

PUBLISHING *FOR* TRANSFER: NOTES TOWARD AN EDITORIAL PEDAGOGY  
FOR THE TRANSFER-BASED WRITING PROGRAM

By

Marcos A. Hernandez

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts in English: Composition Studies and Pedagogy

Committee Membership

Dr. Lisa Tremain, Committee Chair

Dr. Janelle Adsit, Committee Member

Kyle Morgan, Committee Member

Dr. Michael Eldridge, Graduate Coordinator

June 2019

## ABSTRACT

### PUBLISHING *FOR* TRANSFER: NOTES TOWARD AN EDITORIAL PEDAGOGY FOR THE TRANSFER-BASED WRITING PROGRAM

Marcos Hernandez

Scholarly journals dedicated to publishing first-year writing have cropped up at a number of four-year universities in the U.S. over the last two decades. Invariably established and run by the university's writing program, these highly localized journals are meant to showcase the exemplary research and writing that students are doing in their introductory writing courses. Yet, while these publishing projects are nobly undertaken *for* students, the publications themselves are seldom edited *by* students. Here arises a golden opportunity for the transfer-based writing program to promote transfer of knowledge and practice in writing beyond the FYC course. This project argues that placing the responsibility for the publication of a print-based journal of first-year writing in the hands of undergraduate writers can provide them with unique moments for writing transfer as well as opportunities to develop further transferable writing knowledge based on key concepts and practices in writing studies. Bringing together theories of writing transfer in first-year composition, reflection and metacognition, and publishing as pedagogy, as well as conclusions based on an ethnographic study I conducted, this project offers notes toward an editorial pedagogy for a FYW journal that emphasizes lifelong *reflection for metacognitive awareness* as a key practice for writing success across social, academic, and professional contexts.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their immeasurable love and support throughout the process of bringing this project into being:

To Lisa Tremain, Janelle Adsit, and Kyle Morgan, for their encouragement, mentorship, and expertise. To Lisa, for inspiring my passion for writing studies and for seeing the value of my scholarly work even when I had a hard time seeing it myself. To Janelle, for encouraging my interest in publishing and for always making me feel like what I had to say was vital and important. And to Kyle, for providing me with invaluable learning experiences in publishing and for always having an open table full of snacks.

To Michael Eldridge and Mary Ann Creadon, for seeing potential in me and encouraging me to pursue graduate studies in English.

To Jessica Citti, for allowing me to grow at the Writing Studio and for taking time out of her busy schedule to work with me on this project.

To my family for their love and support. To my mom, for early on instilling in me a love of reading and writing, and for always being willing to be my first reader and editor. To my dad, for consistently reminding me how proud he is of me. And to my brother, Joaquin, for our Reddit meme/GIF exchange and weekly game nights, which offered me brief moments of respite during this particularly stressful time in my life.

To my girlfriend, Melina, for her unyielding faith in me. She believed in me even when I had a hard time believing in myself. Her love and encouragement over the years have motivated me to a better person, a better scholar, and one day, a better teacher.

To all the friends I have made along the way. You all made grad school a wonderful experience.

And, finally, to Paul, for the jams and late-night Civ games.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	9
Theories of Writing Transfer in First-Year Composition .....	9
Reflection and Metacognition.....	21
Beaufort’s Model of Writing Expertise .....	27
Discourse Community Knowledge .....	28
Subject Matter Knowledge .....	31
Genre Knowledge .....	34
Rhetorical Knowledge .....	35
Writing Process Knowledge .....	35
Publishing as Pedagogy .....	37
METHODS.....	46
Apprenticeship into the Publishing Community .....	46
Ethnography of ENGL 460: Literary Editing .....	48
Institutional Context.....	48
Method #1: Semi-structured interviews.....	51
Method #2: Classroom observations.....	52
Method #3: Oral and written course artifacts.....	53
Methods of Analysis .....	54
Limitations of the Methodology .....	56
RESULTS .....	58
ENGL 460: A Bird’s Eye View of the Course.....	58
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	68
Discourse Community and Literacy Knowledge .....	69
Points of Reflection.....	74
Genre Knowledge .....	75
Points of Reflection.....	78
Rhetorical Knowledge .....	79

Points of Reflection.....	80
Process Knowledge.....	81
Points of Reflection.....	85
Questions for Further Research .....	86
CONCLUSION.....	88
WORKS CITED & REFERENCED .....	90
APPENDICES .....	102
APPENDIX A: Interview Guide .....	102

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The publishing process of ENGL 460 and 461 .....	48
Figure 2: General flyer advertising volume 65's special theme .....	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Interview Guide ..... 102

## INTRODUCTION

*The problem is that the writing process we teach treats publication as an afterthought, and that our publishing process—where it exists—is often controlled entirely by teachers.*

McDonnell and Jefferson

“Product as Process: Teaching Publication to Students” (2010, 108)

*Education can achieve abundant transfer if it is designed to do so.*

Perkins and Salomon

“Teaching for Transfer” (1992, 10)

Scholarly journals dedicated to publishing first-year writing (FYW) have cropped up at a number of four-year universities in the U.S. over the last two decades. Invariably established and run by the university’s writing program, these highly localized journals are meant to showcase the exemplary research and writing that students are doing in their introductory writing courses. Notable examples of currently active FYW publications include Montana State University’s [\*Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric\*](#) (est. 2003), the University of Central Florida’s [\*Stylus: A Journal of First Year Writing\*](#) (est. 2010), and more recently Bowling Green State University’s [\*WRIT: GSW Journal of First Year Writing\*](#) (est. 2017).

What has given rise to these journals? One compelling argument sees this trend as an attempt by WPAs, programs, and writing faculty to address the problem of how we



value (or de-value) student writing in first-year composition (FYC). Horner (2010) describes this problem as a “tradition of complaint” in writing studies regarding “the putative lack of value to the work student writing can accomplish qua ‘student writing’ with an extremely limited range of circulation” (9). Following Miller’s (1991) critique of the historically “intransitive” nature of undergraduate writing, scholars in this tradition of complaint have underscored the low status that is generally afforded student texts in the university and beyond. From this perspective, the rise of FYW publications represents a well-intentioned effort to address the problem of value by opening formal venues for student writing to “go public,” that is, to have first-year texts circulate beyond the FYC course to reach wider audiences, including prospective students, future FYC students, friends, parents, teachers, other institutional stakeholders, and the wider community. The rise of FYW journals can thus be seen as part of a larger effort to re-value the writers and texts of the first-year composition course.

Yet, while these projects are nobly undertaken *for* students, the publications themselves are seldom edited *by* students. In many cases, writing program faculty manage the publication process by which the vision for the publication is collaboratively negotiated and student submissions are subsequently solicited, assessed, co-revised, published, and marketed. In many cases, the journal represents an instructor or program director’s passion project, and faculty take on the responsibility of editing the journal as part of their service to the department. As McDonnell and Jefferson (2010) see it, this arrangement does little to disrupt the teacher-student dynamic that FYC journals were meant to address, writing that “[w]hile it’s difficult to interrupt the student-teacher

relationship, in which students write for their teacher, this structure doesn't even try" (108-9). Non-student-edited journals also represent for writing programs a missed opportunity to capitalize on the potential pedagogical value of the editorial process. I would add that this missed opportunity is magnified when viewed through the lens of theories of writing transfer in FYC, an educational perspective whose proponents have consistently sought to provide students with the ideal conditions and contexts for successful writing transfer<sup>1</sup> beyond the FYC course and to study students engaged in such moments (Wardle 2007; Yancey et al, 2014; Beaufort 2007, 2016).

This Master's Project begins with the presupposition that engaging undergraduate students in the editorial process of a print-based journal of FYW can provide them with unique moments for writing transfer as well as opportunities to develop further transferable writing knowledge based on key concepts and practices in writing studies. Responding to McDonnell and Jefferson's (2010) call for more student-run editorial courses while also extending their work to more explicitly align with current theories of writing transfer in FYC, my project offers notes toward a future editorial pedagogy that is designed to both provide students with moments for writing transfer as well as opportunities to further develop transferable writing knowledge informed by theories of discourse community, literacy, rhetoric, genre, and process. These notes will propose a

---

<sup>1</sup> As Moore (2017) explains, "successful writing transfer requires transforming or repurposing prior knowledge (even if only slightly) for a new context to adequately meet the expectations of new audiences and fulfill new purposes for writing" (4).

reflective framework for an editorial pedagogy that emphasizes lifelong *reflection for metacognitive awareness* as a key practice for writing success across academic, professional, and social contexts. I maintain that such a reflective editorial pedagogy can help serve the overarching goal of a transfer-based first-year composition program: students' transfer of writing knowledge beyond the first-year composition course.

Since David Smit pointed out the lack of systematic research about writing transfer from the FYC course in *The End of Composition Studies* (2004), writing studies researchers have started to pay increased attention to the factors inhibiting transfer from FYC and have subsequently identified several conditions that could help to promote writing transfer beyond it (Wardle 2007; Nelms and Dively 2007; Frazier 2010; Driscoll 2011). For example, in a longitudinal study she conducted to investigate the problem of transfer beyond FYC, Wardle (2007) concluded that one of the main factors inhibiting transfer in later courses is the lack of continued support for transfer in other contexts of writing. She found that “[w]hile students [...] claimed they learned valuable lessons in FYC, they did not generally feel the lessons and behaviors of FYC were needed in other courses during the first year” (82). Many students expressed the feeling that they could usually get by in their other classes without using knowledge gained from FYC. Yet, more interestingly, they also “indicated they *could* and *did* generalize from their FYC experiences *if required to do so by the expectation of the teacher and the engaging and difficult nature of the next writing assignment*” (my emphasis, 82). In other words, students *can* and *will* transfer knowledge and practice in writing if they are explicitly guided to do so by their teachers in other classes and if the writing assignments in those

classes are both engaging and challenging (in a word: *motivating*). Thus, Wardle concludes that “the burden for encouraging generalization seems to rest on assignments given beyond FYC” (82). The problem is that students rarely get this kind of additional support for writing transfer beyond the first-year writing course. This points to the need for increased collaborations between writing programs and other stakeholders to develop contexts where students are given opportunities to put the knowledges they have gained in FYC into practice. Wardle puts it rather grimly: “Unless we continue to expand WAC and WID programs and discuss writing and writing assignments across disciplinary boundaries, our work in FYC is likely to have very little practical impact on our students beyond the first year” (82).

I agree with Wardle that greater collaboration is needed between writing programs and other stakeholders across the university if there is to be any hope for students’ transfer of knowledge and practice in writing beyond FYC. However, I also believe that some of this work can be done *within* the writing program context. For example, while an editorial course of the kind I hope to one day see designed and implemented would be nestled within the university writing program, such a course, I argue, would promote writing transfer from FYC to other contexts. As a publishing apprenticeship course connected to, yet distinct from, the first-year composition course, a print-based editorial course for an FYW journal *expressly designed* to support writing transfer can provide students with opportunities to generalize and apply knowledge *from* FYC in a context *beyond* FYC.

This argument raises the issue of placement. When I started this research, I

entertained several possibilities for where an editorial pedagogy might fit in a university writing program. Could it work as a special topics FYC course? How about an elective course for graduate students in English Studies? Eventually, I arrived at the position that an *advanced composition course in scholarly editing* available to undergraduate writers who have recently passed the transfer-based first-year writing course would be ideal context to foster the conditions for (future) writing transfer. I came to this position for several reasons. The first has to do with the problem Wardle identified in the study described above. Students may not be getting the support they need to continue developing as informed writers after FYC, and a companion editorial course connected to FYC could provide one context where that additional support is provided. Such a course could serve as a “bridge” between FYC and future disciplinary and professional contexts. Second, a number of writing studies researchers have stressed the importance for first-year students to adopt the rhetorical stance of novice-ship in the first-year (Sommers and Saltz 2004; Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak 2014; Robertson and Taczak 2017). Students making the high-school to college transition often bring with them various kinds of prior knowledge about and dispositions toward writing to the FYC course which may be at odds with the writing program’s outcomes and the types of writing they will be doing in college. For this reason, Sommer and Saltz explain, “freshman need to see themselves as novices in a world that demands ‘something more and deeper’ from their writing than high school” (12). In other words, they need to spend the first-year getting grounded in theories and practices of writing studies before moving on to future writing contexts, such as the advanced composition course in scholarly editing this project envisions. And,

finally, I think that the collaborations between instructors, developing editors, and developing authors that would take place throughout the process of creating a FYW journal would foster a reciprocal relationship that would encourage undergraduate students to continue thinking about the content of writing studies beyond the FYC course.

Based on my overall aim to offer notes toward an editorial pedagogy grounded in a reflective framework, I devised two questions to guide my research study. They are as follows:

1. How can an undergraduate editorial pedagogy potentially support students' transfer of knowledge and practice in writing?
2. What role can *reflection* play in an editorial pedagogy designed for transfer of knowledge and practice in writing?

I set out to answer these research questions in a number of ways. I reviewed the scholarship on both theories of writing transfer in FYC and publishing as pedagogy. I also conducted an original ethnographic study of a literary editing course offered at my institution in order to learn more about how university student-led publishing works in a local context. With the knowledge and data gained from these two undertakings, I worked to compile notes for a future editorial pedagogy for the transfer-based writing program. This yet-to-be-designed editorial pedagogy promotes conceptually-driven reflection as a lifelong writerly practice, which, in turn, promotes writing transfer beyond the first-year writing course.

