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Where Does Writing Curriculum Come From?

Curriculum involves a conception of both the input to and the output of teaching and learning (Wiggins and McTighe, 2006: 6) and can “...start from input, process, or output,... [e]ach starting point reflect[ing] different assumptions about both the means and the ends of teaching and learning” (Richards and Rodgers, 2014: 364). Different approaches to writing are based in different educational traditions, which suggest different orientations to teaching and learning and are consistent with different writing practices. These different traditions and approaches shape the curriculum in writing courses and, more generally, in other courses where writing is a planned activity. They also shape the ways in which writing is and can be assessed.

Content-Centered Curriculum

While every course includes some specific content that will be taught, there is a long tradition in education for a course curriculum to be content-centered. The content-centered tradition for course design stems from a view of education as for the transmission and learning of specific content, or information, typically aiming for mastery of content within a specific subject-area or field. With a focus on content, the curriculum is typically based on forward design (Richards and Rodgers, 2014, ch. 21), in which the content to be taught drives all other decisions about teaching and learning. When content is the focus of design, curriculum planning starts with specification of the items to be taught in a syllabus. In some
cases of content-centered design, the syllabus is the curriculum, that is, there is no specification of teaching methods beyond the delineation of the content that is to be mastered. In other cases, a recommended order for teaching the content is part of the designed curriculum, and in still other cases, teaching approaches or activities are specified or recommended. Within this orientation, writing has often been taught as the mastery of conventions of written language and rhetoric, mastery of the form of language. This perspective on writing seeks to develop mastery of language form and conventions either independent of other content, that is, centering on written language as itself the content of instruction, or within specific content-areas (genres or disciplines). In addition, writing is often a main activity in content-based instruction (CBI), a curriculum approach practiced in English as a second language (Snow and Brinton, 1997) and in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), a curriculum approach practiced in the European Union (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010).

In the teaching of writing, the first of these two types of content orientation views the focus of instruction as language itself. It can be described as aiming for mastery of the grammar – or grammar and rhetoric – of written language, taken broadly to include not only syntax, that is, the structure of sentences, but also the structure of units larger than sentences, that is, paragraphs and whole compositions – with some focus as well on lexis, that is, on the words which build the content of sentences and larger units of writing. Within this tradition of content-focused education, for beginning learners such as children or non-literate second-language learners, curriculum units are broken down into small content-elements or bits of information, and then further content is added on, going from what is judged to be simplest to what is judged to be increasingly complex. In this orientation, writing is learned first as letters of the alphabet, then words, sentences, paragraphs, and multi-paragraph compositions. The focus is on mastering one level of content before proceeding to the next, which for writing means mastering the spelling of words before writing sentences, mastering grammar and punctuation of sentences before writing paragraphs, and mastering paragraph structure before writing a complete composition. In this way, the output of instruction is intended to be mastery of written language grammar (and rhetoric), from the smallest components of words to the largest structure of a whole composition. Around the world, this orientation is common in primary education and can sometimes be found also in secondary-level and university writing courses aiming to teach academic writing from a structural perspective focused on language and the organization of written units.

For learners who have basic language competence and literacy, a different type of content-focused writing pedagogy is common worldwide,
that of genre-based instruction, which is a typical approach to curriculum in elementary schools in Australia and New Zealand and also for first-year writing programs in the United States. Many writing courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) at secondary and university levels are also designed within the specific genre approach that goes by the name of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). At universities in the United States, Writing in the Disciplines (WID) has a strong content focus that connects writing to specific disciplines and their written genres and conventions, often as part of a broader Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) orientation. Different from the grammatical or structural orientation previously described, genre approaches link the study of language forms to the specific content of different genres or disciplines, for example, focusing on the language and organizational patterns of the genre of description or argumentation or of the written genres of biology or history. These approaches center on the language of specific, context-tied discourses or texts, and hence are described by Richards and Rodgers (2014, ch. 10) as “text-based instruction.”

In CBI, where the focus is primarily on learning language, the content for written work may be drawn from academic disciplines or may be thematic. In CLIL, where the focus is on learning content and language in tandem, the content tends to be closely tied to students’ academic subjects.

Assessment of content-centered writing pedagogy is naturally focused on the syllabus and materials and the extent to which that content has been covered by the teacher and mastered by the students. Assessment of writing is often a matter of marking final written products either holistically or summatively according to individual rhetorical criteria of content, organization, language and/or mechanics, and perhaps others related to specific types of assignments (e.g. correct referencing of sources or incorporation of required genre features). Using a componential approach with multiple criteria, each of which is marked separately, counters the tendency in holistic marking for surface level features of language involving word choice and mechanics to override other features of the written work, including global features of organization and content development. Most standardized testing of writing – including automated systems (Shermis and Burstein, 2013) – is content-centered and product-based. Such assessment is most commonly focused on formal properties of language as the most easily measurable aspects of written work, but sometimes with a limited genre focus as well, in which writing is judged according to criteria that assess adherence to linguistic and organizational features of specific genres such as description or argumentation. In content-centered curriculum where mastery of a specific body of knowledge is a goal, that mastery may be assessed either in whole or in part through written work completed as course papers or as essay exams.
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Process-Centered Curriculum

Rather than instructing for the mastery of content – as the starting point (input) of teaching and learning, and also often its de facto middle point and ending point (output) – curriculum may focus on the behaviors and processes involved in learning. Such centering on behaviors and processes stems from more interactional and interpretive views of teaching and learning as involving communication, thinking, and the acquisition of skills over time. With this type of focus, teaching is based less on the starting point of instruction and more on the processes involved in reaching learning targets and goals – that is, on the processes through which educational input is transformed in the learner to become intake or uptake to her/his own cognitive structure, skill-set, or values. It could thus be considered a type of curriculum based on what Richards and Rodgers (2014, ch. 21) refer to as central design. Importantly, process-centered curriculum as I wish to define it is tied to the mastery of specific skills or the achievement of other kinds of learning targets, in order to avoid what Wiggins and McTighe (2006: 16) refer to as “activity-oriented design... – engaging experiences that lead only accidentally, if at all, to insight or achievement.” It therefore includes elements of what Wiggins and McTighe (2006) and Richards and Rodgers (2014, ch. 21) refer to as backward design, meaning that the activities of teaching and learning are based on a view of specific learning outcomes towards which learners are meant to progress. A curriculum with this type of focus can therefore be described as one which zeroes in on what is essentially a “black box” in much content-centered instruction, that is, on the behaviors and processes of teaching and learning that lead to desired learning outcomes. Views of writing that privilege skills and composing processes are within this orientation, including the process approach as well as what has been referred to as writing-to-learn, most notably within WAC and also in CLIL. Writing may also be an integral part of process-centered learning activities, such as collaborative projects, in any course.

