" as insiders (11). For Ivanič, writer identity means that students "participate in the practices which constitute a discourse, and thereby affiliate themselves with others who engage in the same practices" ("Language" 16). Students construct their academic affiliation once they understand academic purposes and dispositions, that is, the *whys* behind discourse practices. This understanding gives students power to choose

how they want to negotiate their academic selves in connection with their non-academic lives. Ivanič's perspective on joining the academic community is much like Linda Flower's on creating meaning: both are negotiated. For writer identity, such negotiation means writers may adopt some values and reject others, bringing to the new academic identity elements from already inhabited identities. This negotiation is what allows students to have a holistic and *authentic* writer identity rather than a superficial, mimicked writer performance.

Bartholomae's and Ivanič's work, as examples of social identity theory applied to the teaching of basic writing, support assignments and curricula that emphasize both internalizing reasons for specific academic conventions (purposes) and ways of being an academic (identity). In the new academic journal, *Literacy in Composition Studies*, Robert Yagelski explains why social identity theory is so important to the teaching of writing: "writing is wrapped up in how we understand ourselves as beings in the world, and the act of writing has the potential to shape our sense of who we are and how we relate to the world around us" (58). These literacy scholars situate student writing and learning as opportunities for students to develop ideas that they personally connect with on an identity level. As Ivanič notes, "people are likely to begin to participate in particular practices to the extent that they identify themselves with the values, beliefs, goals and activities of those who engage in those practices" ("Discourses" 235). If we want basic writing students to participate authentically and not resort to surface-level mimicry, then we will want them to understand the purposes for academic texts and to self-identify with the academic community.

Basic writing students may experience tension as they negotiate how much and which academic identity characteristics to adopt, but it is important to mention here that no student is expected to become "a little academic," replacing current social identities with one dominant academic identity. In "Discoursal Construction of Identity," Michael Michaud applies Ivanič's identity theory in his research, noting that his case study student chose not to completely conform to academic role expectations (50). Michaud posits two potential authorial identity expectations which the student may have been rejecting: being a novice, being a "cultural observer," or more likely, some combination of the two (50). If an assignment or course requires an identity role a student resists, the student can reject that role or create an identity that merges the expected role with another role or identity. Scholars who view student writing from an identity standpoint are not suggesting a wholesale adoption of an academic social identity that displaces other iden-

tities. Students need to understand and adopt some of the dispositions of the academic community while simultaneously bringing their autobiographical or outside-school identities to academic writing in order to create their own *blended* writer identity.

For Ivanič, writer identity development enables greater student agency because students can “own or disown aspects of [the discourse]” and bring “their life-histories and the social groups with which they identify” to their academic writing (*Identity* 32). Beyond Ivanič’s work, for over a decade, other scholars have studied similar kinds of holistic, “identity-type” learning: dispositions toward learning (Driscoll and Wells; Perkins et al.); emotional involvement (Brandt; Micciche); authorship confidence (Greene; Rodgers); and the intermingling of “multiple literate identities” (Roozen 568). All of these scholars argue that for deep, lasting learning, students need holistic ownership of themselves as academic writers.

Although identity development is primarily internal, Ivanič makes it clear that writer identity is visible in student texts. Burgess and Ivanič explain that within a writer’s text is the “representation of herself, her view of the world, her values, and beliefs that the writer constructs through her writing practices; [this self-representation] is a set of interpretable signs from which readers will obtain an impression of the writer” (240). Burgess and Ivanič understand that a writer’s identity actually exists outside of language, but the self-inscribed-on-paper is “interpretable” from the text.

THREE COMPONENTS OF ACADEMIC SOCIAL IDENTITY TO FOSTER

Across its five-year development, my basic writing WAW curriculum gained an increasingly tighter focus on the purposes and dispositions of academic writing in order to guide students in developing their own writer identities. I found one academic writing meta-purpose (or threshold concept) that especially affected students’ own academic writer identity development: contributing to discourse conversations. My curriculum now has these four outcomes: 1) students will *understand* that all (or virtually all) academic texts contribute to some larger academic discussion; 2) students will *understand* and negotiate their *internalization* of core academic dispositions; 3) students will *create* an academic writer identity based on knowledge of academic writers’ purposes and dispositions; 4) students will *develop proficiency* in producing academic texts that accomplish the meta-purpose of contributing to conversations while also expressing their own writer identity. To achieve

these four outcomes, I sought to focus on the three components of writer identity that I adapted from Ivanič's work: autobiographical writer identity, discursual writer identity, and authorial writer identity. Students' cognitive and affective synthesis of these three components results in greater ownership of academic writing's core purpose, adoption of academic dispositions, and creation of their own writer identity.

The autobiographical component is the presence of the writer in the text, primarily through the writer's own ideas but also including relevant personal experiences or examples. Ivanič believes that academic writing often includes some aspect of the writer's personal history (Ivanič *Writing* 24-25; Burgess and Ivanič 238). This personal history may be explicitly represented in the text or only implicitly visible. The important aspect of this component for students is developing personally meaningful ideas in response to whatever academic conversation they engage. Students' ideas can evolve from interpreting concepts in a text (or texts); from applying ideas in a text to their own experiences; or from their unique synthesis of ideas from various sources, their own experiences, and their prior knowledge. The key point of this component for students is developing their own ideas in response to scholarly conversations. Unlike most students' high school writing experiences, college professors expect students to generate their own "take" on issues, not merely repeat well-known ideas or the ideas of one writer. Specifically, autobiographical identity is the students' unique perspective on an issue in the form of claim statements or personal experiences used as examples.

The discursual component is adhering to academic writing conventions. Ivanič describes this component as "discourse characteristics" and wording that meet community expectations (Ivanič *Writing* 25; Burgess and Ivanič 238). For my basic writing class, I chose to focus on two specific discourse conventions: creating clear claims and tying evidence (specifically, examples and quotes) to claims. Creating clear claims that can be supported, and linking evidence to claims, are both taught first from the conceptual level of writing as contributing to conversations and then at the concrete level. All skills are taught in this same manner. This focus on claims enables students to gain greater mastery of these two conventions while indirectly improving related academic discourse characteristics such as overall cohesion and clarity.

The authorial component is the writer's authority (Ivanič *Writing* 26; Burgess and Ivanič 240). I define this component as students' ownership of their ideas and their confidence in themselves as thinker-writers who have

authority to speak their ideas into academic conversations. To distinguish authorial from autobiographical, students' *idea-claims* (claims that are students' own ideas/perspectives) are autobiographical, but their authority over those ideas is demonstrated through their intellectual *development* of those idea-claims. In other words, a student would display autobiographical writer identity by making claims that are her own ideas, but if there is very little development of those claims, this student would evidence low authorial writer identity. Sometimes students learn to create their own ideas as their claims but then either fail to elaborate or merely cite others, showing no intellectual *development* of their ideas. Or, the reverse could be true. A student could make a claim that is merely repeating another writer's idea but then evidence strong authorial writer identity through the student's own critical thinking, explanation, or other means of intellectually supporting a claim. Authorial writer identity is the students' ownership over their intellectual work.