In the chapters that follow, I do the following: First, I review the literature relevant to my research aims; second, I provide a description of the methodology I used to conduct

additional original research for the project; third, I present my results in the form of an ethnographic narrative; fourth, I analyze and discuss my results in terms of the goals of the transfer-based writing program and offer questions for further research; and, finally, I end with some concluding thoughts on the promise and need for an reflective editorial pedagogy designed for transfer of learning.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The project draws from two sources of scholarship, namely “theories of writing transfer in first-year composition” and “publishing as pedagogy.” In this section, I review the literature relevant to my project from these two scholarly conversations. First, I review selected texts from writing studies to develop a working definition of transfer for the project and to identify several related concepts and theories that will inform the notes I offer in subsequent chapters. Specifically, I review current transfer scholarship on theories of *reflection* and *metacognition* to arrive at a model of teaching for transfer that is grounded in a reflective framework. I also review Anne Beaufort’s model of writing expertise to consider the types of knowledges that I argue should be the focus of transfer-oriented reflection and metacognition. Then, I review selected literature that explores the advantages, limitations, and possibilities of using publishing as a pedagogical tool. There is a formidable contingent of scholar-practitioners in (digital) writing studies who have taken up publishing as pedagogy, and other fields such as Library and Information Studies have also recognized the value of teaching editing to students. I take up some of this research here.

### Theories of Writing Transfer in First-Year Composition

Writing transfer theory in first-year composition (FYC) refers to a wide array of writing studies research that is united by a shared interest in responding to what has become known as “the transfer question” as it pertains to the context of FYC. As Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak (2014) frame it, this question “asks how we can support students’



transfer of knowledge and practice in writing; that is, how we can help students develop writing knowledge and practices that they can draw upon, use, and repurpose for new writing tasks in new settings” (2). Put simply, how can writing programs and practitioners promote students’ positive transfer of learning from the first-year composition course to future writing contexts?

This question has proved challenging for a number of reasons. One difficulty lay in how to adequately conceptualize transfer. Part of the problem of definition is the term “transfer” itself, which, at the denotative level, seems to suggest the mechanical “carrying over” of a skill from one situation to another, what Wardle (2012) refers to as the “carry and unload” conception of transfer. Moreover, scholars in cognitive and educational psychology as well as writing studies have long wondered whether it is even possible to generalize skills or knowledge from one context for use in another (for psychology, see: Perkins and Salomon 1988; Detterman 1993; for writing studies, see: Russell 1995), though writing studies researchers today generally accept that transfer of knowledge and practice in writing is possible provided the right conditions and contexts (Wardle 2012; Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak 2014). The challenge of transfer research today is further compounded by the fact that, in working out these difficulties regarding questions of definition and possibility, writing studies scholars have responded to the transfer question using a variety of analytical frames, including, for example, genre theory (Reiff and Bawarshi 2011; Rounsaville 2012; Clark and Hernandez 2011), writer dispositions (Driscoll 2011; Driscoll & Wells 2012; Wardle 2012), activity theory and boundary-crossing (McManigell 2017), threshold concepts (Adler-Kassner, Majewski, and

Koshnick 2012; Adler-Kassner and Wardle, 2015), and reflection and metacognition (Yancey 1998; Beaufort 2016; Gorelzskey et al. 2017). For these reasons, any research involving theories of writing transfer must clarify how transfer is being defined and what conceptual model is being used to respond to the transfer question (*Elon Statement on Writing Transfer* 2013).

In the simplest terms, transfer refers to the act of using prior knowledge to address a current learning problem. If we follow this basic definition, then writing transfer entails actions involving the use of prior writing knowledge to work out a current writing task. Yet, since transfer's formal inception as an area of study in the early twentieth century, two underlying beliefs about transfer have been the matter of much debate, namely that (1) people can transfer learning from one site to another and that (2) transfer can be taught. Skeptics of transfer have cast doubt on whether skills and knowledge learned in one context can be fixed or generalized enough to be used in other contexts. Those looking at the problem from a "situated cognition" perspective have even questioned whether "general skills" exist in the first place. As Yancey et al. (2014) explain in their brief historical review of transfer scholarship at the start of *Writing Across Contexts*, early studies in cognitive and educational psychology suggested that instances of successful transfer were rare, and, when they did happen, "merely serendipitous" (7). The implication of these studies, Yancey et al. explain, was that transfer was not very teachable. The authors cite Thorndike and Woodworth's (1901) inaugural research as well as more recent studies (Prather 1971; Detterman and Sternberg 1993) as representative of this thinking. However, as the authors point out, these findings were

largely based on data collected using experimental research designs that tested for evidence of transfer in highly-controlled, laboratory-like environments. By design, these studies did not attempt to replicate the social *contexts* where learning really happens; consequently, the studies were not appropriately suited to identify the *conditions* under which transfer of learning occurs. A conceptual shift in the thinking on transfer came in the late 1980s with the work of David Perkins and Gavriel Salomon, two educational psychologists who set out to understand why students were often unable to transfer the skills and knowledge learned in one context to other situations (Perkins and Salomon 1988). Because writing studies scholarship on the transfer question owes a great deal to Perkins and Salomon's work (as illustrated by the continued use of Perkins and Salomon's ideas and frames of analysis in current research), it is worth briefly reviewing their contributions to our current understanding of the transfer problem.

In a departure from earlier research, Perkins and Salomon offered an alternative approach to the study of transfer that accounted for "the *conditions* and *contexts* under which and where transfer might occur" (Yancey et al. 2014, 7). They urged researchers to move beyond questions of whether transfer happens, writing that "whether transfer occurs is too bald a question. It can, but often does not. One needs to ask under what conditions transfer appears" (6). They also examined the relationship between general and specialized (or "local") knowledge to explore how bound cognitive skills are to context (that is, how context-specific they are) and to determine whether knowledge is too "local" to transfer (Perkins and Salomon 1989). Ultimately, they argued for a more complex understanding of the relationship between general and context-based skills,

concluding that “there *are* general cognitive skills; but they always function in contextualized ways” (author’s emphasis 19). In another paper, they speak directly to those in education: “Instead of worrying about which is more important—local knowledge or the more general transferrable aspects of knowledge—we should recognize the synergy of local and more general knowledge” (1988, 31). Since much of transfer theory in education is premised on the idea that people can generalize a skill or knowledge and use this general skill or knowledge to tackle future learning problems, in making the argument that general skills do exist and can, in fact, be developed in social learning settings such as the classroom, Perkins and Salomon had effectively legitimized transfer of learning as a worthy goal of educational practice.

Perkins and Salomon subsequently devised three subsets of types of transfer: near and far; low road and high road; and negative and positive. First, in near transfer, a person carries over a physical skill they learned in one context to a similar context, while in far transfer, a person adapts knowledge from one context and applies it to a context with very little resemblance to the first. Second, in low road transfer, similarities between one’s prior knowledge and the current learning problem are strong enough as to trigger “well-developed semi-automatic responses” (Perkins and Salomon 1992, 8) to the problem at hand. This type of transfer is characterized by a degree of reflexivity, automaticity, and routinization. Oppositely, in high road transfer, the learner must deliberately and mindfully abstract a skill or knowledge from one learning site for potential use in another. The authors further distinguish between backward- and forward-reaching high road transfer. In forward-reaching high road transfer, the learner uses

reflection to abstract from a current learning problem a skill or knowledge that they think might be useful in the future. In backward-reaching high road transfer, the learner, faced with a new learning problem, reflects back on previous knowledge and calls forth any skills or knowledge that might be useful for responding to the current problem. Perkins and Salomon write that in either case “high road transfer always involves reflective thought in abstracting from one context and seeking connections with others” (Perkins and Salomon 1987, 26). In other words, reflection is a core feature of high road transfer. Lastly, negative transfer refers to an instance in which application of previous knowledge interferes with the demands of the current learning problem. Its antipode, positive transfer, refers to an instance in which previous knowledge is effectively adapted to meet the demands of the new learning problem. Therefore, negative transfer is used to describe an unsuccessful attempt to transfer learning, while positive transfer is used to describe a successful transfer moment.

In addition to providing a theoretical justification for transfer of general skills and knowledge as well as crafting frames of analysis for studying transfer (near/far; high road/low road; negative/positive), Perkins and Salomon also maintained that it was not just possible, but necessary, to teach *for* transfer if there is to be any hope for students’ transfer of learning. To this end, they proposed “hugging” and “bridging” as two curricular strategies designed to promote transfer at the low road and high road level of transfer, respectively. In hugging activities, students are engaged in close approximations of the desired transfer performance. For example, an instructor might have students participate in mock interviews in preparation for future employment or internship

interviews. As Perkins and Salomon (1992) explain, “The learning experience thus ‘hugs’ the target performance, maximizing likelihood later of automatic low road transfer” (10). In bridging activities, the instructor “encourages the making of abstractions, searches for possible connections, mindfulness, and metacognition” (10). For example, an instructor might ask students to reflect back on a previous assignment to consider similarities and differences to the current one and to subsequently devise a plan of action for approaching the task at hand. Perkins and Salomon write that this type of instruction emphasizes “deliberate abstract analysis and planning” (10).

Written within a year of Perkins and Salomon’s seminal “Teaching for Transfer” (1988), Lucille McCarthy’s (1987) landmark “A Stranger in Strange Lands,” a longitudinal case study which tracked the writing life of a student named Dave as he moved from his freshman writing course to two other courses he subsequently took, brought the transfer problem within the purview of writing studies.<sup>2</sup> In addition to highlighting the failings of writing instruction in one local context to promote transfer beyond the first-year course (Dave did not demonstrate evidence of transfer in subsequent courses), McCarthy’s study also demonstrated the value of qualitative methods such as ethnography in doing transfer research. Following McCarthy’s and Perkins and Salomon’s leads, writing studies researchers in the intervening years have employed more contextual and situated experiment designs in their studies of transfer that have

---

<sup>2</sup> Though, as Beaufort (2016) notes, McCarthy did not frame her inquiry within then-emerging conversations in education and psychology about transfer of learning.

been better able to account for moments of writing transfer as they might occur in social learning contexts (Beaufort 2007). These studies have provided further evidence that transfer is indeed possible, yet, as Beaufort (2016) explains retrospectively, “the move does require the ability of the learner to adapt prior knowledge and skills appropriately to the new context rather than simply apply previous knowledge and skills without alteration for the new situation” (27). In other words, students don’t take what they learned in one context and simply “transfer” it to another context. The “carry and unload” conception of transfer accounts for very few, if any, positive writing transfer events. Rather, transfer of writing knowledge, especially in the case of high road writing transfer, is a more complex action, one that always involves some degree of adaptation or transformation to the knowledge gleaned from the original site of learning to fit the demands of the new learning situation.

Some in writing studies have taken these points to argue that the term “transfer” is “inadequate for describing the phenomenon of using prior knowledge in new ways that entail change, transformation, repurposing, and expansive learning” (Elon Statement, 347). Wardle (2012), for example, writes that the continued use of the word “transfer” in writing studies “limits our ability to think more fully about this phenomenon and what it means” (2). Shortly thereafter, in the same article, Wardle reframes transfer as “creative repurposing for expansive learning,” a view which she argues encourages educators to think about how the institutional habitus of higher education rewards “problem-solving” dispositions towards learning situations at the expense of encouraging students to develop the kinds of “problem-exploring” dispositions that best facilitate creative repurposing (i.e.

transfer). Like-minded scholars have proposed a variety of alternative terms to describe the phenomenon of using prior knowledge to approach new learning situations, such as generalization (Beach 2003), remix and repurpose (Yancey 2009), and integration (Nowacek 2011). Current conceptualizations of writing transfer have, as a result, become more attentive to the adaptive and transformative aspects of using prior writing knowledge to address current writing situations. For instance, Yancey et al. (2014) describe transfer as “a dynamic rather than static process, a process of using, adapting, and repurposing the old for success in the new” (33), later offering a formal definition of it as the “dynamic activity through which students, like all composers, actively make use of prior knowledge as they respond to new writing task” (103). More recently, Moore (2017) has defined writing transfer as “a writer’s ability to repurpose or transform prior knowledge about writing for a new audience, purpose, and context” (2). The Elon Statement on Writing Transfer (2013) sums up the party line in its definition of writing transfer as “the phenomenon in which new and unfamiliar writing tasks are approached through the application, remixing, or integration of previous knowledge, skills, strategies, and dispositions” (352). Nevertheless, the construction “transfer” still offers a useful organizing term that allows those of us in writing studies to speak more broadly about the theory and practice of teaching with that specific pedagogical goal in mind.

If writing transfer is possible, then under which conditions does it typically occur? How can programs and practitioners design courses in ways that promote positive transfers of learning? Yancey et al. and others (Beaufort 2007, 2016) have engaged with these questions along three lines of thought. First, they have reconsidered the role of



content in the first-year composition course to determine what content might best support transfer of knowledge and practice in writing. Second, they have observed the actions entailed in positive transfers of learning and have outlined the moves that writers with a history of expert writing performances make when approaching a new writing task. And, third, they have identified some of the activities that promote writing transfer across contexts and disciplinary communities.