The process approach (for a brief overview, see Stanley, 2003) views writing as an extended activity and complex skill-set that incorporates different kinds of sub-activities, each of which has its associated skills. These are generally seen to involve:

- **Prewriting**, such as brainstorming and discussion to select and narrow a topic and begin to generate ideas related to that topic;
- **Drafting and revision**, both alone and potentially with verbal and/or written input from teacher and peers, to develop an organization of ideas and an effective presentation of the topic;
• *Editing*, sometimes targeted to specific features of language and sometimes with assistance from teacher or peers, to ensure clarity and error-free expression; and

• *Dissemination* or *publishing*, to class members or other audiences, as a way to interact with readers.

These sub-activities may be performed multiple times and recursively, building from the written material generated in one writing episode to the next, during the extended writing process. As characterized by White and Arndt (1991: 3), within the process approach writing is viewed as a “form of problem-solving which involves such processes as generating ideas, discovering a ‘voice’ with which to write, planning, goal-setting, monitoring and evaluating what is going to be written as well as what has been written and searching for language with which to express exact meaning.” Process writing emphasizes writing as a creative and gradual process of constructing meaning within goals of personal expression and communication with others.

In the definition provided by the WAC Clearinghouse (2014): “Generally, writing-to-learn activities are short, impromptu or otherwise informal writing tasks that help students think through key concepts or ideas presented in a course.” Activities such as short summary and response papers or learning logs, which can function as aids to both comprehension and memory, have additional functions different from interactional or transactional writing geared for an audience. As noted by Fulwiler and Young (1982/2000: x):

> We write to ourselves as well as talk with others to objectify our perceptions of reality; the primary function of this “expressive” language is not to communicate, but to order and represent experience to our own understanding. In this sense language provides us with a unique way of knowing and becomes a tool for discovering, for shaping meaning, and for reaching understanding…. [W]riting is [also] a value-forming activity, a means of finding our voice as well as making our voice heard. The act of writing allows authors to distance themselves from experience and helps them to interpret, clarify, and place value on that experience; thus, writers can become spectators using language to further define themselves and their beliefs. This value-forming activity is perhaps the most personally and socially significant role which writing plays in our education….

Writing-to-learn activities serve a variety of purposes of interpretive or constructive (Barnes and Schemilt, 1974; Vygotsky, 1978), transformative (as opposed to transmissive) education, including:

• Organizing learners’ knowledge and building individual knowledge structures;
• Consolidating learning;
• Interpreting experience;
• Putting the learner’s experience, knowledge, and understanding into a concrete form;
• Representing information from an individual learner’s perspective;
• Creating “critical distance” from the learner’s experiences that allows for reflection and value judgment, thus promoting critical thinking;
• Helping to form and refine values.

Writing-to-learn activities thus help to accomplish some of the broad, humanistic goals of education beyond mastery of specific subject-matter and conventions, serving to individualize and personalize learning.

While assessment of teaching often focuses on teaching and learning processes as observed in classes, students are rarely assessed based on their processes of learning. They may however be assessed on mastery of specific skills as an end-product of learning, but these are usually evaluated in terms of a concrete outcome rather than observation of behavior as it is occurring. An emphasis on behavior as it is occurring for assessment of writing could involve collecting evidence (e.g. in physical artifacts as well as by observation, videotaping, or automated record-keeping by computer) of students going through a staged writing process under testing conditions – starting, for example, with note-taking and outlining and then going through various stages of drafting, redrafting, and editing to a final written product. A staged and recursive writing process could be considered evidence of progress in learning how to write, even if the final composition produced were not at the desired level. It could also be valuable for purposes of formative assessment in pinpointing aspects of a student’s writing process that need strengthening and remediation (e.g. spending more or less time on the initial stages of preplanning and generating ideas or on micro-level rather than macro-level concerns in revision). In addition, learning can be assessed through the kinds of brief writing activities employed in WAC programs for writing-to-learn, which, given their purpose of exhibiting the learner’s individual understanding and point of view, and their generally informal and impromptu nature, can be reviewed to gain “a general sense of what students understand and don’t understand” (WAC Clearinghouse, 2014). Hence, rather than being marked as end-products, they can be used as a type of formative assessment of students’ learning as well as of their ability to express their own perspectives clearly and with an authentic voice in their writing.
Learner-Centered Curriculum

The learner-centered curriculum emerged in the 1980s in concepts such as *needs analysis*, basing instruction on learner characteristics and needs (e.g. Brown, 1995); *empowered learning*, giving learners increased power and autonomy in setting the direction and process of their learning (e.g. Freire, 1985); and *constructivism*, as learners’ construction of knowledge and of the self in interaction with others (e.g. Berger and Luckmann, 1991; Sullivan and Glanz, 2006: 15). Within a learner-centered curriculum, writing is viewed as a means for learners to achieve their own goals and to express and develop their identities – personal, social, and academic. Teachers assist students to achieve these outcomes by modeling writing processes and standards, providing opportunities for students to explore themselves and topics of interest through writing, and helping learners integrate aspects of their own personal experience and explorations into their writing. Two learner-centered orientations to writing pedagogy are *writing workshop*, which aims to create a classroom learning and writing community that supports the writing of individual students (Calkins, 1994), and writing activity within *culturally responsive pedagogy*, which incorporates students’ diverse experiences and cultures into their schoolwork to make it more personally meaningful and relevant by connecting to their individual and social identities (Gay, 2000; Taylor and Sobel, 2011). The process approach to composition typically incorporates individualization and personalization of writing, as do the writing-to-learn activities of WAC, and so these two process-centered orientations to writing can also be characterized as learner-centered.