Learning these three components of academic writer identity helps basic writing students understand and be inspired to develop their own identity as academic writers. However, I want to be clear that students do not need such holistic engagement to write college papers. Students can produce moderately successful papers using strategies learned in high school combined with mimicking some academic features. These strategies alone, though, will ultimately fail students: without explicit instruction in academic community purposes and dispositions, few students will understand how to invest, or be motivated to invest, as writers. Writing strategies unattached to academic discourse purposes and separated from holistic dispositional involvement cannot sustain quality writing or enable transfer. Systematically building an academic writer identity grounded in academic purposes and dispositions along with personally held identities gives students much greater motivation and staying power as academic writers.

WAW AND BASIC WRITING: AN APPROPRIATE FIT

My basic writing WAW course using the content of academic discourse purposes and dispositions and grounded in a writer identity perspective is certainly not the only kind of WAW course. As defined above, WAW means a writing course that teaches any kind of writing content; thus, there could be a variety of WAW-specific content, whether or not the course carries the title of "WAW." Writing-content courses use readings and assignments that lead students to reflect on themselves as writers and to learn writing concepts,

usually as abstractions that can be applied in different writing contexts. WAW courses can include a wide range of writing concepts, depending on the specific institutional context and student population needs. Here are some examples: Dana Driscoll (Oakland University) focuses her WAW course on teaching students several dispositions and attitudes toward writing and themselves as writers, equipping students to improve their knowledge transfer (Driscoll; Driscoll and Wells). Elizabeth Sargent (University of Alberta) teaches a WAW course exploring scholarly debates on writing issues and engaging students in research on their own writing processes (Sargent). Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs' WAW textbook examines literacy broadly, focusing on teaching students academic research and helping students view themselves as researchers. The Teaching for Transfer course (TFT) that Liane Robertson and Kara Taczak designed teaches students key writing concepts while engaging students in a semester-long reflective exercise of creating their own theory of writing. Creating this theory enables students to access the concepts and processes learned in TFT and apply them flexibly and reflectively in other contexts (Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak).

What all WAW courses have in common is the use of readings on writing in order to “build procedural and declarative knowledge about and experience with writing” (Downs 1). By teaching students both procedural and declarative knowledge about writing by means of a writing curriculum, students gain a deeper understanding of academic discourse. As they compose their thoughtful responses to these academic readings, students are invited to participate as scholars in the academic community. Both these outcomes of WAW courses make this approach ideal for teaching basic writers.

Although WAW might sound too advanced for basic writing courses, readings and concepts can be adjusted to any institutional context and student demographic. David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky's course (and book), *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts*, though not labeled as a WAW course, showed that using high-level texts as the readings for basic writers is very effective. Shari Sternberg's basic writing course has evidenced that complex concepts such as identity are certainly not too advanced for basic writing students to wrestle with. Similarly, Shannon Carter's basic writing students evidenced success in her basic writing WAW course focused on literacy (*The Way Literacy Lives*). In addition, there is a growing body of scholarship on the effectiveness of WAW in general, research that could apply to WAW in a basic writing course (see Downs for a bibliography up to 2010). For example, WAW as content in freshman writing courses has been

shown to improve transfer (Wardle), academic dispositions (Driscoll and Wells), and self-efficacy as writers (McCracken and Ortiz).

Thus, WAW courses accomplish important writing outcomes that can be very effective for basic writing students, mostly due to the deep learning that stems from students reading, discussing, and writing papers *on* writing concepts. Like all WAW courses, my basic writing WAW course gives students opportunities to deeply interact with academic concepts in a variety of ways: annotating readings, participating in class discussions on the main concepts, personally applying these concepts, and finding one's own connections to specific claims or to larger ideas in the readings. Just as writing in a disciplinary course improves students' grasp of key ideas, writing about writing deepens students' understanding of writing concepts (see Tagg for a great discussion of deep learning and Bird for basic writers' deep learning).

EXPECTATIONS, DISPOSITIONS, AND OPPORTUNITIES: A THREE-UNIT BW COURSE

To develop students' writer identities, I designed a basic writing WAW course that combines Bartholomae's and Ivanič's course goals: students should understand the key purposes for academic writing (Bartholomae) and cultivate academic writer dispositions that lead to a writer identity (Ivanič). The purposes and dispositions gained through the curriculum are applied in daily work and writing assignments. These are the three units in my basic writing WAW course:

- 1) Autobiographical identity: generating personally meaningful, unique ideas
- 2) Discoursal identity: making clear claims and connecting evidence to claims
- 3) Authorial identity: performing intellectual work, specifically through elaboration and critical thinking

The first unit begins with my teaching the meta-purpose for academic writing: joining conversations. The foundational text is Charles Bazerman's "A Relationship between Reading and Writing: The Conversation Model," which is an important base for two reasons. First, it presents the foundational academic discourse purpose in a form that students already have experience with—a conversation. Second, it unveils one of the most important discourse and identity expectations—that writers must understand what others have

said and must contribute something new to the conversation. Students gain “a sense of their own opinions and identity defined against the reading material” (Bartholomae “A Relationship” 659). In the process of expressing their own ideas and identities, they discover that these ideas, experiences, and prior knowledge *matter* to the academic community—their professors expect to see “an original, informed view” and not “a derivative research report” (Bartholomae 660). This explicit encouragement to develop, or author, their own ideas helps students connect their multiple identities to an academic one in meaningful ways. Students begin to view academic writing as “associated with [their] sense of their roots, of where they are coming from, and [understand] that this identity they bring with them to writing is itself socially constructed and constantly changing as a consequence of their developing life-history” (Ivanič *Writing* 24). When basic writing students see academic writing in this holistic sense, integrally connected to who they are and are becoming, they gain significant motivation to invest as writers.

To further help basic writing students view themselves as capable of making claims that are their own ideas, the next two readings teach students that all reading is interpretation and all readers create personal meaning. Mariolina Salvatori’s “Reading and Writing a Text” explains that readers develop meaning from texts through their interpretive processes, which most often means readers are interpreting from their personal history and/or prior knowledge. Then readers in turn generate their own texts to contribute to the conversation. Salvatori’s article emphasizes the power of interpretation in creating meaning for both writers and readers: writers make their interpretation of both ideas and sources explicit for readers, and readers engage each text through their own set of lenses. In Lynn Quitman Troyka’s “The Writer as Conscious Reader,” basic writing students grasp the role of prediction and redundancy in this interpretation process, learning how to express their own meanings in ways that readers understand. This unit teaches two dispositions: viewing texts as interpretations (not facts) and developing confidence to create and express their own interpretations. These dispositions are supported by daily quote-responses that push students to “talk to” the author, creating their own response to the author’s ideas.