With the increased attention on the transfer problem in writing studies in recent decades, scholars have found it necessary to reconsider the role of content in first-year writing instruction. Yancey et al. (2014) put the question succinctly: “[I]s it the case that all content supports students’ transfer similarly, or is some content more useful than other content in assisting students with transfer?” (3). As the authors explain, there is a strong tradition in composition that holds that the content of writing instruction is secondary to what students are actually doing. In this view, so long as students are writing, reading, and engaging in process-based writing practices, the actual content of the course (the readings, topics, concerns) can be anything. In practice, this view has resulted in the proliferation of “theme” or “literature” based writing courses ranging in focus from popular media to specific literary periods. Yet, there is considerable evidence that these approaches have not had the desired outcome of the first-year writing course, that is, the transfer of knowledge and practice in writing across future contexts. Recent transfer-based approaches to first-year writing instruction have subsequently called for writing courses which make the theories and practices of writing studies the content of writing course. For example, in their Writing about Writing (WAW) model, Elizabeth Wardle

and Doug Downs (2007) advocate for reframing the writing course as an introduction to writing studies, thereby shifting the focus from “teaching writing to teaching *about* writing” (Yancey et al. 2014, 49). Beaufort’s (2007) model of writing expertise also emphasizes the role of writing studies content in writing development by articulating five knowledge domains that expert writers typically draw upon when composing texts: discourse community knowledge; subject matter knowledge; genre knowledge; rhetorical knowledge; and process knowledge. As Yancey et al. put it, “In this model of writing expertise, content knowledge is not arbitrary, random, or insignificant, but rather is one of the five domains that expert writers draw upon as they compose any given text” (3). Given this perspective, Beaufort (2016) argues that writing courses which explicitly teach these five domains can help students move towards writing expertise and thus transfer beyond the first-year writing course, providing further argument that writing studies theory and practice should be the primary content of the first-year composition course.<sup>3</sup>

Scholars have also observed through research studies the acts entailed in positive transfer of writing knowledge. Beaufort (2016) offers a good starting point for understanding how students initiate the journey toward transfer of knowledge and practice in writing. Her arguments are based on conclusions drawn from several ethnographic studies she has conducted throughout the years (Beaufort 1998, 2007).

---

<sup>3</sup> I will return to and expand upon Beaufort’s model of writing expertise shortly in my discussion of the types of knowledge that should be the focus of a transfer-based reflection and metacognition in the writing classroom.

Echoing Perkins and Salomon's discussion of high road transfer, she writes that first "the learner must be able to abstract key principles or concepts that may be applicable in other contexts for writing" (27). To use a phrase that she borrows from the two psychologists, students must be able to generalize what they learned in one site of learning into "knowledge to go" (Beaufort 2007; Perkins and Salomon 2012). Provided the opportunity to abstract general knowledge from learning experiences in the FYC course into a working theory of writing, students stand a better chance of transferring writing knowledge across future contexts and disciplines. Many have surmised from this argument that the main role of the transfer-based FYC course is to provide students with multiple and guided opportunities to think critically about their previous and current learning experiences so that they can generalize their thinking into a working theory and practice of writing (Yancey et al. 2014; Beaufort 2007, 2016). They have subsequently worked to identify the kinds of activities that help students develop transferable writing knowledge and have revised their program and course designs accordingly.

The research on both the role of content and the processes entailed in writing transfer suggests that if we want students to transfer across contexts, we must engage them in knowledge-making activities that help them to create a working theory of writing informed by the key terms and concepts of writing studies (such as purpose, audience, genre, and discourse community). The question here is: What kinds of knowledge-making activities helps students develop transferable writing knowledge? In their discussion of forward-and backward-reaching high road transfer, Perkins and Salomon (1987, 1992) point to the centrality of *reflection* in the development of transferable

knowledge. Scholars in writing studies have likewise taken up reflection as one of the key practices that enable students to develop transferable writing knowledge. For example, reflection is one of three key components that comprise the Teaching for Transfer (TfT) curriculum developed by Yancey et al. (2014) in *Writing across Contexts*. In the following section, I will review current theories of reflection and metacognition that recognize the practice.

### Reflection and Metacognition

Many writing studies scholars have emphasized *reflection* as a key practice that supports transfer of writing knowledge (Yancey, 1998; Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak, 2014; Yancey, 2016; Robertson and Taczak, 2016; Beaufort, 2016; Taczak, 2016; Gorelzsky, 2017). These scholars generally agree that specific types of reflection can help writers activate the cognitive and *metacognitive* thinking required to generalize what they know into knowledge for future use. Taczak (2015), for example, writes that reflection “allows writers to recall what they are doing in that particular moment (cognition), as well as to consider why they made the rhetorical choices they did (metacognition).” This “combination of cognition and metacognition, accessed through reflection, helps writers begin assessing themselves as writers, recognizing and building on their prior knowledge of writing” (78). Thus, in the context of FYC, reflection is conceptualized as a means for developing a metacognitive orientation towards one’s own texts, process, beliefs, writing knowledge and practices. Training such an orientation allows writers to develop a reflective practice of “recognizing and building on their prior knowledge.” In other

words, reflection can help students generalize what they know about writing and themselves as writers into transferable writing knowledge for use in future writing situations.

Reflection has a long and varied history in the writing classroom. However, in a departure from previous iterations of reflection, Yancey et al. and other transfer scholars have argued that reflection has to be of a certain *rhetorical* quality to facilitate transfer of knowledge and practice in writing. Yancey et al. explain:

Including reflection in writing classes by now, of course, is ubiquitous, but its use is often narrow and procedural rather than theoretical and substantive. Students are often—perhaps typically—asked to provide an account of process or to compose a “reflective argument” in which they cite their own work as evidence that they have met program outcomes. They are not asked to engage in another kind of reflection, what we might call big-picture thinking, in which they consider how writing in one setting is both different from and similar to the writing in another, or where they theorize writing so as to create a framework for future writing situations. (Yancey et al. 5)

Beaufort (2016) supports this view, writing: “Here, in the content of transfer of learning, reflection becomes not just a cover memo for a writing project or portfolio, but more important, provokes vigilant attentiveness to a series of high-level questions that enable the writer to determine whether there are similarities between prior situations or problems and the current one” (33). And later: “But reflection on what *was* learned is only the beginning for transfer of learning to occur. According to the principles of transfer of

learning, a next step is necessary: the learner must be able to abstract key principles or concepts that may be applicable in other contexts for writing” (33). In other words, a reflective practice designed for transfer is one that, on the one hand, helps students think about relationships (both the similarities and differences) between different writing situations and contexts, and, on the other hand, provides opportunities for them to develop their own working theories of writing based on key principles and concepts in writing studies.

As suggested by the ways Yancey et al. and Beaufort characterize the reflective tradition of the past, reflection has often been construed as an after-the-fact activity. It is done once students have completed a writing project or after they have chosen texts to include in their culminating portfolios. One unfortunate effect of the way reflection has been taught is that it implicitly constructs reflection as a product rather than a practice. By contrast, writing studies scholars in the transfer tradition have articulated a new conception of reflection that recognizes it as an ongoing practice that happens before, during, and after composing events. One of the first instances of this re-conception of reflection is found in Yancey’s *Reflection in the Writing Classroom* (1998). In this seminal work, Yancey theorizes three types of reflection: reflection-in-action, constructive reflection, and reflection-in-presentation. The first refers to reflection that occurs during the composing event, the second refers to reflection that occurs between and among composing events, and the third refers to reflection that involves constructive reflection but with one key difference, that it is reflection as prepared for an audience. This three-part taxonomy of reflection illustrates that the practice of reflection is

something that should happen before, during, and after any composing event. Similarly, Taczak and Robertson (2016) encourage practitioners to teach reflection as a “practice, not just an after-the-fact practice, but one that spans the entire context and beyond so that reflection becomes embedded in the invention, arrangement, and delivery of any piece of writing” (60).

Writing studies researchers have also recognized the role of community in reflective work. At the end of *Rhetoric of Reflection* (2016), for example, Yancey identifies reflection’s “location in community” (303) as one of the practice’s defining characteristics. “A community,” she explains, “helps set the stage for meaning-making through reflection” (309). In other words, reflection does not exist in a vacuum. When writers engage in rhetorical reflection, they are making meaning within relation to a community of peers. Yet, in the writing classroom, reflection is often assigned as an individual activity. Students are asked to write up a personal reflection based on a paper they just composed or a reading they just completed. They compose a reflective memo to append to their culminating portfolio. Instead, Yancey encourages practitioners to imagine the writing classroom as “reflective semi-public space where learning is a communal process” (310). The writing course should be grounded in a culture of reflection where students reflect both individually and together as a class to explore problems, create knowledge, and accomplish their work as a collective. Reflection should be as much a communal practice as an individual activity.

To sum up the major points on reflection, writing transfer researchers have articulated a new conception of reflection for the writing classroom as a rhetorical (a

meaning-making), ongoing, and semi-public *practice*. In this conception, reflection is viewed as a meaning-making activity by which students draw connections between writing contexts and situations and build a working theory and practice of writing. This rhetorical work is embedded throughout the entire composing process and is undertaken at both the individual and community level. A writing classroom situated within this reflective framework provides students with guided opportunities to develop a metacognitive awareness that allows them to build on top of their prior knowledge of writing through the act of assessing their texts, processes, knowledge, and practice in writing. In doing so, they construct a working theory of writing for use in future writing contexts.

The frequent association between reflection and metacognition in the literature requires a brief discussion on metacognition as a theory and practice and its relation to reflection. Metacognition, which is related to but not the same as reflection, is generally described as “thinking about one’s thinking.” In the context of writing studies, metacognition refers to the “writer’s ability to watch their own thinking process” (Beaufort, 2016). Tinberg (2016) echoes Beaufort’s definition when he writes that metacognition “requires that writers think about their mental processes,” adding that such higher-order thinking involves “the ability to perceive the very steps by which success occurs and to articulate the various qualities and components that contribute in significant ways to the production of effective writing” (76). Scholars have long observed the value of metacognition in writing development; yet, as Gorelzskey et al. (2017) note, what metacognition is and what it entails remains “fuzzy” (their word) in both theory and



practice. They address the term's fuzziness by developing a taxonomy of six metacognitive (sub)components based on an empirical research study they conducted. These (sub)components are as follows: (1) person (knowledge of self as writer); (2) task (knowledge of affordances and constraints of project and its circumstances); (3) strategy (knowledge of approaches to the project at hand); (4) planning (identifying a problem, analyzing it, and choosing a strategy to approach it); (5) monitoring (evaluating one's cognition and efforts toward a project); and (6) evaluation (assessing the quality of completed project) (227-32). These metacognitive (sub)components, Gorelzszy et al. argue, can be honed through the practice of "constructive metacognition" (which they base on Yancey's notion of constructive reflection). This type of metacognition requires that writers engage in a special kind of reflective practice. The writers explain, "Constructive metacognition entails reflection across writing tasks and contexts, using writing and rhetorical concepts to explain choices and evaluations and to construct a writerly identity" (225). In other words, constructive metacognition is achieved when the writer constructively reflects on current, previous, and/or future writing situations, applies writing and rhetorical concepts in their reflection, and walks away from this process having a clearer picture of who they are as writers, readers, and researchers in a specific context and time.

Much of the research on writing transfer, reflection, and metacognition that I have highlighted here emphasizes the need for students to apply the key terms and concepts of writing studies when reflecting on their texts, processes, attitudes, and beliefs if they are to develop a writer identity and a working theory of writing that they could practice and

continue to revise throughout their future writing lives. Such a requirement seems to demand, for our part, that we identify which writing and rhetorical concepts would be most valuable for students journeying on the road to developing a sense of writer identity. Many scholars have worked together to attempt various taxonomies of key terms, concepts, and practices in writing studies.<sup>4</sup> For the purposes of this project, I draw upon Beaufort's conceptual model of writing expertise in order to think more broadly about which kinds of *knowledges* would be of best service to developing writers. Beaufort's conceptual model of writing expertise, articulated in her 2007 book *College Writing and Beyond*, offers a useful framework for taking up this question. She approaches the problem of writing expertise and transfer by thinking about the kinds of knowledge that writers with a history of expert writing performances draw upon when engaging new writing situations. With this understanding of how expert writers write, programs and practitioners can design courses that help students move toward writing expertise. Reflection keyed to these knowledge domains can help students develop writing knowledge that will help them to navigate future social, academic, and professional writing contexts.

#### Beaufort's Model of Writing Expertise

A reflective practice keyed to Beaufort's knowledge domains provides a

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Adler-Kassner and Wardle (Eds.): *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (2015).

promising model for teaching for transfer of knowledge and practice in writing. The benefits of this model include a focus on broad knowledge domains rather than particular key terms and an orientation towards developing a theory and practice of writing rather than tracing writing procedure. Beaufort's model consists of five overlapping and interactive knowledge domains: (1) discourse community knowledge; (2) subject matter knowledge; (3) genre knowledge; (4) rhetorical knowledge; and (5) writing process knowledge. When writers engage in individual expert writing performances, they tend, consciously or not, to draw upon these five domains of knowledge. Thus, Beaufort argues, these domains should be the explicit focus of the transfer-based FYC course, and I argue (not without precedent) that reflection, as an epistemological, ongoing, and semi-public practice is one way to bring these knowledges to the surface of students' thinking. I will now briefly describe each of these knowledge domains. In describing these knowledges, a range of key terms and concepts will emerge that will help us consider the kinds of key terms and concepts that could potentially appear in transfer-based reflection, which I have italicized. Furthermore, each of these domains has a rich tradition in writing studies in its own right, and I will be drawing upon some of that specific research to provide additional insight into Beaufort's conceptual framework.