Writing workshop, a highly influential K–12 approach developed by Lucy Calkins (Calkins, 1994) and others involved in a Teachers College (Columbia University) Reading and Writing Project, was designed originally to have students write stories about their own lives within a workshop model aimed to develop students’ sense of authorship and ownership of their own writing and to customize instruction to students’ specific writing needs and problems. The workshop model advocated by Calkins builds on notions of process writing in providing opportunities for students to write during class time, to build their writing in stages, and to interact with peers and the teacher on their writing. The workshop concept underlying this approach can be compared to that of a group of artisans (like those in the craft guilds of the Middle Ages) who come together to create new works. The role of the teacher is that of “writing coach” encouraging and assisting the writers as needed, including through explicit teaching and modeling in individual, small-group, and whole-class “mini-lessons.” Different from some process pedagogy, writing workshop specifically connects writing
and reading activities to build knowledge of genre, writing conventions, and the ways in which individual writers craft their works by use of specific features of language.

The Reading and Writing Project (2010) has developed formative writing assessment continua for grades K–8 as part of their writing workshop approach, with different continua for writing focused on information, opinion, or narrative. According to the Project website, the assessment instruments identify 12 levels of writing performance or development and are closely aligned to the U. S. Common Core State Standards. The website stresses that these are “works in progress” which teachers may find useful for seeing the developmental stages students might pass through in their writing and that the three continua considered all together can “show how the different types of writing are connected and how work in one bolsters the other” (The Reading and Writing Project, 2010). At the same time, the website states that

...no one tool captures all the lines-of-development that constitute growth in writing, and this tool is certainly no exception. For example, this tool does not allow you to assess a writer’s initiative, her fluency and speed, her capacity to critique her own writing, her habits and skills with revision, her abilities to learn from a mentor text, her tendency to draw from a full repertoire of skills that she has learned and to do so with increasing flexibility. (ibid.)

It appears that the assessment instruments developed for writing workshop are more focused on writing outcomes than writing process, as is true of most writing rubrics or evaluation criteria. Such behaviors as those listed above, which are rarely remarked in writing practice, show a writer’s acquisition of important long-range or “meta-writing” skills and so should be given more attention in writing curriculum and assessment. An advantage of the workshop approach, considered as a type of learner-centered pedagogy, is that the teacher regularly conferences with students and observes them as they write, and so gets to know students well as developing writers. This makes it possible for the teacher to assess individual students on long-range or meta-writing skills such as taking initiative (e.g. in selecting topics and aiming to be original), writing fluently and in quantity, and critiquing and revising their own writing. Kruch (2012, ch. 7) suggests that teachers following a writing workshop approach document and celebrate learners’ progress in acquiring desirable long-range and component writing skills and behaviors by creating an individual profile of each student writer, using various types of informal assessment. In addition, consistent with learner-centered pedagogy, students can be expected to perform self-evaluation, and to become increasingly skilled over time at diagnosing and seeking solutions to their own problems, as an aspect of increasing control over their own learning and writing process.
The notion of culturally responsive teaching offers a new way of framing writing pedagogy. Adapting from Taylor and Sobel’s (2011, ch. 6) description of educational environments that foster culturally responsive pedagogy, I propose the following as culturally responsive writing practices:

- Creation of writing-saturated and print-rich environments which include culturally diverse activities and materials, and display students’ own writing;
- Grouping of students in ways that they can experience difference as they learn from and support each other in their writing;
- Support of students’ writing through verbal and nonverbal activities and a variety of visual media;
- Incorporation of students’ spoken language registers and home languages within writing activities;
- Connection of students’ writing to family and community.

I would add a further feature of a culturally responsive writing pedagogy, which is:

- Inclusion of identity-related goals in the writing curriculum, such as making personal connections to topics, defining a unique and authentic writer’s voice, and growing in confidence as a writer.

A specific approach to writing related to culturally responsive pedagogy is that of identity texts, in which students tell and write about their own lives and experiences in any of the languages they know (Cummins, 2001; 2011; Cummins and Early, 2001).

Assessment of culturally responsive writing practices would include reviewing curriculum materials and activities for multicultural and multi-lingual content and focus, and specifically for connections to students’ own cultures, languages, families, communities, and individual identities as represented in the members of specific class groups. It would also make use of classroom observation to assess the extent to which teachers implement a learner-centered pedagogy for writing that maximizes the involvement of every individual in all aspects of classroom process.

Implicit Curriculum

Beyond the influence of the content to be learned, the processes of teaching and learning, and the characteristics of specific learners, the curriculum for writing is often influenced by institutional and technological factors which can become an implicit focus for the curriculum. An implicitly institution-centered writing curriculum can be recognized whenever students write only for a grade, for their teacher as audience, or for a non-authentic, pseudo-audience supplied in the assignment but not actually factored
into the writing purpose or process in any significant way. Such an understanding of purpose and audience by the student overrides other writing goals and becomes the hidden curriculum behind the writing that students produce. In addition, writing instruction that is tied to a standardized curriculum or standardized testing – as is usually the case for education at K–12 levels – contains a strongly institution-centered curriculum underlying, and often overriding, a more explicit curriculum. This implicit curriculum, which seeks to ensure uniformity and standards in the delivery and the outcomes of instruction, limits the influence of other factors in determining the features of writing instruction. It is in fact common in schools around the world for writing instruction to be driven at least as much by the limitations imposed in a standardized educational curriculum and testing program as by curriculum planning specifically focused on writing.

Another basis for writing curriculum that is often implicit rather than explicit, yet highly influential, is technology. As Bruce and Hogan (1998: 270) observe:

> We tend to think of technology as a set of tools to perform a specific function. These tools are often portrayed as mechanistic, exterior, autonomous, and concrete devices that accomplish tasks and create products. We do not generally think of them as intimately entwined with social and biological lives. But literacy technologies, such as pen and paper, index cards, computer databases, word processors, networks, e-mail and hypertext, are also ideological tools; they are designed, accessed, interpreted, and used to further purposes that embody social values. More than mechanistic, they are organic, because they merge with our social, physical, and psychological beings. Thus, we need to look more closely at how technologies are realized in given settings. We may find that technological tools can be so embedded in the living process that their status as technologies disappears.