In the second course unit, students focus on making clear claims and connecting those claims to their evidence (quotes or examples). The readings we use in this unit focus on holistic involvement as writers because this involvement helps basic writing students personally care about the concrete details of academic discourse expectations. Without this holistic connection, learning discourse expectations would turn into mere mimicry. So this unit

helps students to see how their affective dispositions toward writing make all aspects of academic writing meaningful. Specifically, they learn from Toby Fulwiler's "Looking and Listening for my Voice" the value of their own voice and how their readers interpret their voice based on their use of discourse conventions. They read in Alice Brand's "The Why of Cognition" how to use emotions to enhance both their and their readers' connection to their ideas. These two readings highlight the importance of creating claims (their main ideas) that are personally relevant and how attending to details improves how their readers interpret their writer identity. In William Zeiger's "The Exploratory Essay," students likewise learn how to develop an inquiry disposition to enhance their ideas. These readings and applied concepts alter students' sense of academic expectations: instead of being *rules they must follow*, expectations become practices they want to employ to accomplish their internally motivated writing goals.

The third unit teaches basic writing students how to intellectually engage as writers to develop their claims. In the first unit, they learned how to create unique claims; in this unit, the focus shifts to fully developing those claims. The first reading, "The Novice as Expert" by Nancy Sommers and Laura Salze, helps students understand the necessity of deeply engaging as writers in order to give something from themselves (identities and personal ideas). Charles Bazerman's "Intertextuality" helps students understand how to use connections between their personal views and prior scholarship to fully develop their claims. This unit ends with a return to discourse identity in two forms: an overview of grammar and its role in academic writing and an ongoing assignment that requires students to find and correct all major errors in their papers by taking their papers to the Writing Center. All assignments focus on how disruptions in discourse expectations skew the readers' interpretation of students' writer identity.

Beyond the foundational purpose of contributing to conversations, all three units help students understand additional writing purposes involved within the three writer identity components and the dispositions that enable students to develop each identity component. As Perkins and Unger note about deep understanding, "To plan, invent, predict or otherwise make good use of a mental representation, one must not just have it but operate with and through it" (97). These basic writing students, through daily assignments, apply the mental and affective representations of academic writing that they learn through course curriculum and pedagogy, applications that allow them to "operate with and through" their academic writer identity. By teaching students writing concepts that they mentally reflect on as part of

their own identity, they begin to perform as academic writers *operating with* their understanding while being meaningfully involved as novice scholars.

RESEARCH INTO WRITER IDENTITY INTERPRETED FROM STUDENT TEXTS

All three teachers of this course saw significant growth in our basic writing students' holistic development of their own academic writer identities. We would email each other periodically, especially near the end of the semester, with comments about how pleased we were with particular students or with the whole class. Specifically, we noticed that a stack of essays became increasingly distinguished, one from the next, as students improved their authorial identity. In students' final essays, we found much clearer claims, and most students connected their quotes to their claims. Finally, we saw significant expansion of depth, logic, and discussions of each claim, evidencing stronger discursive identity.

These and other results seemed to be sure signs of an effective curriculum, but I wanted more concrete evidence: which writer identity components were developed the most, in what ways did students maintain (or not) their writer identities across time, and was any growth in writer identity due to the course or what all students evidence from simply being in college? To answer these questions, I created a series of research studies. I developed three different comparative studies on the effectiveness of this curriculum, which I report below, using textual analyses of forty-seven student papers, identifying characteristics in students' writing that evidence each of the three components in academic identity performance: autobiographical, discursive, and authorial.

Methodology: Collecting and Coding Student Papers

My research process began the summer of 2010 at the first Dartmouth Research Institute where I gained significant knowledge from lead composition researchers and feedback on my ideas about writer identity and how it can be seen in student writing. I began my first study in the fall of 2011 by requesting that every basic writing student at my small liberal arts college electronically submit their first and last essays from the course. Since I wanted to also understand how my basic writing students' writer identities shifted across time, in the following spring, I requested the same group of students who sent me their fall basic writing papers to also send me their freshman

writing papers. After beginning to sift through this data over the summer of 2012, I wanted to explore how the basic writing students differed from students who did not have this (or any similar) content. So in the fall of 2012, I asked all basic writing students as well as freshman writing students from four classes that did not have content on writing, to electronically send me their “most significant” paper. These three data collection points (fall 2011, spring 2012, fall 2012) resulted in five sets of student papers, totaling forty-seven papers: basic writing students’ first and last paper from fall 2011; those same students’ papers the following semester; and papers volunteered out of all the basic writing students and the freshman writing students in the fall 2012. Then I began coding.

Qualitative coding usually requires marking specific units of language within a text, units that range from words (like pronouns) to whole paragraphs. Though I quantified each of the three studies, with all forty-seven papers being from one institution, I know that the results of this research cannot not be generalized to all students everywhere; however, since there were thirty-nine different students involved in the three case studies, I believe my results could be translatable to other contexts.

As Cheryl Geisler notes in her *Analyzing Streams of Language*, when analyzing texts, coding schemes can be created in four ways: anchoring them in a source (or sources); using built-in comparisons; using intuition; and letting the data “speak to you” (60). I decided to begin by using a coding scheme anchored in both Ivanič’s research and the collaborative research of Amy Burgess and Roz Ivanič. Thus, my first coding scheme was divided into three sections—autobiographical writer identity, discoursal writer identity, and authorial writer identity. After my initial round of coding, I modified several specific codes in this scheme based on how I was “hearing” the data relate to both the theory and the course’s foundational concept of contributing to academic conversations. For example, in my first round of coding, I had a code for giving an example, but I dropped this code since it didn’t cleanly fit both the theory and the course’s foundational concept. I also combined several codes into larger conceptual categories in order to reduce the number of codes that showed up only a few times. I then defined each code and invited an outside reader to code ten papers to verify my codes and definitions. Finally, I recoded all papers a third time in order to both reconcile my coding and the outside reader’s coding and also to make sure my new coding scheme was aligned well with the data.

Since student papers varied in length, I needed to find the average number of words in each paper to more accurately compare papers. After

coding, I also counted the number of words within each code in order to more precisely determine how much each code was evidenced in student work since one code unit might be attached to three words in one instance while that same code is attached to thirty words in another instance.

Below I list each code category, the definition of the category, and the specific discourse components I coded. I labeled each writer identity category as a writing *performance* since these studies did not investigate students' sense of their own identity but instead looked at textual evidence of their writer identity, the identity performed. I also provide a representative passage for the code category. Here I am very careful to choose passages that were truly representative of the majority of passages marked with each code.

Coding for the Three Components

1. Autobiographical Component: Contributing One's Own Ideas:

Definition: Claims that show some originality and examples from the writer's experience or prior knowledge.