### Discourse Community Knowledge

For Beaufort, a theory of the discourse community is the overarching knowledge domain within which the four remaining domains reside. She writes:

What writing expertise is ultimately concerned with is becoming engaged in a particular community of writers who dialogue across texts, argue, and build on each other's work. Discourse communities exhibit a particular network of communicative channels, oral and written, whose interplay affects the purposes and meanings of the written texts produced within the community. Based on a set of shared goals and values and certain material/physical conditions, discourse communities establish norms for genres that may be unique to the community or shared with overlapping communities and roles and tasks for writers are appropriated within this activity system (Beaufort 1997). (Beaufort 2016, 18-19)

For Beaufort, the ultimate motivation for students to develop as writers is so that they can enter into and actively participate in discourse communities. Participation in a discourse community requires knowledge of the participatory mechanisms by which members of the community dialogue with each other (its "particular network of communicative channels, oral or written"), knowledge of the genres by which the community's dialogue is facilitated, and knowledge of the shared goals and values which provide the basis for community unity and organization. Beaufort's description roughly follows Swales' (1990) six defining characteristics of the discourse community, though Swales' description accounts for a shared *lexis* (a discourse community's specialized vocabulary) and a *threshold level of membership* (ratio between newcomers and experts in the discourse community. He also explains that a discourse community "uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback" (221) to members.

Johns (1997) adds issues of access, conflict, and change to this theory of the discourse community. As she points out, early conceptions of the discourse community tended to stress the *shared* aspects, what she calls the “uniting forces” (511), of the community—its shared goals, shared values, shared genres, and so forth. Moreover, theories of the discourse community have suggested, perhaps through the absence of any thoughtful consideration of problems of access, that people can enter into discourse communities more or less freely and “remain affiliated at levels of their own choosing” (511). According to Johns, this conception of the discourse community doesn’t capture the full complexity of such social formations. For one, it ignores the fact that discourse communities often employ exclusionary practices to regulate the membership of the community. “In some cases,” she writes, “people are excluded from communities because they lack social standing, talent, or money, or because they live in the wrong part of town” (511). Even when one becomes a member of a discourse community, Johns writes that a lack of agency and authority can often limit or restrict the member’s active participation.

In addition to problems of access and agency, discourse communities are also characterized by inter-community conflict and critique. She writes:

Even after individuals are fully initiated, many factors can separate them.

Members of communities rebel, opposing community leaders or attempting to change the rules of the game and, by extension, the content and argumentation in the texts from shared genres. If the rebellion is successful, the rules may be changed or a new group may be formed with a different set of values and aims

[...] Even without open rebellion, there is constant dialogue and within communities as members thrash out their differences and juggle for power and identity [...] (511).

Newcomers to the community often bring new goals, values, and motivations with them that conflict with the “broadly shared set of public goals” (Swales, 220) of the discourse community. When such conflict reaches a tipping point, a “rebellion” within the community can occur. A successful rebellion can result in transformative change in the community’s goals, values, and genres. Even without full-scale rebellion, change occurs over time as members, new and old, “thrash out differences and juggle for power and identity” (511). Johns thus conceptualizes the discourse community as a site of *exclusion*, *conflict*, and *change*. Within this conceptualization, we can also include concepts such as *access*, *agency*, *authority*, *power*, and *identity*. The issue of *access* will be further explored in the following discussion on subject matter knowledge.

### Subject Matter Knowledge

To participate within a discourse community, Beaufort writes that “writers must engage a specific subject matter considered within the purview of the discourse community” (19). I would like to offer a more politicized definition: Subject matter knowledge involves knowing and being able to critically dialogue with the conversations, histories, epistemologies, vocabularies, inquiries, and ideologies of the discourse community. “Such critical thinking” Beaufort writes, “involves knowing how to frame the inquiry, which kinds of questions to ask or analytical frameworks to use in order to

‘transform’ or inscribe documents with new meaning(s)” (19). This description of subject matter knowledge is not unlike Gee’s (1989) explanation of how a person acquires the *literacy* of and exhibits control over a *secondary Discourse*. Gee defines a “Discourse” as “a sort of ‘identity kit’ which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize” (7). He further distinguishes between *primary* and *secondary* Discourses (home-based vs. non-home based) as well as *dominant* and *non-dominant* Discourses (those attached to social, political, or economic capital vs. those that may bring solidarity but not status) (7-8). He subsequently defines literacy as “*the mastery of or fluent control over a secondary discourse*” (author’s emphasis 9). According to Gee, “Discourses are not mastered by overt instruction ... but by *enculturation* (“*apprenticeship*”) into social practices through scaffolded and supported interaction with people who have already mastered the Discourse” (7).

One implication of this theory is that there is no general literacy, that is, no universal process of learning to read and write; rather, Gee’s is a socially-situated view of literacy in which literacies (now pluralized) are always embedded in the social practices of particular communities. A person acquires a literate identity within the discourse community by way of enculturation and apprenticeship. This again raises questions of *access* in the discourse community. In what ways is literacy regulated to include some while excluding others from the discourse community? Deborah Brandt’s (1998) notion of *literacy sponsorship* is helpful. She defines *literacy sponsors* as those “agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, model, as well as recruit,

regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy in some way—and gain advantage by it in some way” (46). In other words, the subject matter of a discourse community—its literacy—is not just some abstract entity that any person could pick up. Literacy is always bound up in issues of access and membership. If people want to gain access to a discourse community, then they must have access to those who can sponsor their literacy development into the community.

When one enacts the subject matter, or Discourse, of a particular community, that person effectively assumes a subject position—that is, an *identity*—within that social group. A demonstration of subject matter knowledge in any given writing situation is the demonstration of *literacy acquisition* and *identity formation* within the discourse community. In other words, to participate effectively and critically within a community, a member must develop a literate identity in relation to the community’s Discourse (i.e. its subject matter). But literacy (knowledge of subject matter) is never freely given; it is sponsored or suppressed. Gee and Brandt add to Beaufort’s concept of subject matter knowledge ideas about *literacy (sponsorship)*, *Discourse*, *identity*, *access*, *membership*, and *enculturation (apprenticeship)*. Subject matter knowledge thus might more appropriately be labelled “Literacy Knowledge.” Moreover, because you can never really talk about literacy without talking about discourse community, for the remainder of this project, I have combined Beaufort’s “Discourse Community” and “Subject Matter” knowledge domains into a single domain I call “Discourse Community and Literacy Knowledge.”



### Genre Knowledge

In addition to discourse community and subject matter knowledge, Beaufort explains that “writers must also develop knowledge of genres whose boundaries and features the discourse community defines and stabilizes” (20). In other words, writers must be able to locate and perform the accepted genres of the discourse community. Unfortunately, this description tells us little about *how* writers develop the ability to locate and perform the genres of a community.

To this end, I propose the addition of three theories of genre to the domain of genre knowledge that can help writers hone their ability to identify and perform the genres of the discourse community. First, writers benefit from an understanding of *genre as social action* (Miller 1984). In practice, this means knowing that in addition to being able to identify the “typical features” of a genre, an equally important factor the writer must consider is what the genre *does*—the social activity which the genre helps to mediate. Second, writers benefit from an understanding that genre is a dynamic rather than static action (Devitt 1993). Genres change over time and across contexts to meet evolving needs; in other words, they are marked as much by *variation* as by *stability*. In practice, a writer who understands genre as dynamic is less likely to look for a formula or template for performing a genre. Rather, they are going to think about how to best adapt a genre to fit the needs of a particular rhetorical situation. Third, writers benefit from the knowledge that different genres serve to accommodate information for the needs of different audiences, even if the message meant to be conveyed is the same (Fahnestock

1986). In practice, this means knowing how to deliver the same information to a variety of audiences.

### Rhetorical Knowledge

Expertise in writing also requires considerable rhetorical knowledge. As Beaufort puts it, “writers must address the specific, immediate rhetorical situations of individual communicative acts (Ede and Lunsford 1984; Lunsford and Ede 1996). This includes considering the specific audience and purpose for a particular text and how best to communicate rhetorically in that instance” (20). In other words, rhetorical knowledge entails awareness of the constituents of the rhetorical situation (Grant-Davie 1997). That is, writers enact expert writing performances when they are able to successfully define their purpose (*exigence*), address their audience(s) (*audience*), establish a writerly ethos (*rhetor*), and consider the affordances and constraints of the writing situation (*constraints*). Rhetorical knowledge also involves knowing that *writing is a social and rhetorical activity by which people (or communities) make-meaning and mediate activity* (Roozen 2015; Estrem 2015). In other words, expert writers know that their writing contributes to a discourse community’s inward or outward conversation in some way and that their writing will have visible consequences on the immediate or distant world around them.

### Writing Process Knowledge

Lastly, students must develop knowledge of the strategies, procedures, and collaborations involved in the creation and circulation of texts as well as the individual

dispositions that best facilitate such activities. That is, they must continue to build on their knowledge of the writing process. This includes knowledge of strategies for writing, such as shitty first drafting (Lamott 1994). It also includes knowledge of the procedures involved in writing, such as brainstorming, drafting, revision, and editing. I would add here that process knowledge involves knowing that writing is a *recursive* process that often requires circling back and jumping forward. It also means knowing and accepting the *collaborative* aspect of writing despite the persistent cultural myths that writing is an activity done in solitude (which it almost never is) and that the best writers are recluses (Holbrook and Hundley 2017). Writing process knowledge also benefits from dispositions toward writing that accept *failure* and *risk-taking* as essential features of the process (Brooke and Carr 2015; Carr 2017).

Taken together, Beaufort's five knowledge domains provide a framework for thinking about the kinds of knowledges (and related terms and concepts) that could be the explicit focus of transfer-based reflection and metacognition. These knowledges are taught in today's first-year writing courses that adopt a TfT or WaW approach, and I suggested in my introduction that an editorial course offered as a companion course to FYC could provide a context for students to continue building on that knowledge and practice in writing. It would seem, then, that the next logical step is to provide an account of how writing studies and other disciplines have taken up editorial pedagogy, which has also been referred to as "publishing as pedagogy." We can begin by looking at writing and composition studies' comparatively recent interest in the pedagogical value of public writing, or composition's "public turn" (Mathieu 2005).

### Publishing as Pedagogy

Over the last several decades, a great number of writing studies researchers, writing programs, and composition practitioners can be said to have participated in what Paula Mathieu (2005) termed the field's "public turn," a turn characterized by an increased drive to engage student writers in various "writing for public audiences" projects. These public writing projects have ranged in purpose and focus; some have focused on increasing students' civic engagement through service learning (House 2015; others have established community publishing projects rooted in social activist causes (Mathieu 2005; Mathieu, Parks, & Rousculp 2012), and still others have brought multimodal digital publishing projects such as blogging and zine creation into writing course instruction as a way to have students consider how texts are composed and circulated in the digital age. There are also the numerous student-edited literary journals that we must take into account when taking stock of the various kinds of "writing for public audiences" courses that populate English and Writing Program course listings.

Considering the fact that many writing programs in the U.S. already offer various "writing for public audiences" courses, some of my readers would be well within their right to ask: What learning experiences does a transfer-based editorial pedagogy for a course dedicated to the publication of a print-based FYW journal offer that other writing for public audience projects do not? I have several thoughts in anticipation of this question. In terms of community publishing and literary publishing projects, one key distinction I can make is the shift in focus. In community publishing writing courses, the

focus tends towards either civic engagement or social activism. Writing, while an important feature of such courses, is secondary to the focus on engagement or activism, and the *content of writing studies*, the cornerstone of current transfer-based approaches, takes an even further place (if it is considered at all). In contrast, the writing/editorial process and the content of writing studies would be the prime focus of a transfer-based editorial course dedicated to the publication of an FYW journal. Students would add to their knowledge of the writing process by engaging in a developmental editorial process that better reflects how texts are composed and circulated in professional and academic contexts. Furthermore, students in a print-based editorial course that publishes an FYW journal would continue to work with the content of writing studies that they learned in FYC and would subsequently participate in enacting the disciplinarity of writing studies in a localized context (through the publication of a university FYW journal). The focus on the content of writing studies and the enacting of writing studies as a discipline also distinguishes the pedagogy that I am calling for from the literary editing courses that exist in many English departments across the United States.

As for what distinguishes the future editorial course I envision and digital and multi-modal publishing pedagogies, I would point to the general distance between the editors and the texts that are getting published. In a multi-modal publishing course, students are often self-publishing their own work and/or collaborating with peers to publish a group text. In an editorial pedagogy for a print-based FYW journal, the editors are working with texts that have been submitted from outside of the classroom. I would also appeal to the power of the printed word. Mathieu et al. (2012) describe the “resonant

meaning of ‘being in print’ that carries importance for many individuals” (2). As I have discovered in my research, such “resonant meaning” serves as a motivating factor for many students. Additionally, much of the work done in for a print-based editorial course involves multimodal and digital text production anyway, as will be made apparent in the ethnography and resulting analysis/discussion that make up the latter half of this project. The two are not mutually exclusive.

The FYW journals that have emerged at universities across the U.S. over the last two decades can also be viewed as part of the “public turn” in writing studies. However, despite the rise of FYW publications, little writing studies scholarship presently exists that deals with how and why to teach undergraduate students the print-based editorial process, and, to my knowledge, none exists that explicitly theorizes a print-based editorial pedagogy designed for the transfer of writing knowledge. This isn’t altogether surprising. As McDonnell and Jefferson point out, the FYC journals that do exist tend to be edited by faculty members. It is also possible that other ecological factors such as funding and institutional constraints impede the creation of print-based editorial courses. Whatever the case, it follows that perhaps the exigence for an editorial pedagogy for the transfer-based writing program has not been as strong as it could be. All the same, some scholars in the field have recognized the potential of the editorial process of as a pedagogical tool and have started to articulate editorial pedagogies that place the responsibility of the publishing process in the hands of students (McDonnell and Jefferson, 2010; Ball, 2012, 2013; Stommell, 2012). *Publishing as pedagogy*, as it has come to be known, has also been an area of interest in Library and Information Studies

owing in part to the fact that many university libraries house small university presses that hire students to engage in editorial projects.