The types of technology available have a major effect on education and on writing, especially in the current era, computers and course management systems in general or specific software geared for writing courses. Where available, each of these technologies can have an impact on writing practices as significant as, or more significant than, other explicit curriculum, as in the design of a university-level writing course for delivery via a Blackboard-type course management system (Remley, 2013), the teaching of writing in primary schools with laptop computers (Warschauer, 2009), or the use of a wiki for a collaborative project (King, in press). The factor of technology is also interactive with the institutional goals of standardized courses and testing, as online course management systems make these easier to deliver even as they restrict options for instructional design and
delivery. On the other hand, access to individual computers with Internet access exponentiates the options for innovation in writing and curriculum more generally.

Towards a Blended Curriculum

Each of the curriculum traditions represents a specific and so also a limited approach to education. It is therefore desirable to consider how the different curriculum orientations might be combined or blended in the teaching of writing.

A content-centered writing curriculum often relies heavily on teaching materials as the source of curriculum, focusing on the quantity and completeness of the content to be taught and learned, and underemphasizing instructional methodology. With a content focus, teacher and learner roles are typically defined in a traditional narrow and hierarchical expert–novice, giver–receiver relationship. When curriculum centers on the content to be learned, the teaching–learning process tends to be conceived in terms of transmission and reception of input, with little or no attention to how that input is transformed in going from teacher or curriculum content to learner. In the best case, as in much of CBI and CLIL, the focus on content is married to a focus on learning processes and language as communication that ensures less hierarchy between teacher and students, more interaction among students, and greater attention to how content can best be internalized. In some genre-based instruction, a strong focus on language and rhetorical conventions is moderated by an understanding that writing – and genre – cannot be learned only as language content but must also be learned as a form of action. In such cases, the learning of writing or genre as content is complemented by the learning of writing/genre as process, that is, as a means of accomplishing desired effects in other people. Crucial to the effectiveness of such process-oriented instruction is the empowerment of students to perform actions through writing/genre, that is, to use written language conventions for their own purposes and authentic audiences. As part of this empowerment, students need to feel able to maneuver within different genres and to follow and break conventions in order to satisfy their own writing goals. Thus, teaching and learning approaches that are learner-centered, aiming to build confident, engaged, and independent learners and writers intent on achieving their own personal, social, and academic purposes through writing, complement a focus on the language and structure of specific genres.

A process-centered curriculum may have less well-defined endpoints for learning than a content-centered curriculum, and may even intentionally
avoid targeting specific content that is to be learned (as in the Montessori approach to the education of children; North American Montessori Center, 2014), based on the view that exploratory activity has intrinsic value (as in Piaget's 1962 concept of the value of exploratory play in children) and will ultimately result in desirable outcomes which enable or facilitate learning. A process-centered curriculum may therefore aim to develop or enhance such qualities as learner motivation, initiative, and curiosity, under the assumption that these will lead to high engagement and pursuit of learning that consequently result in acquisition of skills and bodies of knowledge (i.e. content). With the affordances of modern media and the Internet, an exploratory, process-centered curriculum is possible for a writing course, in which teachers offer students guidance and support in pursuing their own interests and purposes for writing and in making use of electronic tools and resources for writing. Such a curriculum for writing is however unrealistic in conditions of limited technology and resources for exploration and, even when such resources are available, is restricted by institutional requirements for grading, accountability, and consistency of instruction. It is also not likely to succeed with older learners, who may benefit less from unstructured learning and play, and who may have instrumental motivations for learning and very specific learning objectives. Even children benefit from the structure provided by learning goals and targets for their writing. The alignment of process-oriented instruction with specific learning goals and content is therefore desirable, such as in university WAC/WID approaches combining writing-to-learn activities with discipline-specific content and learning goals, K–12 writing workshop approaches incorporating reading and explicit instruction in genre, and CBI and CLIL approaches that incorporate writing into communicative and process-oriented learning.

The individual learner, and so learner-focused needs analysis, is a logical starting point for the design of both the content and the process of instruction. Yet there is an often unstated and sometimes unrecognized difficulty in designing learner-centered curriculum in that no two learners are alike in their backgrounds, needs, learning styles, or learning goals. Entirely learner-centered curriculum is in fact an ideal which cannot be realized in practice. It is simply not possible to design a curriculum that takes all individual learner factors into consideration, and it is equally impossible (other than perhaps in individual tutoring) to implement a curriculum that perfectly matches instruction to each student. There is moreover a conundrum involved in the fact that customizing instruction for individual students can lead to unequal educational provision or opportunity across the student group as a whole. This problem is compounded by the fact that failure to implement a uniform or standardized curriculum will
make assessment difficult and potentially unequal and unfair. Rather, a curriculum based on the assumption of diversity, such as culturally responsive approaches to writing pedagogy, or one which allows for individualization and personalization, but within standardized features of content and process, as are provided in WAC and CLIL and as might be provided in process or genre approaches to writing, will be more realistic and workable in most educational contexts.

In sum, it would seem that blended approaches to writing curriculum can maximize the advantages and minimize the disadvantages of approaches that are exclusively content-, process-, and learner-centered. In so doing, they help to balance the competing requirements of education as transmission versus interpretation and construction of knowledge and culture, thereby allowing learners to build their minds and identities in ways that connect to the past yet reconstruct and reinterpret it as they also innovate to create the future.

Editor’s Perspective on Volume 6, Number 1

The Featured Essay for this issue, “Authorial Identity: A Graduate Student Odyssey,” is a case study in which Heather K. Olson Beal traces her own identity-altering journey during graduate school along the road to becoming a member of the community of academic writers in the Education field. We journey along with Olson Beal through six terms of her graduate study as represented in six key course papers which she wrote during that time, examining her practices in referencing the work of others, in explicitly referencing her own actions and experiences by use of first-person pronouns, and in employing questions for various discourse functions.

Olson Beal found that she improved the mechanics of referencing from the first to the last of her six papers but did not make progress in “building upon others’ work to establish [her] own space in the literature” nor in “mov[ing] beyond merely presenting other authors’ work.” Based on the explicit advice of an instructor, she incorporated personal introductory narratives in two of her papers and made statements describing her actions within her papers using I in overview and methodology sections. She also interjected her own voice and opinion in an observation report and in concluding remarks to papers by use of the pronouns I and we. Yet she continued to feel uncomfortable making her own authorial presence explicit in her papers. While she made significant use of questions to “set up a virtual debate” and “invite readers into a conversation,” her use of question strategies was consistent with her other analyzed language use in suggesting “her reluctance to stick [her] novice neck out and draw attention
to the weaknesses of another author’s argument.” The review of her writing practices in these three areas is followed by some general reflections on her experience integrated with suggestions for university writing instruction, in particular, for leading doctoral students to understand “that academic work [needs to] balance originality and conformity to norms regarding perspective, voice, tone, grammar, punctuation, and referencing conventions” and to view “the development of an authorial identity as a process rather than as an achievement with a finite end.”