Text marked as autobiographical writing performance has these characteristics:

- Making a claim that is the writer's own idea
- Making a claim that applies a known idea in a new way or to a specific issue
- Making a claim that is a "twist" on a known idea
- Giving an example from the writer's experience or prior knowledge

The autobiographical component of academic writing performance is representing self—one's own ideas or experiences. Burgess and Ivanič express this component as that which "the writer brings with her to the act of writing . . . all her experiences of life up to that moment with their associated interests, values, beliefs, and social positionings" (238). Ivanič terms this component the "*writer-as-performer*" (emphasis original, "*Writing*" 24). Many freshman writers (both basic and non-basic) are used to writing essays with claims that are obvious, purely opinionated, or restatements from a source. None of these types of claims would be considered autobiographical. Opinionated claims may be the writer's own idea, but students provide no evidence or support; claims that were coded as the writer's own ideas are followed with at least some support. Bartholomae expresses what I coded as autobiographical identity in this way: "[students] don't originate a discourse,

but they locate themselves within it aggressively, self-consciously” (15). Of course, very few student papers, especially from freshmen, show *truly* original thinking at the level expected of academic professionals. However, there is a difference between a student merely repeating an idea she reads in a source and a student expressing her own take on that idea or expressing the idea in a personally unique way. This coding tries to capture the move away from purely (and usually mindlessly) repeating exactly what the student writer had heard or read and toward self-representation.

Thus, I coded students’ claims as “own idea” if the claim differed from the source(s) the student cited or if the claim clearly reflected the student’s own background (as evidenced in the paper). For example, this text was coded as autobiographical: “The more we use our voice in a piece of writing, the more a reader can get to know us as a writer and that is where the emotional risk comes into play.” This student was writing about voice after reading Toby Fulwiler’s article, “Looking and Listening For My Voice.” Though the student clearly referenced ideas in Fulwiler’s article, this sentence is somewhat unique, not something that is obvious, well-known, or that exactly replicates Fulwiler’s ideas. Here is another example: “Instead we should structure our papers based on what others have said and continue with the conversation interjecting our personal thoughts along with comments.” This student’s paper was in response to Charles Bazerman’s article, “A Relationship between Reading and Writing,” and the student’s claim reflects, but is not identical to, Bazerman’s main idea in this article.

2. Discoursal Component: Making Clear Claims and Linking Evidence to Claims

Definition: Either making a clear claim or relating evidence (examples or quotes) to a claim.

Text marked as discoursal writing performance has these characteristics:

- Making a clear claim
- Defining a term (rarely seen in these texts)
- Relating a quote to a claim
- Relating an example to a claim

To keep a tight focus, I narrowed the indication of discoursal identity from Ivanič’s explanation of it. In Ivanič’s earlier work, she describes this component as “the way [the writer] wants to sound” (*Writer* 25), which is quite broad. Later, though, with Amy Burgess, she somewhat refined that description of the discoursal component: “This is the representation of her self, her view of the world, her values, and beliefs that the writer constructs

through her writing practices; her choices of wording; and other semiotic means of communication” (Burgess and Ivanič 240). To capture the “representation of self” in this component, I included connections between claims and quotes and between claims and examples. These connections show the writer’s effort to focus her reader on her own claims and not let examples or quotes take center stage.

This discursal component of the academic writer identity includes sentences that explicitly tie a quote or an example to a claim. These kinds of connectives are expected in academic papers, indicating writers are using sources credibly since the writers connect the source to their claim. For example, a student had this claim: “A conversation consists of two or more people exchanging ideas, opinions, and comments with each other; this is also what we need to achieve when we write.” Under this claim, later in the paragraph, he used this quote: “Charles Bazerman [sic] sums up what writers ought to do when he said, ‘[i]ntelligent response begins with accurate understanding of prior comments, not just of the facts and ideas stated but of what the other writer was trying to achieve’ (658).” And the student then linked this quote to his claim: “He talks about actually knowing what the previous authors have said and meant within their text, so that we can logically respond to what has been said.” The expected discourse conventions for college writing include showing the audience how you are using a source and how it connects with the claims you are making.

Additionally, crafting clear claims is a “semiotic means of communication” (Burgess and Ivanič 240) that is expected in academic writing; thus, I marked all clear claims as evidencing discursal identity. I also marked definitions since they contribute to the “representation of self” (Burgess and Ivanič 240). The majority of units coded in this discursal category were not definitions or the connectors to claims; the majority were claim statements. I chose to mark claims as evidence of discursal identity because I view discursal as being most distinct from the other two components in this way: discursal is the only component that emphasizes discourse conventions. Since making clear claims is one specific academic discourse convention that is expected in all disciplines, I wanted to focus on claims as evidencing discursal identity, that is, as one evidence that the student can perform as a writer of academic discourse. For example, this student’s text was coded as a claim: “A relationship between the reader and writer starts with the voice. It sets the story in motion.”

3. *Authorial Component: Displaying Intellectual Work (Depth and Development)*

Definition: phrases or sentences that evidence the writer's intellectual work.

Text marked as authorial writing performance has these characteristics:

- Rephrasing a complex quote in own words (rarely seen in these student texts)
- Discussing a quote or a claim
- Showing logical development or explanation

Authorial writer identity is textually seen as developing the writer's ideas through logic, explanation, or elaboration—the writer's intellectual work. Papers that evidence this component have a lot of discussion by the writer. As Ivanič notes, this is “how far [writers] claim authority as the source of the content” (*Writing* 26). Most freshmen throw in quotes and allow the quoted authors to have the authority, but students show their own authority when they discuss a quote or rephrase it in their own words. Though Ivanič only references “choice of content” (27) briefly, I chose to extend this aspect of authorial identity by marking all places where students explain or use logic to develop the content of their essays. For example, this excerpt is coded as “discussing a quote” within this category:

Many different people have already started a conversation based on or similar to your topic of your paper, so your job is to read and absorb what others have said about your similar subject [*claim*]. Familiarize yourself with prior comments and ideas, taking them into consideration and then respond. Effective speakers know when to interact with the conversation and give their input and we, as students, need to do the same every time we write. Our goal is to relate previous knowledge to new comments that are personal to us.

Here the student explains his idea, draws out implications, and creates a full discussion that incorporates his own ideas. Sentences marked with the authorial code express students' own thinking, which acts as a contribution (even though it might be a small contribution) to the academic discussion. This contribution is their own “content” (Ivanič) and is both an academic discourse expectation (Bartholomae) and reflective of students performing an identity as an academic writer (Ivanič).