At the same time that writing studies scholars were beginning to reconsider how students' texts were valued within the university, McDonnell and Jefferson (2010) made the case for making students responsible for the publication of existing and future FYC journals on the grounds that such a programmatic move would both participate in the revaluing of student texts and provide students on the editorial side with valuable learning experiences. They present a two-fold critique of how publishing and the publishing process are treated in most first-year composition contexts. First, in FYW courses, publication is often treated as "an afterthought," if publishing is even considered at all. They write, "Our students prepare, compose, collaborate, rewrite, collaborate some more, and edit in a dizzying circle, but they do not learn to be published" (108). They cite the curious fact that most composition text- and hand-books used in first-year writing contexts are devoid of any sections devoted to publishing or writing for publication as evidence for this claim. The second and more pertinent critique has to do with how the publication process of FYW journals is handled. In most cases, the process is handled exclusively by the faculty. McDonnell and Jefferson argue that the faculty-curated arrangement typical of most FYW journals does nothing to disrupt the problem that FYW journals were meant to address; in fact, the authors reason that such an arrangement ultimately reinforces this dynamic. As a potential solution to the problem, McDonnell and Jefferson advocate for involving students in "the back-room, behind-the-scenes negotiations that most FYW publications reserve for faculty" (109). They highlight the

pedagogical activity among faculty that happens in these contexts as a missed opportunity to promote student learning:

When we work collaboratively to define and apply criteria to finished student texts in order to create a publication, we engage in exactly the kind of critical reading and writing we hope to teach students in FYW. We are not peer reviewing or workshopping rough drafts under a teacher's watchful eye, nor are we editing, as our students typically understand the term ... We are instead doing the work of editors, in which publishing is the process. Putting this responsibility in the hands of students extends to them the larger perspective afforded by publication. (109)

The authors go on to identify several editorial course activities that are beneficial in terms of writing development: generating an assessment rubric for submissions, developmental peer-review, and an activity they call “comments-on-comments.” The first requires students to articulate and negotiate their values about writing and understanding of writing studies topics. The second is an extended form of peer review in which reviewers work with authors over several weeks or months (depending on time constraints) to help them revise their piece for publication. The last is a meta-assignment for the peer review whereby reviewers share their feedback (comments) to authors with other student reviewers and “comment on those comments.”

McDonnell and Jefferson wrote “Product as Process” in 2010. Since then, a growing number of digital writing studies scholars have been taking up, theorizing, and practicing editorial pedagogies in writing program contexts (Ball, 2012; Ball, 2012; Ball, 2013; Stommell, 2012). Cheryl C. Ball, for example, has spent the better part of the last



decade developing and refining her editorial pedagogy focused on the creation of multimodal web-texts as well for digital scholarly and non-scholarly publication venues as well as print-based academic . Ball’s pedagogy is deeply informed by her experience editing the peer-reviewed [\*Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology and Pedagogy\*](#). In a three-part series of web-texts published by [\*Hybrid Pedagogy\*](#), a self-described “open-access journal of learning, teaching, and technology,” Ball outlines, first, her editorial pedagogy as professional teaching philosophy ([\*Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 1: A Professional Philosophy\*](#)), then how an editorial pedagogy plays out in writing courses ([\*Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 2: Developing Authors\*](#)), and, finally, how an editorial pedagogy works in an student-led editorial course ([\*Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 3: Developing Editors and Designers\*](#)). Together, these articles illustrate what publishing as pedagogy (an editorial pedagogy) can look like in writing program contexts. In my review of this literature, I want to draw particular attention to the pedagogical value of a developmental editing model of peer-review.

In her editing courses dedicated to scholarly publications, Ball emphasizes the rhetorical and developmental work that editors engage in when producing an academic journal. For example, she teaches rhetorical awareness by consistently requiring students to consider how their work as developmental editors involves making rhetorical choices based on their best approximations of the venue’s mission and values. How, for instance, do they “work closely to develop an author’s work while acknowledging the mission, values, and/or time constraints of that venue?” (4). How “might they honor the author’s voice while also answering to the venue’s and the readers’ needs?” (4). These important

rhetorical questions can be taken up editorial pedagogy, since editorial work involves navigating between the various and sometimes conflicting needs of authors, audiences, and the venue itself. Subsequently, these conversations can help students to develop a strong sense of rhetorical awareness that can be useful as they go on to become editors, writers, and readers in later contexts.

Ball's editorial pedagogy also teaches the value and benefits of a developmental editing model of peer-review. As defined by Norton (2009), "*developmental editing* denotes significant structuring or restructuring of a manuscript's discourse." In a developmental editing model of peer-review, editors and reviewers provide ongoing organizational and/or stylistic writing support to authors whose submissions have been accepted into the planned publication. The author enacts process knowledge by undertaking a revision process that is both fundamentally recursive and collaborative. In her undergraduate writing and publishing courses, Ball promotes a developmental model of writing and editing that emphasizes *recursivity* and *collaboration* as key features of the co-constitutive process of publishing and writing for public audiences. She explains:

An editorial pedagogy builds on the recursive and reciprocal nature of professionalization through editing, writing, mentoring, and teaching — [student and teacher](#), author and editor, [reader and scholar](#) learn from each other (and the lines between those roles blur in an editorial pedagogy) (Ball, 2012).

In an editorial pedagogy, students, whether they be developing authors or developing editors, are treated as scholarly subjects who hone their practice (whether it be writing or editing) through collaboration with each other. Such recursivity and collaboration are key

features of writing process knowledge, one of Beaufort's five knowledge domains, providing further evidence that an editorial course provides a promising context for teaching for transfer of knowledge and practice in writing.

Publishing as pedagogy has also been theorized in Library and Information Studies more generally and as part of Scholarly Communications in particular. In the last decade, several scholars have articulated the learning benefits of engaging students in the editorial process. Bauer et al (2009) identify several benefits to using the publishing process as a learning tool. Students deepen their knowledge of the subject of study, develop better research skills, increase their knowledge of rhetorical situations and scholarly genres, and sharpen their critical thinking about scholarly research and circulation. The authors also observe that working on the editorial staff improves students' writing and debating skills. Likewise, Alexander et al (2016) note that using publishing as a pedagogical tool encourages several of the high impact educational practices listed by the AACU, such as extensive writing, collaboration, undergraduate research, and experiential and community-based learning.

Despite the rich scholarly conversations going on about, on the one hand, transfer of knowledge and practice in writing, and on the other hand, publishing as pedagogy, I have yet to find a contribution to the transfer conversation that calls for or articulates an editorial pedagogy that *explicitly* attends to the goals of a transfer-based writing program (though one could well argue that some of the articles I have reviewed above *implicitly* tend to transfer). In any case, the fact that I have been unable to find any such articles

indicates a possible gap in the scholarly conversation. This project hopes to address this gap.

In addition to synthesizing existing research on transfer and publishing as pedagogy, I conducted an original qualitative study of an editorial course taught at my institution as part of the project. This study employed three ethnographic methods, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and genre analysis of written and oral texts, to study ENGL 460: Literary Editing, a publishing course offered at Humboldt State University which annually puts out the student-edited *Toyon: A Multilingual Journal of Literature and Art*. In the section that follows, I describe in more detail the methodology that was used to conduct this ethnographic study.

## METHODS

### Apprenticeship into the Publishing Community

This section begins with the admission that I did not have a wealth of experience in publishing when I began this project. Recognizing that my lack of experience in publishing might present grave problems if I chose to move forward with the project, I resolved to seek out opportunities. Fortunately, things more or less fell into place for me. In the fall of 2018, I landed a digital marketing internship with Humboldt State University Press (HSU Press), where I worked with Scholarly Communications Librarian Kyle Morgan and several other interns to promote HSU Press titles on social media, manage author relations, and develop marketing materials for our various titles. I created a promotional video for one of our children's books and a Wikipedia page for the Vietnamese diaspora writer [Võ Phiến](#), who was the subject of one of our books of literary criticism. The following spring, Kyle Morgan hired me part-time working as a Digital Marketer for HSU Press, where I have continued to post about our titles on HSU Press's social media accounts. I also worked closely with one of our authors to market their book and gained invaluable experience putting together a press kit for the title, which included a press release and email blast. I also created a new Wikipedia page based one of the book's subjects and wrote an "Interview with the Author" article that I hope to get published in a campus or local news editorial.

In my role at HSU Press, I also served as a peer reviewer for the upcoming 2019 volume of [\*ideaFest: Interdisciplinary Journal of Creative Works and Research from Humboldt State University\*](#), an open-access journal of creative and scholarly works started

at HSU in 2017. In an interesting twist of fate, an article I submitted to the very same journal was accepted with minor revisions for publication in the upcoming issue. As with most literary and scholarly journals, *ideaFest* journal uses a developmental editing model in their publishing process. Each article that is accepted into the upcoming issue goes through three rounds of peer-review, including both a student and faculty review, before it is published. This review process last around three months. Because I participated in this process as both reviewer and author, I was provided a unique perspective from which to reflect upon the benefits of such an editing model. As a peer reviewer, I gained invaluable behind-the-scenes experience about how the peer review process works in one particular university context, including how submissions are rated and selected for the forthcoming issue and best practices for providing revision suggestions. As an author, I engaged in a revision process that involved multiple people, including the managing editor, student reviewers, and faculty reviewers. I also learned that the author has a degree of agency in deciding which changes to make in their manuscript, so long as they can defend their reason for doing so and accept that the editorial board may decide to rescind their acceptance into the publication.

In addition to my apprenticeship into the publishing community, I planned and conducted an ethnographic study of Dr. Janelle Adsit's ENGL 460: Literary Editing course, the first in a sequential pair of literary publishing courses offered every fall and spring semester at Humboldt State University. The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of how a student-run print-publication process works.

## Ethnography of ENGL 460: Literary Editing

### Institutional Context

Each fall, students enrolled in ENGL 460 work together to complete roughly the first half of publishing process which results in *Toyon: A Multilingual Journal of Literature and Art*, the annual literary magazine published at Humboldt State University. While this course is the exclusive focus of my original ethnographic research, I should stress that ENGL 460 is actually one of a complementary pair of publishing courses offered every school year by the English department at HSU. The fall course is followed by ENGL 461: Literary Magazines and Audiences in the spring. As shown below, *Toyon's* publishing process is spread out over the course of the fall and spring semesters. In ENGL 460, students complete the *editorial stage* and roughly the first half of the *production stage* of the

publishing process, which in sum includes acquisitions and copyediting (editorial) as well as typesetting and design (production).



The first proof of the forthcoming issue is generated towards the end of the semester, and the class engages in one round of proofreading before handing the issue off to the spring class. In ENGL 461, students finish out the production stage by finalizing the proof and sending it out for

Figure 1: The publishing process of ENGL 460 and 461

print. ENGL 461 also marks the formal start of the *publicity stage* of the publishing process. Staff members on the publicity side manage the marketing and distribution of the journal, undertaking such projects as promoting the journal's March release as well as planning, organizing, and hosting the journal release party. Although the figure suggests a sequential order to the process, there is in fact significant overlap between these stages. For example, the production team starts typesetting and designing the book in early September, and they progress right alongside acquisitions and copyediting. The teaching of skills broadly understood as marketing begins at roughly the same time as proofing and is arguably even a feature of the acquisitions process (creating and posting Call for Submissions flyers *is* a form of marketing). Together, the courses contribute physical, intellectual, and emotional labor to the yearlong effort to produce and distribute *Toyon Multilingual Journal of Literature and Art*.

The study gave me the opportunity to learn about how student-run university publishing works in one local context. It should be noted here that this research did not attempt to analyze how Dr. Adsit teaches scholarly editing or how the class was designed to support transfer, since neither scholarly editing nor transfer were the explicit focus of the course; rather, this research investigated how students enrolled in an editorial course worked together with the course instructor to produce a student-edited university publication. I used this information to theorize ways that the activities of the editorial course can be modified to explicitly promote transfer of writing knowledge by integrating a reflective framework into the publishing process. Based on this goal, my guiding question for the research study was as follows: how can the work of an editorial course be



modified to promote transfer of writing knowledge from the first-year writing course to future social, scholarly and professional contexts?

I conducted this study using qualitative approaches over the course of 1-2 months to study the following: a) student and instructor descriptions of the work they have done in the course; b) student and instructor interactions in the course; c) the oral and written texts produced in the course. The research methodology used semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and genre artifact collection (respectively) to meet these study objectives.

Data collection methods were as planned: 1) one hour-long, semi-structured interview of five (5) student participants; 2) two classroom observations of Dr. Adsit's ENGL 460 course; and 3) collection of written and oral course artifacts produced by the instructor and students for the course. Data resulted from: 1) transcribed and analyzed interviews with participants about their perceptions of the course; 2) transcribed and analyzed classroom observations; and 3) analysis of written and oral course artifacts.

The three aforementioned methods to collect data were chosen to provide robust, triangulated data sets that could provide valuable insights into the inner workings of an editorial course, such as how the student-run editorial process progresses throughout the semester, the kinds of conversations had in an editorial room, and what motivates students to choose to work on a student-run publication. As defined by Scott and Morrison (2007), triangulation "uses different methods (either qualitative or quantitative) to look at the 'same' phenomenon." The use of multiple methods to study the same group in ethnographic research "allows researchers to investigation different facets of a

phenomenon in order to provide a more holistic and rich account of that phenomenon” (251-52). Triangulation thus lends credibility to a research study, as it allows for cross-checking for validity of data. Typically, three methods are employed, hence the term ‘triangulation.’ In this research study, the use of semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and genre artifact collection provided a triangulated research design for the ethnography.