In the first article of the Research Matters section, “Standards and Personalization in the Writing of Linguistically Diverse Students,” Kerry Anne Enright offers a detailed examination of three female secondary-level writers, two of them Spanish-English Mexican-origin bilinguals and one an English-only resident of California, as they evolve and complete a required senior-year project that centrally incorporates research and writing over the entire school year. The project aims to give students an opportunity for individualized study on a topic of personal interest that is to be written up as a report and displayed in a Senior Exhibition to panels of teachers, students, and community members. Students worked under the guidance of mentors and teachers in weekly tutorial periods and following a detailed project handbook and assessment rubric designed to satisfy state-level expectations based on national (U.S.) standards for writing performance.

Enright charts the students’ work, showing how the project’s goals of personalization of learning and adherence to standards came into conflict. Two of the students who followed the project guidelines and teachers’ suggestions closely “demonstrated deep attention to official academic standards of the written product, personalizing the project only as required within the explicitly standards of the rubric.” While these two students received B-level grades on their projects, a third student whose “project reflected deep personalization throughout the year…, with a personally and socially meaningful goal and well-defined outcome,” received a lower grade because she did not attend to project guidelines and deadlines as specified in the handbook. Yet this student, who was more independent and personally invested in her work, “produced the most sophisticated text” and the one which “met the rubric criteria better than any other essay.” The contrast of this student’s behavior and project outcome with those of the other two students raises a troubling issue of the extent to which a focus on standards promotes standardization rather than quality of writing. It also suggests the potential value in writing assessment of incorporating process-oriented criteria that show a writer’s acquisition of long-range or meta-writing skills such as taking initiative, working independently, putting a high value on originality, and showing ownership of one’s own writing process and expression.
The second Research Matters article ("Thinking like a Writer: Inquiry, Genre, and Revision") is by Virginia Crank, who investigates a student writer’s process of inquiry in performing an analysis of an advertisement. Starting from the position that a key aspect “of what it means to think like a writer is to sustain an inquiry mindset,” Crank examined a series of student written artifacts produced over a period of two weeks through activities designed to encourage new perspectives, alternative readings and points of view, and ongoing questioning of meanings, purposes, and immediate reactions and responses. These included various kinds of notes generated at different stages of the writing process, answers to key questions posed by the teacher, in-class freewriting and peer response, any outlines produced, a rough draft written prior to a teacher conference, any further drafts, and a polished draft. After holistically reviewing these artifacts for all of her first-year composition students, she focused on the artifacts generated by one student writer in the attempt to see more clearly the student’s inquiry and decision-making processes in moving from planning through drafting and revision of an essay.

The overall finding was that the student appeared not to continue her inquiry process once she had developed her own perspective on the advertisement she was to analyze. The student’s lack of inquiry focus was revealed in a number of behaviors: she abandoned many good ideas that did not fit easily into her original perspective; she responded to teacher queries about meaning and purpose with superficial editing changes; she maintained a writer-centered response rather than developing a critical response to the ad; and she did not make many changes in her writing after she had completed a draft of her essay, no matter how much input she received suggesting that she needed to. Crank draws on the student’s own writing to show how she largely maintained the position of a student completing an academic essay assignment rather than a writer involved in processes of inquiry and social action. In this sense, the student appears to be stuck within an institutional framing of writing that is the implicit or hidden curriculum of much writing in schools and universities. On the basis of the student writing problems uncovered in her investigation, Crank plans to put a greater focus on genre and its social and cultural context in aiding students to take a more critical stance in their writing and to maintain an inquiry mindset that “works within the frame of genre.”

In the first of two Reflections on Practice essays ("Intensive Writing Institute for Second Language Writers: A Bridge to University-level Academic Writing and Cultural and Institutional Expectations"), Zuzana Tomáš, Marie Isabel Gardett, and Erin Jensen describe an intensive hybrid course designed for international students and aiming to provide an “understanding of and experience with the processes, products, and expectations
relevant to authentic university assignments in a Western educational context.” The course curriculum was designed based on a thorough needs analysis and also involved formative evaluations from the students and the teachers towards continued development and improvement in the future. The needs analysis and the students’ responses suggest the value of focusing on cultural differences in expectations and practices between education in the receiving country (in this case, the United States) and the home country (in this case, China). In their evaluations of the course, teachers also noted cultural differences, including some problems that these engendered as well as some anticipated problems that did not occur. Recommendations for similar courses arising from the design and evaluation of the Intensive Writing Institute include providing pre-university orientation in the home country and ample language support for students parallel to their coursework, in addition to organized opportunities to interact with domestic students.

In the second Reflections on Practice article, “Extreme Puppet Theater as a Tool for Writing Pedagogy at K–University Levels,” Mark Spitzer, a creative writer and writing teacher, describes ways in which he has used group activities involving puppet performance in his university writing classes. Spitzer’s Extreme Puppet Theatre, which he encourages other teachers, from kindergarten right up to graduate level, to try, would seem to be a creative way to motivate students to explore ideas through language, both in the performance of the puppet shows and in the writing of related scripts or papers. As an extension of the puppet-based dramas Spitzer has had students perform in his classes, I would suggest that since the shows typically involve the puppets performing different arguments or perspectives on a topic, further writing could be done immediately post-puppet show or as homework by members of the puppet team as well as the audience summarizing and reflecting further on those topics, as writing-to-learn activities or as adapted to a broader writing workshop focus.