A Basic Writing Course Design to Promote Writer Identity

Component	Auto-biographical: Creating New Ideas/ Claims and Expressing Unique Experiences	Discoursal: Making Clear Claims and Linking Evidence to Claims	Authorial: Contributing Intellectual Work (Discussion, Logic, and Develop- ment)
Definition	Phrases and sentences that evidence personal ideas, beliefs, or expressions	Phrases and sentences that either make a clear claim or relate evidence to a claim	Phrases and sentences that evidence the writer's own thinking
Specific codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making a claim or statement that is the writer's own idea • Making a claim or statement that applies a known idea in a new way or to a specific issue • Making a claim or statement that is a "twist" on a known idea • Giving an example from the writer's experience or prior knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making a claim • Defining a term • Relating a quote to a claim • Relating an example to a claim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rephrasing a complex quote in own words • Discussing a quote or claim, or showing logical development or explanation • Making a claim that explicitly differs from a source cited

Table 1: Summary of All Three Writer Identity Components

Analyzing the Data

After collecting all forty-seven papers across the two-year time span, I then began analyzing the data. I chose to conduct three sets of analyses in order to evaluate three different comparisons. The first comparison set was the first and last papers from the fall 2011 basic writing students. The second set included the same second (last paper) subset from fall 2011 and the "most significant" paper from these same students in the following semester (from their regular freshman writing class). The third set included the "most significant" paper from basic writing students in the fall of 2012 and the "most significant" paper of a control group, a group of students who were in the regular freshman writing class that same semester who had never had a WAW course. In summary, then, these are the three sets of papers for my three analyses:

- 1) The beginning paper and ending paper of the fall 2011 semester of basic writing students

- 2) The ending paper of the fall 2011 basic writing students and “most significant” paper at the end of spring 2012 freshman writing (from the same students who were in basic writing the prior fall)
- 3) The “most significant” paper at the end of fall 2012 for basic writing students and the “most significant” paper at the end of fall 2012 for freshman writing students

Since my overall goal was to find out, in general, how students in this basic writing WAW course developed and maintained (or grew) in the three writer identity components, I needed to quantify my results to see the general trend. In order to make sure I had accurate results, I asked a social scientist statistician to calculate both statistical significance and effect size. Statistical significance indicates how much confidence we have in inferring the results of the analyses. Do we trust that these results can be inferred to the population of students we are studying a smaller sample of? If the results are statistically significant, we do. Effect size is quite different. It indicates how big an empirical effect is. For example, if the results comparing some aspect of basic writers’ first paper to their last paper in a semester show statistical significance, it means we trust these results enough to infer them to the population of students our sample represents. Effect size, on the other hand, tells us how big a difference there was between the first papers and the last papers. A small effect size indicates a small change in the papers while a large effect size indicates a large difference between the first and last papers. Statistical significance is normally reported as being true or false although the actual mathematics are more complicated and based on probabilities. In these analyses all results were deemed statistically significant if they were significant at the $p < 0.05$ significance level (which is the commonly used level for statistical significance in social science research). Effect size was calculated using a statistical tool that provides a value ranging anywhere from zero to one. If the statistical tool (Cramer’s V is used in these analyses) produces a value of zero, there was no difference between the sets of papers. If the result is a V value near one (which is extremely rare), it would mean there was a huge difference between the sets of papers.

Eight of the nine analyses achieved statistical significance. With one exception, then, these results infer well to the population of students at the campus where the research was done. Being statistically significant, the results are worth considering, but then we need to consider the effect sizes to see just how big the change in writer identity was. For example, in the

first comparison group, the beginning-of-semester papers (1a in the chart below) showed nearly the same percentage evidence for writer identity in the discursal component as the end-of-semester papers (1b). Thus, the effect size measure is .05. There is a very small effect. Having a small effect does not mean that the comparison has no practical significance—it does. We often engage in practices that make small changes in our students but believe these changes are very important, and having a small effect means that there is indeed a change.

The full analysis of all three comparisons included a total of forty-seven student papers. There were twenty papers in the first analysis, eighteen papers in the second analysis (though ten of those papers came from the second set of the first analysis), and nineteen papers in the third analysis.

1a) Fall 2011 BW, first paper 10 papers	1b) Fall 2011 BW, last paper 10 papers	2a) Fall 2011 BW, last paper (the same set of papers as in 1b)	2 b) Spring 2012 FW, last paper (from the same student group as those in both 1b and 2a) 8 papers	3a) Fall 2012 BW 9 papers	3b) Fall 2012 FW 10 papers
9,260 words	15,966 words	15,966 words	16,009 words	7,260 words	10,142 words
Average words per paper: 926	Average words per paper: 1,596	Average words per paper: 1,596	Average words per paper: 2,001	Average words per paper: 807	Average words per paper: 1,014

Table 2: Summary of Student Papers Used in the Three Analyses

Comparison 1: BW students' first and last papers: Improving thinking and claim articulation (authorial and discursal identity)

The first analytical study aimed to assess how students' evidence of academic writer identity changed across the semester in each of the three academic writer components, comparing students' first and last papers for the course.

Academic Writer Identity Components	Fall 2011 BW First Paper	Fall 2011 BW, Final Paper	Size of Effect
Autobiographical Component	22.5%	15.5%	.08 small effect
Discoursal Component	11%	15%	.05 very small
Authorial Component	42%	47%	.04 very small

Table 3: First Comparison: BW Students' First and Last Papers

In the first set of BW papers, the autobiographical component, which is expressing students' own experiences or views, decreased across the semester. In the first paper, students, on average, evidenced this component in 22.5% of the total words, and in their final paper, students displayed autobiographical elements in 15.5% of the total words. Although this component decreased, since there was an increase in both discoursal and authorial components, this reduction in voicing personal views most likely indicates that the higher percentage of thinking and connecting their evidence to their claims might be what caused the percentage of words expressing personal views or experiences to be lower. In other words, as students expanded the percentage of words given to their idea development, they lowered the percentage of words given to claim articulation: few claims and more discussion.

Students increased their use of the discoursal component, which represents students' articulation of clear claims and their connections between evidence/quotes and their claims (instead of merely "plopping" in quotes or evidence). The students' first papers had on average 11% and their final papers had on average 15% of the words indicating this discoursal component.

In this set of papers, we see an increase in the authorial component, which means students increased the amount of thinking they expressed in their papers. The students' first papers had on average 42% of the words coded for authorial, and their last papers had on average 47% of the words coded for this component. Thus, students improved in how much they demonstrated their own thinking, mostly through logical development or discussion/explanation of ideas.

The increase in the percentage of both authorial and discoursal components, though small, is a real statistical effect. Since these two components are often markers of what we might loosely term, discussion, it appears that students in this type of WAW basic writing class expand the percentage of words used to discuss their claims.

Comparison 2. Students in BW class and the following semester: Increasing claim connections (discoursal identity)

Although my longitudinal study is only comparing results from fall to spring semesters of one school year, this brief longitudinal analysis still provides some indication of how well these academic writer identity components continue to be present in basic writers' work.

As we can see in Table 4, overall, there is an increase in the percentage of two of the three components of academic writer identity.

Academic Writer Identity Components	Fall 2011 BW, last paper^a	Spring 2012 FW, last paper^a	Size of Effect
Autobiographical Component	15.5%	17%	.12 small
Discoursal Component	15%	29%	.16 moderate
Authorial Component	47%	46%	.005 no effect ^b

Table 4: Second Comparison: Students in BW Class and the Following Semester

a. Since many sections were coded with more than one code, these percentages may exceed 100% and since not every word or sentence is coded, the percentages may not reach 100%.

b. This component did not make statistical significance and had no effect.