#### Method #1: Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews made up the first research method that was used in this study. In contrast to the rigidity of the structured interview or the freeform nature of unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews offer a middle-path, providing the researcher “greater flexibility to introduce ‘probes’ for expanding, developing and clarifying informants’ responses” (Scott and Morrison 2007, 134). At the commencement of the research, interview participants were solicited through a presentation of the research focus during one of the course’s scheduled meeting dates. Those interested in participating in the interview portion of this research were prompted to provide their contact information so that I could reach them if they are selected to participate. Later, with the help of my committee members, I selected five (5) students to participate in 1 to 2 interviews. Participants were selected to form a collection of cases that provides a range of experience across the participant group. Each participant was scheduled for an hour-long, semi-structured interview. An interview guide (see APPENDIX A) was used for each of the five interviews to ask and guide questions during the interview. The interview

guide allowed me to start with a few guiding or anchoring questions and ask follow-up questions related to the conversation. The interview guide included open-ended questions or prompts to the subjects to promote discussion about their perceptions of and feelings about the work they have done in the course. All of the questions were explored across interviews.<sup>5</sup>

### Method #2: Classroom observations

Classroom observations made up the second qualitative data collection method that was used in this research. Observational methods complement interview methods in that they enable “researchers to sample educational experience first-hand rather than depend on what participants say and do” (Scott and Morrison, 2005). In other words, this method allowed me to observe the instructor and students of an editorial course *in action*—that is, engaged in interactions that were the focus of the ethnography. This provided a space for me to explore patterns and breaks between what participants said during an interview, what the collected instructional and student artifacts illustrated, and what I saw them doing in the classroom.

Specifically, I conducted two classroom observations of Dr. Adsit’s ENGL 460: Literary Editing course. The observations were conducted on Monday, November 26th

---

<sup>5</sup> Though I had initially anticipated that the interviews would last 60 minutes, such did not turn out to be the case. Almost all the interviews lasted 20-25 minutes, with one interview lasting 35 minutes.

and Monday, December 3rd. Both class meetings met from 5:00pm to 6:50pm. During each observation, I acted as a non-participant observer, meaning that I did not participate in the activities of those who I was observing. During each observation, I employed traditional ethnographic methods such as jotting down fieldnotes and scripting. Scripting involves doing off-the-cuff transcribing of dialogue exchanges between participants involved in the study. Once the two observations were completed, the field notes and scripts I composed were transcribed digitally and stored in my Google Docs folder containing all of my Master's Project materials.

#### Method #3: Oral and written course artifacts

Lastly, with the permission of both Dr. Adsit and students enrolled in the course, I collected and analyzed oral and written course artifacts produced by students and the instructor for the course. Dr. Adsit and the Toyon Staff kindly gave me permission to access the course documents posted to the course Canvas site. Audio recordings of student engaged in specific editorial activities were also created, and I was provided permission to access these files as well. Student documents that were collected and coded included research assignments, evaluation comments, various team-specific assignments, professional development genres (resumes, for example), and other miscellaneous texts produced for the course (Letter to Future Staff). Instructor materials that were collected and coded included the course syllabus, assignment briefs, and announcements. I also collected public artifacts posted on Toyon's website, including fall 2018's Masthead, staff bios, Toyon history projects, and selected readings in literary publishing.

### Methods of Analysis

The methods of analysis for the project can be organized into two parts. First, I set out to construct an ethnographic narrative of Toyon's fall 2018 semester based on the data I collected during the data collection phase of the study. I started by using the course syllabus and other instructional materials to create a rough timeline of the course from its start date on Monday, August 20<sup>th</sup> to its last scheduled meeting date on Wednesday, December 7<sup>th</sup>. This preliminary undertaking of mapping out the semester provided a skeletal understanding of the broad movements of the course. Then, using the interview transcripts, observation notes, and other course artifacts that I had collected, I weaved in student and instructor perceptions of the course, dialogue between participants, participant activities, and textual evidence to add an extra level of detail to the story that was beginning to emerge from the data. The main goal here was to create a bird's eye view of the course. I present these findings in the form of an ethnographic narrative in the Results chapter of the project.

Once I had written the ethnographic narrative of the course's activities, the next task was to analyze and interpret my findings. I chose to base my analysis of Toyon's fall 2018 semester on a slightly altered version Beaufort's (2007) model of writing expertise that combines "Discourse Community Knowledge" and "Subject Matter Knowledge" into a single domain titled "Discourse Community and Literacy Knowledge."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> As I explained in the literature review, Beaufort's description of subject matter knowledge closely

Subsequently, my analysis was framed within four knowledge domains: (1) discourse community and literacy knowledge; (2) genre knowledge; (3) rhetorical knowledge; and (4) process knowledge. The following questions guided my analytical approach:

1. How can ENGL 460 be viewed as an apprenticeship into the discourse community of literary publishing? How are students developing literate identities within the literary publishing community?
2. What are the genres of Toyon? How do students go about writing in the genres of the publishing community?
3. What kinds of rhetorical challenges did members of Toyon Staff face while working to put out volume 65 of Toyon?
4. How was the writing/editorial process conceptualized and enacted in ENGL 460?

By approaching the activities of ENGL 460 based on these questions, I was able to consider how the students of an editorial course engage the knowledge domains that

---

resembles discussions in writing studies about literacy, though the latter offers a political dimension to subject matter knowledge not recognized in Beaufort's model. As I argued, the demonstration of subject matter knowledge in any given rhetorical situation is a demonstration of *literacy acquisition* and *identity formation* within a discourse community. Yet, the subject matter of a discourse community is not given freely; such knowledge is always bound up in issues of access and membership (Gee 1998; Brandt 1998). Furthermore, the overlap and interactivity between literacy acquisition and the discourse community further suggested to me that I should combine the two knowledge domains into a single domain titled "Discourse Community and Literacy Knowledge."

Beaufort argues are central to writing expertise. The subsequent perspective gained from this analysis helped me to think about the ways that a reflective component keyed to these knowledge domains can be integrated into an editorial course designed to promote writing transfer beyond the first-year writing course. I present my conclusions in the Analysis and Discussion chapter of the project.

### Limitations of the Methodology

There were several limitations to research design I employed to conduct the ethnographic study. A key limitation of the methodology was the choice of a literary magazine editing course as the object of my study. Ideally, I would have preferred to study the editorial process of student-run scholarly journal, since what I ultimately hope to offer here are notes toward an editorial pedagogy for student-led journal of first-year writing. Such a journal which would consist primarily of writing studies-based scholarly texts.

Several time constraints also limited the scope of the study. I proposed the ethnography to Dr. Adsit at the beginning of the fall 2018 semester in late-August, and by the time I received IRB approval for the study in early November, ENGL 460 was more than halfway through their editorial process. Consequently, I was unable to conduct observations during the acquisitions phase of Toyon's editorial process. Classroom observations of the key activities of this phase, such as the rubric generation process, would have been rich with material for analysis. Interviewees' responses may also have been affected by the time constraints of the study. I conducted all of the interviews from mid-to-late December, and participants may have had difficulty recalling their

experiences from earlier in the semester. Had the interviews been conducted while students were engaged more deeply in the editorial process and not towards the end when everything had slowed down, their responses may have been more revealing.

I must also acknowledge the limitations that arose due to my role as a novice ethnographer. For example, when I began to analyze the transcripts from the semi-structured interviews, I recognized several instances where I could have asked a follow-up question to expand, further develop, or clarify the participant's response to the original question that had been asked. Additionally, my lack of experience conducting observations, in my view, severely impacted the quality of my observation notes. I have chosen to view these failures as teachable moments that will influence how I go about conducting qualitative research in the future.



## RESULTS

### ENGL 460: A Bird's Eye View of the Course

ENGL 460: Literary Editing is a 400-level class open to all majors. The course can fulfill an elective requirement for English majors across concentrations, and, because Toyon is [deeply committed to environmental justice](#), the course also counts toward the environmental studies major. It primarily attracts English majors, and almost all those who enroll are seniors. There is a heavy emphasis in ENGL 460 on career education, in part because the course is the one place in the English department's curriculum where students can learn about and create career-oriented genres such as cover letters and resumes. Dr. Adsit explained to me that the career education aspect is threaded throughout the course. All the learning experiences are grounded in conversations about future opportunities for careers in publishing and other professional contexts. Students read about what it is like to work in the publishing industry, what kinds of jobs are available in publishing, and what the hiring practices are like. Many students who take the course have an interest in potential jobs in publishing; not all of them do, however, and Dr. Adsit often engages students in conversations meant to help them think about how the publishing skills learned in ENGL 460 map onto other career paths.

Fall 2018's ENGL 460 class, the course where qualitative data were collected, was organized to complete roughly the first half of the publishing process of Volume 65 by the end of the semester. The class met every Monday and Wednesday from 5:00 p.m. to 6:50 p.m. for a total of seventeen weeks, including Finals Week. Most class sessions were led by Janelle and the Toyon's fall 2018 Managing Editor.

Toyon is no small commitment. Students were expected to be present both physically and mentally during every scheduled meeting date. Students were also expected to do much of their work outside of the classroom. Each student signed up to do an hour of tabling at one of the various campus events taking place during the semester. Members of the Editorial Team met most every Friday morning to discuss editorial concerns. The Outreach Team was tasked with going out into the wider campus and local community to network and promote the journal. Despite the labor-intensive and deeply collaborative nature of ENGL 460, students seemed genuinely eager to work on Toyon. As one interview participant explained:

Like it's the ultimate group project. And for the first time I didn't feel like, "Oh, God. I'm doing everything." Like, you know, everyone really was focused [...] I mean, there's probably a few people that got away with not doing much, but we all went in wanting to do something and not half ass it, you know. Like, it's weird. I didn't feel like, "Man, this is going to suck working with a bunch of other people." It worked out really well, and I think it came down to [the fact] that we had organized roles and we all really ultimately just wanted to put out something good.

Because students saw themselves as contributing to a meaningful project, they were more than happy to undertake all the work involved in participating on Toyon.

Students spent Week 1 getting situated, setting personal and community goals and expectations, planning the semester out, and deciding individual and team roles. On the first day of class, the Managing Editor welcomed students to the Toyon Staff, talked

about his and Dr. Adsit's expectations for the year, started the conversation about a vision for volume 65, and discussed the special theme (migration) for the upcoming issue. Dr. Adsit led students through an exercise that was designed to help them learn and think about the life cycle of the book as well as Toyon's own editorial process. The Managing Editor then facilitated an icebreaker activity so that students could get to know each other, learn about their peer's interests in publishing, and begin to build community. Dr. Adsit followed with a description of the various roles that staff members can fill in Toyon and ended that discussion by administering a role preference sheet to be completed by midnight the following day. Dr. Adsit and the Managing Editor gave walkthroughs of both the physical (Toyon Room) and digital spaces (Toyon Canvas; Google Team Drive; [toyonliterarymagazine.org](http://toyonliterarymagazine.org)) of *Toyon*.

Students were introduced to the literary publishing community as well as Toyon's own [distinguished](#), if at times [checkered](#), sixty-five-year history (the links connect to two "History of Toyon" articles that several students composed and published for an assignment later in the semester). They devised a collective vision for the journal as well as a list of community agreements to guide their collaborations. Based on the individual preferences students listed the week before, Dr. Adsit and the Managing Editor placed students into one of four teams: editorial, production, outreach, and web-design/spoken word. Many students ended up wearing multiple hats, as each staff member selected a specialized role to play both in their teams and on staff. For example, one interview participant served as both secretary for the entire staff and co-lead on Outreach Team. Other roles included editorial team lead, spoken word division editor, typesetter and book

designer, literary translator, archiving editor, and writers and artists community liaison. Students subsequently created “road-maps” for the semester and set benchmarks for later assessing how they met their team’s measurable goals. These matters tentatively resolved, the staff moved quickly into the editorial stage, which began Week 2 with acquisitions.

# TOYON LITERARY MAGAZINE

SUBMIT YOUR POETRY,  
ARTWORK, ESSAYS, SPOKEN  
WORK, SHORT STORIES, ETC.

**Deadline - Sept. 30, 2018**

**Special feature: Migration, or the  
movement of people**

TOYONLITERARYMAGAZINE.ORG



@toyonhsu

facebook.com/toyonmagazine



Figure 2: General flyer advertising volume 65's special theme

Acquisitions entailed both the soliciting and evaluating of submissions for the future issue, and Weeks 2-9 were largely dedicated to completing these twin tasks. In Week 2, students learned about and enacted best practices for creating Call for Submissions flyers and other advertising materials. Soon after that class meeting, updated flyers advertising this volume’s “special theme” as well genre-specific flyers could be seen on bulletin walls all around the campus and local community and across

Toyon’s various social media accounts (see: Figure 2: General flyer advertising volume 65's special theme). During this same period, staff members who had decided to do their hour of tabling early could be found at most social, academic, or career events held on the University Quad passing out stickers created by students in previous iterations of the course, handing out back issues, and delivering their best *Toyon* “elevator pitch.” The

Outreach Team began to scout the university and local scene for promotional and other networking opportunities. In the classroom, students learned about jobs in literary publishing, the types of literary publications, and issues in hiring and retention in the publishing industry.