In his From the eSphere contribution, “From Typing to Touching: A Review of Writing with Natural User Interfaces,” David R. Gruber describes the trend moving computer-users from traditional computer graphic user interfaces (GUIs) focused on typing text, clicking, and the opening and closing of files to natural user interfaces (NUIs) that employ gestures and movement to operate the computer. Gruber first explores an NUI interface that makes it possible for a user to interact with a poem which is projected on the viewer:

The text is literally embodied such that viewers become participants and read their own bodies by reading text projected across their bodies. In this way, bodies become like pages of a book; but more than simple pages, the poem is read in its entirety only through body movement.
Gruber next explores two programs within art gallery exhibitions which “feature giant touch screens that allow visitors to paint abstract images or make comic books that re-imagine the ancient Greek story of Perseus through remixing images from a tapestry with the visitor’s own inserted text in thought bubbles.” His third example is a gesture-controlled armband that allows the user to operate the computer, thereby creating a rhetoric of writing which incorporates movement and bodily activity. This leads Gruber to propose that “NUIs might refocus the analysis of writing on how it is materialized, how it operates as a situated performance, and how it opens itself up to audience response or shuts down response.”

The New Books section includes reviews of four books on creative writing. In the first of these, Laura Valeri offers an enthusiastic endorsement of Stephanie Vanderslice’s Rethinking Creative Writing in Higher Education: Programs and Practices That Work, which she describes as “an instant classic, a must-read for anyone and everyone involved with creative writing, whether as a teacher, an administrator, or an aspiring professional writer.” The significance of Vanderslice’s book lies in what Valeri sees as the boldness of its vision for creative writing, as grounded in the author’s careful and extensive review of its past and current position, with illustrations from model academic programs. Valeri’s review is complemented by my own review of three books in Multilingual Matters New Writing Viewpoints Series: Carl Vandermeulen’s Negotiating the Personal in Creative Writing; Dominique Hecq’s edited collection, The Creativity Market: Creative Writing in the 21st Century; and Dianne Donnelly’s and Graeme Harper’s edited collection, Key Issues in Creative Writing. Vandermeulen’s book draws on survey, interview, and class observation data to make an effective case “for maximizing learning [in creative writing programs] in a psychologically non-threatening and interactive environment where students will be highly engaged and willing to take risks with their writing.” The two edited collections overlap the content of Vanderslice’s book and touch many of the same issues, with the editors and the individual contributors all generally reinforcing the points made by Vanderslice, thus suggesting that there is a general consensus in the field of creative writing about relevant issues and the way forward. Like Valeri, I assessed the reviewed books as “essential reading for scholars, teachers, researchers, postgraduate students, and administrators involved in any way in creative writing.”

References


**2013: The Year in Review**

In 2013, *Writing & Pedagogy* completed its fifth year of publication. The first (open topic) issue addressed the difficult position of adjunct teachers of writing, the struggles of an adult student attempting to negotiate an identity as a writer, the constraints and problems of designing an online writing course, and the literary practices and concerns of Mexican multilingual writers. The first issue of the year also contained two articles on use of computer analyses in academic writing and reviewed some evolutionary trends in writing pedagogy and a recent book on foreign language writing instruction. The second (special topic) issue centered on Teaching Writing with Technology and, as is typical for our special topic issues, was double-issue size, containing two editorials and thirteen articles. The breakdown of articles for Volume 5 was Editorial (3), Featured Essay (2), Research
Matters (5), Reflections on Practice (7), From the e-Sphere (2), and New Books reviews (3). As in the previous year, in two issues we published as many articles as some journals would in three or four. Content for Volume 5 centered primarily on university contexts in the United States but included one article focused on children’s writing and others focused on writers in Mexico and Taiwan. Contributors to Volume 5 included authors primarily from the United States but also from the United Kingdom, Hong Kong, and Peru. A first for Volume 5 was inclusion of an article by a manually impaired writer who writes using Speech Recognition software.

We thank all of our Editorial Board members, the authors who contributed articles to Volume 5, and the following additional reviewers for helping to keep W&P strong and growing in 2013:

- Olivia Archibald, Saint Martin’s University (USA)
- Mary Baron, University of North Florida (USA)
- Mark N. Brock, Cardinal Newman University (USA)
- Rebecca Ingalls, Drexel University (USA)
- Mark L. Richardson, Shenandoah University (USA)
- Candace A. Roberts, Saint Leo University (USA)
- Shelley K. Taylor, University of Western Ontario (Canada)
- Sherry Taylor, University of Colorado at Denver

This year Christopher John Hill continued as a part-time editorial assistant while pursuing his Ph.D. in the English Department of City University of Hong Kong and also contributing an article to issue 5(2). Another Ph.D. student, Joseph Alvaro, assigned to assist me in my work also provided service as an editorial assistant on the journal.

2013 saw a continuing slow and steady rise in both research articles and submissions to the other categories of the journal. We continued our practice of giving generous editorial assistance in maintaining our vision of Writing & Pedagogy as an “author-friendly” journal, with a high proportion of “revise and resubmit” decisions on first submission – approximately two-thirds of submissions, or 65%, fell into this category in 2013. Continuing the trend for the previous years of the journal, the large number of submissions receiving a judgment of “revise and resubmit” since the journal’s inception (60–70%) balances out a low rejection rate (25% this year; 20–25% since inception) and a low acceptance rate (10% this year; 10–15% since inception) at the first stage of review. The total acceptance rate, which includes articles accepted after being revised and resubmitted for one or more additional rounds of review, continues as in previous years to be in the range of 35–40% of submissions, trending this year to 35% (mainly due to lack of resubmission).
Succession of Editorship for Writing & Pedagogy

Having inaugurated Writing & Pedagogy in January 2008 and seen it through eleven issues, including the current one, since the first issue in Spring 2009, I am preparing to give up my leadership of the journal as part of my plans to step back from full-time academic work in order to leave more time for my own writing. Effective 1 January 2014, Rodney Hale Jones, Acting Head of the English Department at City University of Hong Kong and the journal's New Books Editor, has assumed the newly created position of Associate Editor. Starting a year later, on 1 January 2015, Rodney will assume the position of Editor-in-Chief of the journal and I will serve for one year as Associate Editor.

Rodney holds an M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language from City University of Hong Kong, an M.F.A. in Creative Writing from University of Arkansas, and a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Macquarie University. He specializes in discourse analysis, digital literacies, and the teaching of writing and is the designer and supervisor of the first-year writing and general education curricula of City University of Hong Kong. He also previously designed peer tutoring and writing-across-the-curriculum support programs for the university. Rodney has won numerous competitive grants in addition to a Pushcart Prize for fiction, and he is the author of Discourse Analysis: A Resource Book for Students (Routledge, 2012), co-author (with Christoph Hafner) of Understanding Digital Literacies: A Practical Introduction (Routledge, 2012), and editor of the forthcoming Routledge Handbook of Language and Creativity.