In the autobiographical component, there was a small effect of the statistically significant difference in percentages of words devoted to expressing students' own ideas or experiences, with this writer component being 15.5% of words in the fall and increasing to 17% in the spring papers.

Students improved most dramatically in the discoursal component, connecting examples, quotes, and evidence to their claims. The discoursal component showed not only a statistically significant increase but also an increase that has a stronger effect, improving from 15% in the fall student papers to 29% in the spring papers. This increase had a moderate effect.

The authorial component basically remained the same. In order to better understand why these students did not increase the percentage of words indicating their own thinking or analysis (authorial), I looked more closely

at the number of instances of authority phrases/sentences. I found a higher percentage of times students in the spring class used *logical development* compared to the other two codes in authorial writer identity, “rephrasing an author’s claim” and “making a different claim than an author”. In the fall, the basic writing students had, on average, 82% of the authorial code being logical development, and in the spring, these students had, on average, 92% of the authorial code being logical development. In other words, even though the overall number of words marked with authorial went down from the fall, the words coded as *logical development* increased. This means that students used fewer words marked as claims and more words marked as logical development in the spring semester than in the fall semester. Thus, even though the overall percentages for the authorial component remained basically the same across the year, these basic writing students still evidenced improvement in one aspect of this authorial component: logical development.

Comparison 3. Students in BW and FW: Expanding logical development (authorial identity)

Out of the three comparative studies, this one was the only one that used two very different groups of students: those who placed into basic writing and those who were exempt from basic writing.

Overall, despite being placed in a lower-level writing course, the papers from the basic writing students evidenced higher levels of authorial and autobiographical components and a lower level of the discursal component compared with the papers from the FW students.

Academic Writer Identity Components	Fall 2012 BW, their “most significant” paper of the semester	Fall 2012 FW, their “most significant” paper of the semester	Size of Effect
Autobiographical	9%	3%	.13 very small
Discursal	13%	17%	.06 very small
Authorial	23%	10%	.18 moderate

Table 5: Third Comparison: BW and FW

For the autobiographical component, the BW papers evidenced this trait in about 9% of the students’ total words compared with 3% in the FW papers. This means that the BW students displayed more of their own ideas,

either in claims or in examples, than the FW students. Though several FW papers included significant portions of their papers that were life narratives, these sections were not coded as “autobiographical” since I wanted to restrict this code to students’ ideas and students’ experiences that were specifically tied to claims as examples. In other words, a paper that merely told a story about an event would not fit the academic goal of contributing to conversations, whereas a paper that made claims that were students’ own ideas and gave personal examples to support those ideas would fit this academic writing goal and thus be marked with this category code. Narratives from either the BW or FW students were not included in this analysis.

The BW papers, though, had less of the discursal component. Since this component is making claims and relating ideas to claims, in light of the research finding on development/logic in the authorial analysis, it is probable that the BW students spent a higher percentage of their words on developing fewer claims, and the FW spent a higher percentage of their words on making more claims but not developing each claim as much.

The higher percentage of the authorial component in the BW papers compared with the FW papers is actually the strongest effect results in this entire research. The BW papers had 23% authorial component compared with the 10% in the FW papers. Of the three qualities in this component, the discuss/reason/explain quality showed the greatest contrast between the BW papers and the FW papers. The basic writing students had a higher percentage of words developing their ideas than the freshman writers.

Looking at the authorial and autobiographical components together, the BW student papers had more of their own input—more of their own ideas (the autobiographical component) and more of their own authority as academic thinkers (the authorial component).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

My basic writing WAW course is grounded in writer identity theory, especially drawing on ideas from David Bartholomae’s “Inventing the University” and from Roz Ivanič’s work. This basic writing WAW course teaches students one meta-purpose of academic writing, to contribute to scholarly conversations. It also teaches other academic purposes connected to the three components of writer identity: to contribute one’s own personally meaningful ideas to the academic conversation (autobiographical), to fulfill academic discourse expectations by connecting evidence and quotes to claims (discursal), and to perform their own intellectual work by adding

depth and development of ideas (authority). Thus, the course equips students to build their own writer identities as they begin to holistically understand and incorporate key academic writing purposes and dispositions.

The three comparative research studies showed that this basic writing WAW course improved students' academic writing in these ways:

1. Across one semester in this basic writing WAW course, students improved discourse proficiency and expanded their intellectual work (their authority). They improved the amount of discussion, explanation, and logic used in their papers to show greater authority; they also increased the number of words used to relate evidence to their claims to display greater discursual competence.
2. From the end of their basic writing WAW course to the end of their following semester's regular freshman writing course, students further increased their authority with expanded discussion and intellectual contributions.
3. At the end of both the basic writing WAW course and four non-WAW freshman writing courses, the basic writing students had significantly greater authority evidenced in their papers. Specifically, the basic writing students used a significantly higher percentage of words to develop their ideas as intellectual contributions than the freshman writers. In addition, basic writing students had more claims that expressed their own ideas than the freshman writers. Taken together, basic writers evidenced more of their own input—more of their intellectual work (the authorial component) and more of their own ideas (the autobiographical component).

Thus, basic writers demonstrated improvement (first study), short-term transfer (second study), and expanded intellectual contributions—their authority—as compared with freshman writers (third study).

Beyond the one-year transfer studied in this research, other transfer outcomes from this course can be anticipated based on research on the role of the affective in learning. For instance, confidence and motivation have the greatest likelihood of transferring beyond FYC (Nelms and Dively; Pea; Wardle). Because students tend to naturally be more motivated as writers when expressing their own ideas and beliefs, students will more likely continue to use what they know about academic discourse purposes when they view academic writing as opportunities to contribute their own per-

spectives. Additionally, having dispositions toward academic writing—for example, knowing to view writing assignments as being an opportunity to join conversations—increases the likelihood of transfer (Bereiter; Driscoll and Wells). Personal investment and a sense of belonging in academia have been evidenced as contributing to future academic success (Brook; Haskell; Geisler *Academic*; Lucas). In fact, belonging is so critical that Brook emphasized this affective attribute as necessary *before* students can become academic writers, saying that students “must first see themselves as more than just students in our classrooms, as real thinkers with power and ability” (152).

All of these scholars note that achieving transfer requires several key academic expectations and dispositions, most of which are taught in this basic writing WAW course: how to contribute new ideas, how to present themselves as academic writers, and how to contribute their own intellectual work in support of their claims. This course emphasized internalizing and individualizing the academic concepts and dispositions, and whatever is internalized is far more likely to transfer across domains and time than rules that are reproduced in mere mimicry.