During Week 6, with the September 30<sup>th</sup> submission deadline fast approaching, the students started to prepare for the evaluation phase of acquisitions. That week, the entire staff participated in the critical task of generating a *general* and a series of *genre-specific* rubrics to be used for evaluating submissions in poetry, fiction, literary criticism, creative nonfiction (CNF), visual art, and spoken word (see Appendix for example). These early negotiations were informed by selected readings in, and subsequent discussions about, aesthetic theory. The deliberations were variously described as “chaotic,” “messy,” and “clumsy.” One interview participant described the experience:

I mean we started from scratch. We didn't have [a template], like, we just kind of thought, let's just start brainstorming ideas of what looks like good writing to us. What does that look like? What is something you would publish? And it was kind of vague. And like I think at first it felt like, what are we saying? How do you evaluate something and say like, “it's specific, but it's also broad.” [...] I can't remember the exact words we used, but some of our parts of our rubric seemed like, like there was something about poetry being like musical and image driven. And I'm like, that's... So okay. So, *every* poem needs to be musical and image driven? Cause not every poem that is good is necessarily lyrical. Sure. So sometimes that was a little clumsy.

During the rubric generation process, members of the Toyon Staff went through three rounds of revision of the rubrics and debated what students came up with. In one related activity, Dr. Adsit had the Toyon Staff flip through 30 quotes and summaries of different aesthetic theories (these were pasted on index cards) from diverse authors. In one phase of the exercise, the students selected the cards they felt most aligned with Toyon's mission statement. In another phase, they were prompted to speak back to those cards by either modifying or agreeing with them. They were asked to take notes on their conversations, and these notes served to help facilitate the rubric generation process.

During this period, staff members also read, wrote, and talked about the problems associated with blind review, the method of peer review currently employed by Toyon. As I found out, Toyon uses blind review more out of necessity than any ethical allegiance, as the possibility of a reviewer knowing an author is high for a student-led publication in such a small university setting, and open forms of peer review have the potential to lead to personal positive or negative bias. The question about blind review also led to important conversations about representation and diversity in literary publishing, discussions which were had both in class and on a course Canvas forum.

Each staff member then signed up to review manuscripts in one of three genre categories, in either (1) fiction, (2) poetry or (3) critical analysis and CNF. Everyone was expected to review visual art and spoken word submissions. Spanish and other language speakers on the Toyon staff self-identified as willing to read any submissions written fully or partially in different languages. During Wednesday's class meeting, the staff held a norming session in which they attempted to collectively align their scoring in each of

the submission categories. The submissions window closed just before midnight that following Sunday.

Week 7 to Week 9 were designated as “working sessions.” Staff members spent the majority of those two weeks evaluating submissions using the class-generated rubrics they had composed the prior week. Each manuscript was read by two people in blind review and given a score of 3 to 1. A score of 3 meant *accept*; a score of 2 meant *accept with reservation* or *accept contingent upon requested revisions*; and a score of 1 meant *reject*. Reviewers were required to submit an evaluation comment for each submission they reviewed providing a written justification for the score they gave. They were strongly encouraged to think about each submission *through* the language of both the general and the corresponding genre-specific rubrics they had generated as a class. All submissions evaluations were completed on Wednesday, October 17 (Week 9) and released to division editors in each genre category. The division editors were then expected to spend the next week deciding which submissions they wanted to publish out of the those that received a score of 2 or 3. They would be expected to present their “top-tier” selections to the entire staff the following Wednesday. It was at this point that the class began to approximate what would go into the forthcoming issue.

During Weeks 10 and 11, students prepared for the copy-editing and typesetting stages of production. On Monday, students talked about typesetting, known in the industry as the “the guts.” On Wednesday, Scholarly Communications Librarian Kyle Morgan visited the class to give a crash course on copyright and permissions. At this point, they did a check for work that had already been published or work that excerpts

beyond fair use, as the journal cannot publish work without proper permissions from the copyright holder. As scheduled the week prior, Division Editors presented a tentative version of table of contents to the rest of the staff. All the manuscripts that were selected for publication were subsequently uploaded onto the Google Team Drive.

On Monday, October 29, Toyon Staff members were expected to attend the Campus Dialogue on Race Keynote Address. Before the event, the staff decided that they wanted to record all the performances at the event and encourage performers to submit these recordings to Toyon. They also decided that they wanted to host a dinner with keynote speaker Denice Frohman after the event. As Dr. Adsit later told me, these collective choices “reflect the students’ orientation toward social justice.” Simultaneously, the students were reviewing the contents in the team Google Drive and emailing the division editors with any concerns about their selections.

During Weeks 12 through 15, the process got a little messy. The editorial team tracked down authors and queried them about developmental editing concerns. Production Team worked on the guts of the upcoming issue, including front and back matter, and prepared for typesetting. As the editorial teams received back author revisions, they started to copyedit the accepted manuscripts. Once they had finished copyediting, they then queried the authors again to receive final approval to move forward with publishing the submission, and once they received approval, they sent over “transmittal manuscripts” over to production. Once production received the transmittal manuscripts from editorial, the production team began to typeset the texts for publication.



During Week 15, the class began to think about the rhetoric of job interviewing and resume-building as part of the ongoing career education that is a large feature of the course. On Monday 26<sup>th</sup>, students began the class with activities meant to prepare them for interviews for professional jobs in publishing. They did this in preparation for the final for the course, which would take place during Finals Week and would consist of a Mock Interview with Morgan Barker, an Instructional Designer with a background in career curriculum assessment, Loren Collins, Faculty Support Coordinator for Service Learning and Career Education, and Kelly Fortner, and Americorps Vista Volunteer who was working in the campus career center for the 2019-20 academic year. They participated in small group and whole class activities where they considered the rhetorical situation of the job interview and took a look at the kinds of questions that they could potentially be asked during an interview. For example, Dr. Adsit posed this question to students: “How would you respond to the same question for two different job positions?” One student replied that they would try to say something that reflected the particular values of the two organizations. The second half of the class was spent thinking about the resume genre. Dr. Adsit presented them with a variety of different resumes and asked students to identify similarities and differences between the examples. Through this activity, students were able to consider their own preferences for their own resumes.

Week 16 was spent proofreading the first proof, reviewing spoken word submissions, and wrapping up their work for the semester. On the second day I observed the course, Dr. Adsit began class with an exercise in which Toyon Staff collectively composed a “Letter to Future Staff” to be read by the fall 2019 staff. Staff members

arrived in class to find a total of nine poster sheets posted all around the classroom. Each poster had a different prompt: the first asked why students were glad they had joined Toyon; the second asked students to give advice to future staff; the third asked students to write something they wished they had known on the first day of class; the fourth asked students to think of changes they'd like to see in Toyon's editorial practices moving forward; the fifth asked staff to envision Toyon's future; the sixth asked staff for suggestions for future special themes; the seventh asked the staff to offer advice for writers and artists who might submit to Toyon in the future; the eighth asked staff to consider changes that could be made to the submission guidelines and/or to Toyon's web content; and the ninth asked staff to add any last comments or advice. After students had gone around the room to write something on each poster, Dr. Adsit broke everyone up into groups. Each small group was given one of the posters and was asked to draft up a paragraph or list based on what everyone in the class had written on it. The entire class worked collaboratively on a Google Doc to draft a "Letter to Future Staff."

After the "Letter to Toyon Staff" activity, Dr. Adsit and the staff walked over the Humboldt Lab, where they spent the remainder of class proofreading the entire issue. Each staff member was given one or more flashcards containing a specific proofreading job, such as checking for capitalization errors or inconsistencies in typesetting. Each staff member spent the class session combing through the entire issue for errors. They added every error they identified to a Google spreadsheet for the Production Team, whose job it would be to enter final edits into the proof before sending it out for print.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

As the current scholarship on transfer theory that I reviewed earlier has illustrated, students are most likely to develop and transfer writing knowledge when they are given multiple opportunities to reflect on their texts, their writing process, their knowledge of writing theory and practice, and their knowledge of themselves as writers within and across contexts. As many have argued, a necessary feature of such reflection is the use of the key terms and concepts of writing studies (Yancey, Robertson and Taczak, 2014; Beaufort, 2016; Gorelzskey et al, 2017). For this project, many of these terms were organized within a slightly altered version of Beaufort's conceptual model of writing expertise consisting of four knowledge domains: discourse community and literacy knowledge; genre knowledge; rhetorical knowledge; and process knowledge. It is through these four knowledge domains that I have chosen to analyze the ethnographic narrative of ENGL 460 that I presented in the Results.

I begin each section with a broad overview of how these knowledge domains are typically approached in the transfer-based FYC course. I do so with an awareness that pedagogical approaches to such concepts as genre and rhetorical situation vary widely in first-year composition and that any description I give here is bound to be limited and biased. For example, while I may harp on issues of access and change in the discourse community, others might focus more on its shared aspects. Nevertheless, I maintain that the overviews I provide are useful because they allow us to think broadly about the kinds of knowledges we want students to transfer beyond FYC. I follow each overview with an analysis of how students in ENGL 460 engaged these knowledge domains in the context

of a student-led publishing apprenticeship. Even though these domains were not always explicitly taught, as would be expected in a transfer-based curriculum, students in ENGL 460 learned about and enacted knowledge across all four domains as they worked together to produce volume 65 of *Toyon*. After each analysis, I discuss ways that the inclusion of reflection as an ongoing, private and communal, writerly practice can help students in an editorial course translate their learning experiences across these domains into transferable knowledge for use in future writing contexts. To that end, I conclude each discussion with a few points of reflection for practitioners interested in developing editorial pedagogies attentive to the goals of a transfer-based writing program.

#### Discourse Community and Literacy Knowledge

Transfer-based approaches to FYC encourage student writers to consider how learning to read and write (acquiring *literacy*) is a socially-situated process whereby we gain *membership* and develop literate *identities* within particular *discourse communities* (Gee 1998; Swales 1990; Johns 1997). Becoming literate in the *secondary Discourse* of a community is a process of *enculturation* (Gee 1998) that involves learning to speak the *lexis*, being able to identify and perform the *genres*, and coming to internalize the *goals* and *values* of a particular community (Swales 1990). Such knowledge is achieved via *apprenticeship* into the community under the watchful eye of the experts, which is to say, the “old-timers,” of the community (Swales 1990), who act as *literacy sponsors* (Brandt 1998). Some literacies, such as those acquired through *apprenticeship* into various academic disciplines, are prized more than others because they are attached to the

dominant discourses of powerful communities. These literacies are more difficult to acquire because they are connected to social, economic, or political capital and are thus subject to intense regulation and control by the discourse community. As Johns (1997) points out, while discourse communities may be united by shared goals, they are also sites of *exclusion, conflict, and change*.

An editorial course provides meaningful opportunities for students to continue building on the ideas about literacy and discourse communities that are introduced in the transfer-based first-year writing classroom. Throughout the semester, Toyon staff members were mentored by several experts in the field (foremost among them Dr. Adsit), who provided students with the tools and resources needed to develop literate identities as editors, marketers, and designers within the literary publishing community. In short, they were *enculturated* into the publishing community with the help of various *literacy sponsors*. From the very first day of semester, Dr. Adsit helped students navigate the publishing world by engaging them in the *lexis* and *genres* of literary publishing as well as the *goals* and *values* that have historically informed the Toyon community in its local context. Toyon students also developed literate identities in publishing with the help of other literacy sponsors connected to the community. As mentioned above, Scholarly Communications Librarian Kyle Morgan visited the class to teach them the basics of copyright and permissions. For their final, students did mock interviews with staff and faculty members, which required them to perform publishing identities in a low-stakes form of community *gate-keeping* (failure to adequately perform the identity simply meant that they had more practice to do in the future). By apprenticing into a localized

publishing community on campus, members of Toyon Staff effectively learned how to think, speak, write, and act like members of the publishing community. Evidence of these developing identities is found in some of the course artifacts I collected. For example, staff members are listed in the [masthead page](#) of the website immediately upon hearing of their role on staff. They also receive business cards with Toyon information listed on it; these, of course, identify them as staff members. They compose personal bios (see: masthead link above) that require them to take up a professional identity and do so knowing that their bio will be up long after they have taken the class. They had ongoing discussions about best practices for performing an online presence (individually or on behalf of Toyon).

Toyon Staff members were also encouraged to consider how active participation on the part of newcomers can lead to transformative change within the community. This capacity for change was most visible in discussions about the lack of diversity both in the hiring practices of the publishing community and in the authors and texts that literary journals tend to represent. During these conversations, which took place during class and in online discussion forums, students grappled with the reality that the literary publishing community has had a long history of excluding certain voices from both the editorial room and the published text. *Toyon* itself, they learned, is implicated in this history of exclusion based on gender. Later discussions ensued about how to make their issue of *Toyon* more inclusive and diverse in the forthcoming issue. These discussions about diversity subsequently informed how staff members solicited, evaluated, and selected texts for the issue that they eventually put out.

Students addressed issues of diversity in other ways as well. For example, in September 2018, Dr. Adsit assigned a writing project that asked students to do research on the history of Toyon and to compose a text addressing a particular aspect of the magazine's history. These would subsequently be posted as web-texts on Toyon's website (under the "History" tab). Two student texts created for this project illustrate how fall 2018 staff members worked to transform the Toyon community to better reflect the magazine's current values. In a web-text titled "Acknowledging the Complicated History of Our Past Issues," staff members Madeline Bauman, Quinn Dobbins, and Heather Rumsey addressed Toyon's checkered history of publishing what many today would consider sexist content. In the first part of this text, Bauman, writing on behalf of Toyon, acknowledged Toyon's history and expressed the community's desire to change to more accurately reflect their current values of diversity and inclusion:

Toyon acknowledges the content in our past issues, with their complications, misconceptions, and their severe straying from our current values of diversity and inclusion.