I will be mainly responsible for the first (open topic) issue, 7(1), of 2015, and Rodney will have main responsibility for the other two (special topic) issues of 2015, 7(2) and 7(3). This summer, searches will be undertaken for a New Books Editor, other section Editors, and members of the Editorial Board to work with Rodney when he assumes the Editor-in-Chief position in 2015. Anyone interested in being considered for one of these positions to begin in January 2015 can email Rodney at enrodney@cityu.edu.hk with information about qualifications and relevant background.

Upcoming Issues

Writing & Pedagogy has expanded and will now publish three issues per year: one open topic issue (Spring), one special topic issue (Winter), and one other issue (Summer) – either open topic or special topic. Submissions for all issues of Volume 7 (2015) are now being accepted, including the Spring 2015 open topic issue and the Summer and Winter 2015 special topic issues (see revised Calls for Papers below). The remaining issues of 2014 are no longer accepting submissions.
UPCOMING SPECIAL TOPIC ISSUES

Vol 6(2) Summer 2014  Feedback on Writing  Guest Editor: Miriam Eisenstein Ebsworth, New York University

Vol. 6(3) Winter 2014  Children's Writing: Perspectives on Teaching and Learning  Guest Editor: Sherry Taylor, University of Colorado at Denver

Vol 7(2) Summer 2015  Orality and Literacy in the 21st Century: Prospects for Writing Pedagogy  Guest Editor: Rosalind Horowitz, University of Texas–San Antonio

Vol 7(3) Winter 2015  Writing Assessment  Guest Editor: Jane Lockwood, City University of Hong Kong

CONTENTS  Volume 6(2), Summer 2014

Special Topic Issue
Feedback in Writing  Guest Editor: Miriam Eisenstein Ebsworth, New York University

Featured Essay
The Role of Writing Feedback: A Historical Perspective  Miriam Eisenstein Ebsworth, New York University

Research Matters
Feedback for Adolescent Writers in the English Classroom: Exploring Pen-and-Paper, Electronic, and Automated Options  Paige Ware, University of California, Irvine

Influences on Teachers’ Corrective Feedback Practices in Second Language Writing  K. James Hartshorn, Norman W. Evans, and Emily Allen Tuioti, Brigham Young University

Form-Focused Written Corrective Feedback: Students’ Preferences and their Changes over Time  John P. Haupt, Northern Arizona University

A Teacher’s Perspective on Peer Review in ESL Classes  Oksana Vorobel and Camilla Vásquez, University of South Florida, USA
Twenty-five years ago, *Comprehending Oral and Written Language* (Horowitz and Samuels, 1987, Academic Press) was published. Chapter One of that book began with the following statement, which still holds:

In the next century it will be virtually impossible to pursue the study of written language and literacy without attention to oral language....

REVISED CALL FOR PAPERS Vol 7(2) Summer 2015
Special Topic Issue

Orality and Literacy in the 21st Century

Prospects for Writing Pedagogy
Speculations are that 100 years from now, not only will there be a mingling of research perspectives, but since features associated with oral and written language and social-psychological factors associated with language processes are constantly in a state of flux, our very object of study will also change dramatically. The lexis, grammar, and larger structures of oral language and written language may become alike, with the norm being a writing that is largely indistinguishable from speech. (p. 1)

We are soliciting contributions for a special topic issue on “Orality and Literacy in the 21st Century: Prospects for Writing Pedagogy.” The issue will address attributes of orality and literacy that are gaining heightened attention world-wide and that we believe will significantly influence the nature of classroom instruction in writing. Scholarly examination of oral and literate cultures and spoken–written expression and their cognitive representation will influence the pedagogical practices that are advanced in the 21st century in educational policy, teacher education, and classroom learning and teaching.

The special topic issue will include articles in the categories of critical essay, empirical research, pedagogical reflections, technology-focused or internet-focused articles, and reviews of books to be published in the period from Summer 2013 to Summer 2015. We are seeking articles relevant for any level of education or type of writing pedagogy or practice, such as the following topics and areas of inquiry:

- **The evolving nature of orality and literacy, historically and culturally** – How are changes in orality and literacy reshaping writing pedagogy? How have the oral and written dimensions of language, whether primary or second languages, been characterized by scholars and how might different perspectives have influence on pedagogical practices in writing?

- **The functions of oral vs. written communication among individuals and/or in given social groups or communities** – Are the functions of the oral and written dimensions of language changing within specific cultures or social-contextual settings, and if so, how are these changes influencing writing pedagogy?

- **Interactions of oral and written expression and knowledge development within different academic disciplines** – How is spoken language used to support writing tasks, genres, and writer-reader goals of different academic disciplines? How do oral and written modes of communication interact in contrasting types of knowledge domains, such as in science versus history?

- **Ways in which forms of speaking influence writing** – How do speech styles and genres work as precursors to writing, and how do they
strategically enter into and follow writing? How do discussions influence motivation and processes of writing and the products that are produced by learners? How can students in classrooms progress from spontaneous utterances to more planned discourse?

- **Spoken versus written input to writing** – What is the comparative value of spoken versus written feedback or other kinds of contributions on students’ writing?

- **Linkage of oral and written competence across languages or dialects** – How might students’ oral or written competence in their primary language be used to support or enrich writing in another language? How can writing pedagogy incorporate bilingual or bidialectal competence?

- **The role of the body in oral versus written expression** – How do the mouth, ear, eye, hand, or larger human body contribute to the production of written discourse, such as through incorporation of specific features of oral language, gestures, or overall performance? How do visual and manual processing contribute to writing when writers use specific tools such as pen, computer, or hand-held devices? How should connections between mind and body be studied or employed in writing pedagogy?

- **Timing and prosody of speech and writing** – How do timing and prosody through features such as intonation units, punctuation, and utterance/sentence length differ in speech versus writing? How are the rhythmic elements of language and discourse conveyed in writing? How might these be taught to developing writers?

- **Voice in speech and writing contexts** – How is voice conveyed in specific speaking and writing contexts? How do writers adjust voice to geographic space or social-situational contexts? How can voice be defined and developed in the writing curriculum?