ALTERNATIVE APPLICATIONS OF WAW AND WRITER IDENTITY

First, as mentioned above, the course described in this article is only one approach of many WAW course options. Although WAW approaches have been used in some form for over a decade (a few composition experts have used some versions of WAW long before it was labeled “WAW”), with the exception of Deborah Dew’s course (see Dew’s 2003 *WPA* article), research on WAW for basic writing courses has been a more recent trend. Starting in 2010, there have been six Conference on College Composition and Communication presentations on WAW and basic writing (including a short workshop presentation), and a 2009/10 issue of *BWe* which highlighted three articles on basic writing WAW courses (Bird; Carter; Charlton). This article extends this recent trend, and the empirical research reported here will hopefully encourage others to use a WAW basic writing curriculum that intentionally invites students to *participate as scholars*—emphasizing high-level academic participation and dispositions toward writing.

Second, this application of writer identity theory can be applied in various ways. Literacy scholars have been developing this theory for decades (Burgess and Ivanič; Hyland; Ivanič; Ivanič and Camps; Starfield; Stacey; Street). Recently, composition scholars have been using this theory in our own research (Hull; Lu; Roozen). Additionally, a new journal is devoted to

this issue: *Literacy in Composition Studies*. Since writer identity seems to be tied to both transfer and deep learning, we need more research in composition studies on how this theory supports the teaching of writing.

We all want to help our basic writing students gain access to the academic community and gain the confidence and expertise necessary to represent themselves in academic conversations. This access and expertise requires immersion in academic texts and in concepts that lead students from mimicking academic discourse (Bartholomae) to participating holistically, self-identifying as academic writers. Since students are “positioned by the discourses they participate in” (Burgess and Ivanič 237), we can significantly improve students’ ability to participate by teaching them core writing concepts and encouraging academic dispositions. This teaching, though, must also include opportunities for “[involving them] in scholarly projects” (Bartholomae 11). That is, basic writing students need to “operate with and through” academic writing concepts and dispositions. This kind of WAW curriculum and pedagogy equips basic writers to do more than mimic: they can authentically perform their academic writer identities as those who belong.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback and thank my writing center consultant, Hannah Adderley, for her expertise as a close reader. Dr. Steve Bird is the social scientist who calculated the statistical significance and effects used in this research and who significantly contributed to the methods section. Without his help, my analysis would not have been possible. Most importantly, I am truly grateful to Hope Parisi, co-editor of JBW, for her patience and generous feedback.

Works Cited

- Bartholomae, David. “Inventing the University.” *Journal of Basic Writing* 5.1 (1986): 4-23. Print.
- Bartholomae, David, and Anthony R. Petrosky. “Facts, Artifacts, and Counter-facts: A Basic Reading and Writing Course for the College Curriculum.”

- A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*, Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Longman, 1987: 275-306. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles. "A Relationship between Reading and Writing: The Conversational Model." *College English* 41.6 (1980): 656-61. Print.
- . "Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts." *What Writing Does and How it Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Ed. Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior. New York: Routledge, 2004. 83-96. Print.
- Bereiter, Carl. "A Dispositional View of Transfer." *Teaching for Transfer: Fostering Generalization in Learning*. Ed. Anne McKeough, Judy Lupart, and Anthony Marini. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995. 21-34. Print.
- Biggs, John. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*. Buckingham, England: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open UP, 1999. Print.
- Bird, Barbara. "Meaning-Making Concepts: Basic Writer's Access to Verbal Culture." *Basic Writing e-Journal* 8/9 (2009/10): n. pag. Web. 20 Apr. 2014.
- Brand, Alice G. "The Why of Cognition: Emotion and the Writing Process." *College Composition and Communication* 38.4 (1987): 436-43. Print.
- Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy as Involvement: The Acts of Writers, Readers, and Texts*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. Print.
- Burgess, Amy, and Roz Ivanič. "Writing and Being Written: Issues of Identity Across Timescales." *Written Communication* 27.2 (2010): 228-55. Print.
- Carter, Shannon. "Writing About Writing in Basic Writing: A Teacher/Researcher/Activist Narrative." *Basic Writing e-Journal* 8/9 (2009/10): 151-169. Web. 20 June 2014.
- . *The Way Literacy Lives: Rhetorical Dexterity and Basic Writing Instruction*. New York: SUNY Press, 2009. Print.
- Charlton, Jonnika. "Seeing is Believing: Writing Studies with 'Basic Writing' Students." *Basic Writing e-Journal* 8/9 (2009/10). Web. 20 June 2014.
- Dew, Deb Frank. "Language matters: Rhetoric and Writing I as Content Course." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 26.3 (2003): 87-104. Print.
- Downs, Doug. "Writing-About-Writing Curricula: Origins, Theories, and Initial Field-Tests." *WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies*, No. 12. (2010). Web. 14 June 2013.
- Downs, Doug, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching About Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)envisioning 'First Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication* 58.4 (2007): 552-84. Print
- Driscoll, Dana Lynn. "Department of Writing and Rhetoric." *Oakland Uni-*

- versity. (2014). n. pag Web. 20 June 2014.
- Driscoll, Dana Lynn, and Jennifer Wells. "Beyond Knowledge And Skills: Writing Transfer And The Role Of Student Dispositions." *Composition Forum* 26 (2012). Web. 14 June 2013.
- Flower, Linda. *The Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive Theory of Writing*. Southern Illinois UP, 1994. Print.
- Fulwiler, Toby. "Looking and Listening for My Voice." *College Composition and Communication* 41.2 (1990): 214-20. Print.
- Geisler, Cheryl. *Academic Literacy and the Nature of Expertise: Reading, Writing, and Knowing in Academic Philosophy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1994. Print.
- . *Analyzing Streams of Language: Twelve Steps to the Systematic Coding of Text, Talk, and Other Verbal Data*. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004. Print.
- Greene, Stuart. "The Role of Task in the Development of Academic Thinking Through Reading and Writing in a College History Course." *Research in the Teaching of English* 27.1 (1993): 46-75. Web. 1 August 2013.
- Haskell, Robert E. *Transfer of Learning: Cognition and Instruction*. San Diego: Academic Press, 2000. Print.
- Hyland, Ken. "Projecting an Academic Identity in Some Reflective Genres." *Ibérica* 21 (2011): 9-30. Print.
- Hull, Glynda A. and Mira-Lisa Katz. "Crafting an Agentive Self: Case Studies of Digital Storytelling" *Research in the Teaching of English* 41.1 (2006): 43-81. Web. 9 Sept. 2014.
- Ivanič, Roz. "Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write." *Language and Education* 18.3 (2004): 220-45. Print.
- . "Language, Learning and Identification." *Language, Culture, and Identity in Applied Linguistics*. Ed. Richard Kiely, Pauline Rea-Dickins, Helen Woodfield and Gerald Clibbon. London: Equinox, 2006. 7-30. Print.
- . *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Vol. 5. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 1998. Print.
- Ivanič, Roz, and David Camps. "I am How I Sound: Voice as Self-Representation in L2 Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10 (2001): 3-33. Print.
- Leamson, Robert. *Thinking About Teaching and Learning: Developing Habits of Learning with First Year College and University Students*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 1999. Print.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of Fast Capitalism." *College Composition and Communication* 56. 1 (2004): 16-50. Web. 9 Sept. 2014.