- **Audience awareness or interaction in speaking versus writing** – How is audience incorporated into acts of speaking versus writing, and what are the pedagogical implications?

- **Cognition and consciousness in speech and writing** – How does written language influence cognition and consciousness differently from speech, and what are the implications for teaching and learning how to write for cognitive development? In what ways are differences in speech and writing as modes of meaning and thinking incorporated into educational curricula?

- **Methods of oral and written discourse analysis** – What methods, including with technologies, may be useful for the analysis of spoken and written discourse, and how can they be applied to writing pedagogy?
Contributions to this issue may come from researchers and practitioners from a range of disciplines, such as Rhetoric and Composition, Communication, Psychology, Culture Studies, Linguistics, Education, Media and Information Technology, as well as from those interested in writing in specific disciplines. A range of methodologies are welcomed, including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method empirical studies as well as historical or issues-centered analysis and pedagogical description and critique. Contributors may suggest an issue or topic that is not listed but that may be germane to the theme of this special issue.

For articles in all categories other than book reviews, interested potential authors should send their email and postal addresses along with a provisional title and draft article or detailed abstract, summary, or outline of contents by email or hard copy by post to the guest editor. For best consideration, submit this by 1 June 2014 or at your earliest convenience. Also send a 75–100 word biographical statement that includes highest degree and where from, current institutional affiliation and job title, and major achievements. For book reviews, please notify the guest editor of relevant books to appear in the period of Summer 2013 to Summer 2015 and whether you would like to be considered as a possible reviewer of a specific book or books, for which the reviewer would receive a free copy. If you wish to be considered as a reviewer, also send email and postal address along with a 75–100 word biographical statement that includes highest degree and where from, current institutional affiliation and job title, and major achievements.

Guest editor contact information:
Professor Rosalind Horowitz
Rosalind.Horowitz@utsa.edu
Discourse and Literacy Studies
Department of Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching
College of Education and Human Development
The University of Texas–San Antonio
One UTSA Circle
San Antonio, Texas 78249-0654
USA

Potential contributors will be notified within two months of submission of a decision about their proposed contribution and, if positive, given feedback towards a first or revised draft. The final deadline for complete papers to be received is 1 December 2014. Both the guest editor and the other editors of the journal will work closely with selected authors to aid in producing a unique and memorable issue on this important topic.
Thirty years ago, writing assessment appeared to be the intellectual domain of a relatively few testing experts worldwide and to be the commercial domain of even fewer commercial testing agencies. The main activity revolved around the generation of valid and reliable summative scores for a range of gatekeeping purposes such as university entrance, job promotion, and immigration prerequisites. However, the field of testing and assessment has opened up in a remarkable way over the last two decades, embracing and supporting classroom writing pedagogies at schools and universities, and embracing and supporting a range of workplace and professional writing needs. So in 2015, what is this thing we call writing assessment, and how and why has the change come about?

The changes are multifaceted and are not confined to changes in pedagogy, but also involve changes in, and the potentials of, new technologies and the new demands of the globalized world around us. In pedagogy, language teachers now talk and practice “assessment for learning,” seen in the adoption of a range of formative assessment practices for diagnostic and writing improvement purposes. In addition, these same teachers in decentralized school and university contexts take more responsibility for the design and use of “assessment of learning,” that is, summative assessment of their students’ work.

Students today construct writing in different ways using new technologies, and writing assessment practitioners are exploring the possibilities of using automated scoring and feedback. These new practices must ultimately change how we currently assess writing both formatively and summatively.

Finally, in our globalized world, questions are being asked about what constitutes good writing in the different contexts and audiences for which we write. How do we assess, for example, the business correspondence of a Chinese business manager writing to her colleagues in the Asian region where the recipients are also second language writers (and readers)? All of these contexts, changes, and questions set a broad agenda in this call for writing assessment contributions from colleagues researching and practicing in this area.

Invitations for papers on writing assessment broadly fall under the following themes:

(i) Writing assessment practices and policies in primary and secondary schools
(ii) The link between pedagogy and assessment in schools and universities
(iii) Re-evaluating high stakes writing assessment in different contexts
(iv) Writing assessment in local and global workplaces
(v) Writing assessment technologies and possibilities
(vi) Formative writing assessment practices and the place of feedback

Contributors may suggest an issue or topic that is not listed but that may be germane to the theme of this special issue.

We seek articles in all categories, as follows:

- **Featured Essay** A mid-length or full-length article which argues a controversial point, advocates for a specific theoretical position or type of practice, reviews issues, or presents new ideas about writing assessment;
- **Research Matters** A full-length article which presents empirical research (e.g. comparative research, developmental study, ethnographic research, case study, issues-centered survey, etc.) on writing assessment;
- **Reflections on Practice** A mid-length referenced discussion of practices relating to the assessment of writing;
- **From the eSphere** A short, mid-length, or full-length discussion or description focused on new technologies or new uses of familiar technology and/or the internet in writing assessment;
- **New Books** A short review or full-length review article on books published or to be published in 2014 or 2015 that center on writing assessment.

For articles in all categories other than book reviews, interested potential authors should send their email and postal addresses along with a provisional title and draft article or detailed abstract, summary, or outline of contents by email or hard copy by post to the guest editor. For articles in all categories other than book reviews, interested potential authors should send their email and postal addresses along with a provisional title and draft article or detailed abstract, summary, or outline of contents by email or hard copy by post to the guest editor. For best consideration, submit this by 1 August 2014. Also send a 75–90 word biographical statement that includes highest degree and where from, current institutional affiliation and job title, and major achievements. For book reviews, please notify the guest editor of relevant books to appear in 2014 or 2015 and whether you would like to be considered as a possible reviewer of a specific book or books, for which the reviewer would receive a free copy. If you wish to be considered as a reviewer, also send email and postal address along with a
75–90 word biographical statement that includes highest degree and where from, current institutional affiliation and job title, and major achievements.

Guest editor contact information:
Dr. Jane Lockwood
lockwood@cityu.edu.hk
English Department
City University of Hong Kong
Run Run Shaw Creative Media Centre
Cornwall Street
Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
Hong Kong

Potential contributors will be notified within two months of submission of a decision about their proposed contribution and, if positive, given feedback towards a first or revised draft. Both the guest editor and the other editors of the journal will work closely with selected authors to aid in producing a unique, cutting-edge issue on this important topic.