- Lucas, Leyland M. "The Role of Culture on Knowledge Transfer: The Case of the Multinational Corporation." *The Learning Organization* 13.3 (2006). 257-75. Print.
- McCracken, I. Moriah, and Valerie A. Ortiz. "Latino/a Student (Efficacy) Expectations: Reacting and Adjusting to a Writing-about-Writing Curriculum Change at an Hispanic Serving Institution." *Composition Forum* 27 (2013): n.pag 25 July 2013. Web. 20 Apr. 2014.
- Micciche, Laura R. *Doing Emotion: Rhetoric, Writing, Teaching*. Portsmouth: NH: Boynton/Cook, 2007. Print.
- Michaud, Michael. "Discoursal Negotiation of Identity in the Writing of Adult Students: A Case Study." *Writing Pedagogy* 5.1 (2013): 31-55. Print.
- Mlynarczyk, Rebecca Williams, and Marcia Babbitt. "The Power of Academic Learning Communities." *Journal of Basic Writing* 21.1 (2002): 71-89. Print.
- Nelms, Gerald, and Ronda Leathers Dively. "Perceived Roadblocks to Transferring Knowledge from First-Year Composition to Writing-Intensive Major Courses: A Pilot Study." *WPA: Writing Program Administrators* 31.1-2 (2007): 214-40. Print.
- Pea, Roy D. "Socializing the Knowledge Transfer Problem." *International Journal of Educational Research* 11.6 (1987): 639-63. Print.
- Perkins, David N., and Chris Unger. "Teaching and Learning for Understanding." *Instructional-Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory*. Vol. II. Ed. Charles M. Reigeluth. New York: Routledge, 2013. 91-114. Print.
- Perkins, David, Shari Tishman, Ron Ritchhart, Kiki Donis, and Al Andrade. "Intelligence in the Wild: A Dispositional View of Intellectual Traits." *Educational Psychology Review* 12.3 (2000): 269-93. Print.
- Piorkowski, Joan L., and Erika Scheurer. "'It's the Way that They Talk to You': Increasing Agency in Basic Writers Through a Social Context of Care." *Journal of Basic Writing* 19.2 (2000): 72-92. Print.
- Prior, Paul. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum, 1998. Print.
- Rodgers, Johannah. "Defining and Experiencing Authorship(s) in the Composition Classroom: Findings from a Qualitative Study of Undergraduate Writing Students at the City University of New York." *Journal of Basic Writing* 30.1 (2011): 130-55. Print.
- Roozen, Kevin. "From Journals to Journalism: Tracing Trajectories of Literate Development." *College Composition and Communication* 60.3 (2009): 541-72. Print.

- Salvatori, Mariolina. "Reading and Writing a Text: Correlations between Reading and Writing Patterns." *College English* 45.7 (1983): 657-66. Print.
- Sargent, Elizabeth, and Cornelia Catherine Paraskevas. *Conversations About Writing: Eavesdropping, Inkshedding, and Joining In*. Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Nelson, 2005. Print.
- Solomon, Gavriel, and David N. Perkins. "Rocky Roads to Transfer: Rethinking Mechanisms of a Neglected Phenomenon." *Educational Psychologist* 24.2 (1989): 113-42. Print.
- Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 124-49. Print.
- Stacey, Jennifer. "Writer Identity While Learning Discipline-specific Academic Literacy in an Additional Language." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 27.3 (2009): 345-56. Print.
- Stenberg, Shari. "Learning to Change: The Development of a (Basic) Writer and Her Teacher." *Journal of Basic Writing* 21.2 (2002): 37-55. Print.
- Street, Brian V. "At Last: Recent Applications of New Literacy Studies in Educational Contexts." *Research in the Teaching of English* 39.4 (2005): 417-23. 04 April 2013. Web.
- Tagg, John. *The Learning Paradigm College*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Co., 2003. Print.
- Troyka, Lynn Quitman. "The Writer As Conscious Reader." *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*. Ed. Theresa Enos. Manchester, MO: McGraw Hill, 1987. 307-17. Print.
- Wardle, Elizabeth. "Intractable Writing Program Problems, Kairos, and Writing about Writing: A Profile of the University of Central Florida's First-Year Composition Program." *Composition Forum* 27 (2013). Web. 20 Apr. 2014.
- . "Re: WAW." Message on WPA-L. 05 Sept. 2014. E-mail.
- . "Understanding 'Transfer' from FYC: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 31.1-2 (2007): 65-85. Print.
- Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. *Writing About Writing: A College Reader*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2014. Print.
- Yagelski, Robert P. "Literacy and Consequences: A Response to Kate Vieira." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 1.1 (2013): 56-59. Print.
- Yancey, Kathleen, Liane Robertson, and Kara Taczak. *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2014. Print.

A Basic Writing Course Design to Promote Writer Identity

Zeiger, William. "The Exploratory Essay: Enfranchising the Spirit of Inquiry in College Composition." *College English* 47.5 (1985): 454-66. Print.

Appendix: Curriculum

Authorial Component: Joining the Conversation by Contributing One's Own Thinking	
Reading texts as conversations	Bazerman
Personally connecting to texts	Salvatori
Examining academic writing	Troyka
Discoursal Component: Joining the Conversation Credibly Connecting Evidence to Claims	
Voice	Fulwiler
Emotion & writing	Brand
Connecting to academic essays	Zieger
Autobiographical Component: Joining the Conversation Authentically by Making a Personally Meaningful Contribution	
Authority as writers	Sommers & Salze
Intertextuality	Bazerman
Style, syntax, & grammar	excerpts from Hartwell and Lunsford; handouts

Readings Used

- Salvatori, Mariolina. "Reading and Writing a Text: Correlations between Reading and Writing Patterns." *College English* 45.7 (1983): 657-66. Print.
- Troyka, Lynn Quitman. "The Writer As Conscious Reader." *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*. Ed. Theresa Enos. Manchester, MO, McGraw Hill: 1987. 307-17. Print.
- Brand, Alice G. "The Why of Cognition: Emotion and the Writing Process." *College Composition and Communication* 38.4 (1987): 436-43. Print.
- Zeiger, William. "The Exploratory Essay: Enfranchising the Spirit of Inquiry in College Composition." *College English* 47.5 (1985): 454-66. Print.

- Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 124-49. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles. "Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts." *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Ed. Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior (2004): 83-96. Print.
- Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47.2 (1985): 105-27. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea A., and Karen J. Lunsford. "Mistakes are a Fact of Life: A National Comparative Study." *College Composition and Communication* 59.4 (2008): 781-806. Print.