And later:

Past issues have suffered from a lacking attention to diversity. More recent issues feature attention to multilingual submissions and readers, as well as diverse representation. Since 2016, staff meetings are held regarding attention to diversity and inclusion as our utmost concern: becoming aware of the danger of the single story. The mentioned issues suffer greatly from telling a single story, whether that is one of sexism, of white importance, or of male-domination. The current

incarnations of Toyon, in our careful selections, hope to ensure this history remains history – unrepeated.

In addition to learning how to think, speak, write, and act like members of the publishing community, members of the Toyon Staff also learned to see themselves as agents of change capable of transforming the local literary and publishing community in order to better reflect their own goals and values, as suggested by their efforts to address Toyon's history of sexist content. In effect, they became active agents of change within the Toyon community. In the transfer-based FYC course, these are the activities that we want to see our students enact as they move through the university and join various disciplinary and professional contexts.

In an editorial course designed to support transfer of learning, the inclusion of ongoing, individual and communal, reflection throughout the process of acquiring these literacies can help ensure that students extrapolate literacy and discourse community knowledge from their learning experiences that could be used to navigate future social, academic, and professional communities of practice. In a reflection-centered editorial pedagogy, greater attention can be paid to ideas about literacy acquisition and development as students themselves are acquiring and developing literate identities in publishing. When teaching students the lexis of editorial work (such as Dr. Adsit did throughout the duration of the course), or when providing help with writing in one of the genres of publishing (such as when Dr. Adsit worked with staff to compose author queries), the instructor can pause to ask students to reflect on how learning the *lexis* as



well as the *genres* of a given community can be understood broadly within ideas about literacy acquisition and discourse community participation. They can also be asked to reflect on how becoming a member of a discourse community involves internalizing a community's *goals* and *values* so that they develop *identities* within and in relation to the community. Furthermore, reflection can help students see that the communities of practice change over time as new members enter the discourse. Toyon's decision to address the complicated history of its past issues illustrates that the editorial course is provides authentic moments to reflect on community change and self-definition. By bringing these ideas to the surface of student's metacognitive thinking, students can develop transferable literacy and discourse community knowledge keyed to terms and concepts such as *lexis*, *genre*, *goals*, *values*, *identity*, *access*, *membership*, *enculturation*, and *change*.

### Points of Reflection

- The publishing community has all the characteristics of a discourse community. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote discourse community and literacy knowledge by providing students a space to practice identifying the key characteristics that make the publishing community a discourse community, such as its specialized *lexis*, its particular *genres*, its purposes for and means of circulating those *genres*, its shared (or conflicting) *values* and *goals*, and its *membership*. Backward-reaching reflective activity can help them call forth their prior knowledge about these concepts so that they can apply them to the

publishing community, while forward-reaching reflection can help them abstract strategies for navigating the discourse community for use as they enter future communities of practice.

- The publishing community has a history exclusion both in its hiring practices and in the authors and texts it chooses to represent. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote discourse community and literacy knowledge by alerting students to issues of *access*, *membership*, and *representation* within the discourse community. Such conversations can also help students think about how communities *transform* over time as new members with different *values* and *goals* enter into the community.
- Members of an editorial team take up specific roles, or *identities*, in order to accomplish the collective goals of the publication. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote discourse community and literacy knowledge by encouraging students to reflect on their prior knowledge of identity and to consider whether the idea that *identities* are formed in relation to the discourse community confirms or alters their understanding in any way.

### Genre Knowledge

Students in transfer-based FYC courses today are taught to think about genre in new and potentially cool ways. They are encouraged to move beyond the narrow conception of genre as “type” and to think about *genre as social action*, that is, as

“typified response[s] to socially-recurring situations” (Miller 1984). And, even though writing speaks to situations through recognizable forms” (Bazerman 35), these “recognizable forms” (genres) are marked as much by their *variation* as by their *stability* (Devitt Hart-Davidson 2015). Genres change across contexts and time periods to meet different and evolving social needs. While cover letters may share similar rhetorical and design patterns, no two cover letters look exactly the same because they are responding to different situations. A syllabus today probably looks quite different than one from 60 years ago. Students also learn that genres serve to *accommodate* information for the needs of different audiences (Fahneestock 1999). A journalist and a police officer may write about the same robbery, but the journalist’s story and the officer’s report will inevitably differ in how they present the details of the crime.

A publishing course offers students many opportunities to practice and further develop their knowledge of genre. Throughout the semester, Toyon Staff members were required to pick up and perform a variety of genres necessary to accomplish both the collective work of Toyon as well as the responsibilities demanded of each student’s particular role. Students enacted genres in order to mediate activity in the many rhetorical situations in which they found themselves, such as those that emerged between staff members, between editors and authors, and between Toyon and the wider community. Students composed and circulated many different genres of writing throughout the process of putting together volume 65 of Toyon. Some of these were genres that all members were required to compose, such as flyers, staff bios, and evaluation comments. They also collaborated to generate evaluation rubrics for assessing submissions to the

journal. Other genres were specific to particular teams or roles on staff. For example, Outreach Team was in charge of sending out call for submissions emails and other marketing genres. Division Editors were in charge of sending out author queries. Toyon's secretary (who I interviewed) was expected to write meeting minutes during every staff meeting. In ENGL 460, then, very little writing was done for the sole sake of demonstrating competency for a grade; instead of reproducing what Wardle (2009) has termed the "mutt genres" of the university (that is, those assignments with very little use-value beyond the student-teacher or student-institution context), Toyon staff members did genre-based writing that had meaningful consequences on the world around them.

Adding a reflective component to the genre-based writing of the publishing course can help students think about their work with various genres and turn that thinking into a working theory and practice of genre that will be useful to them as they travel through the university and other social or professional contexts. Since the genres they compose in a publishing course actually have meaningful consequences in the community, students can, through reflection, begin to develop of theory and practice that understands genre less in terms of "typical features" in favor of a view of *genre as social action* (Miller 1984). For example, when students ask how to write a particular genre, instead of providing a template for how to write the text, instructors can lead with reflective questions that ask the student what they are trying to motivate others to do by writing the text. Dr. Adsit did this kind of reflective teaching when she worked with staff members to draft and revise professional resumes. This kind of reflection can also help students think about how genres often vary in rhetorical and design choices, even if they

are relatively stable genres, further leading students away from a “type” or “template” based understanding of genre. Lastly, reflection can be used to get students to think about how different genres accommodate information to meet the needs of different audiences. For example, instructors can prompt students to think what happens when the information presented in one genre (Vision for the Journal) is re-presented in another genre (Call for Submissions flyers). Such reflection on genre accommodation can prepare students for the different types of accommodation writing they will be doing as they move through the university. In sum, a reflection-centered publishing pedagogy can help students develop transferable genre knowledge keyed to such terms and concepts as *genre as social action*, *genre variation*, and *genre accommodation*.

### Points of Reflection

- Members of an editorial team do genre-based writing that has meaningful effects in the world around them. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote genre knowledge by encouraging students to reflect upon what they want their genre performances to do, that is, what *social actions* they hope to accomplish by writing in the genre.
- Even though the publishing community has a set of relatively *stable* genres it uses to accomplish its work, these genres can *vary* widely in terms of rhetorical choices and design depending on the demands of particular rhetorical situations. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote genre knowledge by encouraging students to reflect upon *stability* and *variation* in genre performance.

- In an editorial course, the publication's goals and values are communicated in a variety of genres, and that information often shifts rhetorically to accommodate the needs of different audiences. A reflective editorial pedagogy can help students to consider how genres translate information to meet the needs of particular rhetorical situations.

### Rhetorical Knowledge

In transfer-based FYC courses, instructors teach approaches to writing that emphasize the social and rhetorical nature of writing (Roozen 2015). We teach writing as a knowledge-making activity (Estrem 2015). We teach students to consider the constituents of the rhetorical situation (exigence; audience; rhetor; and constraints) (Grant-Davie) for any writing situation they approach.

Students' work on Toyon Staff was fundamentally social and rhetorical. In the course of putting together volume 65, members of Toyon Staff came to see themselves as active rhetorical agents whose individual and collective work would ultimately contribute to Toyon's sixty-five-year legacy as HSU's premier student-run literary publication. In crafting and subsequently carrying out a new vision for the journal, they became meaning-makers tasked with creating and circulating new knowledge in the local community. Students encountered many individual and collective rhetorical challenges along the way that required them to consider the exigencies, audiences, and constraints of particular rhetorical situations, both individual and collective. Interestingly, students

often spoke, not as individual rhetors, but as “institutional” rhetors speaking on behalf of Toyon. In other words, they were thinking beyond their own rhetorical situations to consider Toyon’s larger rhetorical situation as a community-based publication.

Discussions about how to prepare genre-specific advertising materials, how to assess the submissions they received (and subsequently which submissions to publish), and even how to design the book, all required collective rhetorical choices that were based on students’ best approximations of Toyon’s exigencies, audiences, and constraints.

A publishing course is rich with opportunities for students to practice and develop their rhetorical knowledge, and a reflective framework can be added to ensure that students don’t simply *do* rhetorical work but extract from their experiences a theory and practice of rhetoric that can help them approach later writing and rhetorical situations. For example, when crafting and subsequently carrying out a vision for the journal, greater attention can be paid to how people navigate between their own individual rhetorical situations and those of the communities they represent, for writing on behalf of an institution or entity such as a community publication requires the rhetor to navigate between the various needs of authors, audiences, and the venue itself. In sum, a reflection centered publishing course can help students develop transferable writing knowledge keyed to such key terms and concepts as *writing as a social and rhetorical activity*, *rhetorical situation*, *exigence*, *rhetor*, *audience*, and *constraints*.

### Points of Reflection

- In an editorial course, students often work together to update and enact the

journal's mission and values by (re)writing such texts as the journal's mission statement or Call for Submissions flyers. In doing so, they actively engage in rhetorical work whereby they create new meanings for the publication. A reflective editorial pedagogy can couch these activities in discussions about writing as "meaning-making" or "activity-mediating."

- In an editorial course, students often have to make rhetorical choices that require them to consider the rhetorical situation of the journal they represent. Such a demand requires them to navigate between the various and at times conflicting needs of authors and potential readers as well as the publication itself. A reflective editorial pedagogy can capitalize on these novel learning experiences by using them to teach the constituents of the rhetorical situation (exigence; audience; rhetor; constraints) as they are enacted by rhetors writing on behalf of larger communities of practice.

### Process Knowledge

Transfer-based approaches to FYC invite students to think about writing as a recursive and collaborative process that always involves some degree of *risk-taking* and *failure*, no matter how accomplished a writer you are. Writing is taught as *recursive* rather than linear process that has no clear order of activity; writing regularly demands that we double-back to earlier stages of the process or skip forward to later stages. Instructors emphasize *collaboration* by engaging students in group writing tasks, by having them participate in peer writing conferences, and by requiring them to make use



of the university writing center. Some instructors teach such strategies as shitty first drafting (Lamott) and work with the concept that “failure can be an important part of writing development” (Brook and Carr, 2016). By normalizing those ideas, instructors encourage students to take calculated risks as well as adopt a positive orientation towards failure in their own writing.

An editorial course offers multiple and sustained opportunities for students to enact their process knowledge by engaging them in *publishing as a process* that reflects how written texts are composed, revised, edited, and circulated in real-world contexts. In the course of reviewing submissions and deciding what to include in the new issue, for example, Toyon staff members were able to think about writing and the publishing process in new and exciting ways. As one interview participant described the process:

It was a lot different than I originally thought it was. I thought it was just, like, the person had edited their book fully and then they gave it to a publisher, and it was published without that much editing. But working on Toyon, I noticed that there’s a lot of work actually going into submissions that come in—how we read them and rate them and then how those are further edited and sent back to the author, who can make changes whether they want to or not. Then [they are] sent back to us where we make still little adjustments in the print copy.

Partly to the behind-the-scenes work of publishing, this interview participant came to see that writing for publication involves multiple stages of revising and editing and is accomplished through intense collaborations between authors, reviewers, and editors. This despite the fact that, unlike *Kairos* and *ideaFest*, which both include a lengthy

period of developmental editing in their publishing process, Toyon's developmental editing process is truncated to meet a tight timeline.<sup>7</sup> In a publishing context that is able to make room for an extended period of developmental editing, *recursivity* and *collaboration* in the writing process become all the more apparent. Authors writing for publication engage in a revision process that has no clear order of activity. Writers, reviewers, and editors work together much more closely and over a sustained period of time to revise existing content, further develop ideas, and edit the piece for publication. All this suggests to me that a developmental editing model is the most effective for teaching ideas about the writing process. The longer the period of developmental editing, the better. Even though Toyon is unable to employ an extended period of developmental editing, staff members nevertheless were able to see that writing for publication is both a recursive and collaborative process.

Some interview participants expressed feeling liberated once they learned how Toyon's publishing process works. One participant reflected, "it has kind of helped me be like, 'just write like these people submitted. You could write something, too. I mean it's

---

<sup>7</sup> Toyon is unable to incorporate an extended period of developmental editing into its publishing process due to various time and labor constraints. They have from September 30 to December 10 to evaluate 300+ submissions, make their selections, check permissions, evaluate their selections based on equity models (like VIDA count), typeset, and do one round of proofreading. With such a tight timeline, they are unable to offer authors much time to revise. For this reason, they select pieces which they feel need relatively few revision steps, and then they query authors about those revision steps that they feel are essential and possible to complete in an abbreviated timeline.

not as high stakes as you're thinking.” Another expressed a similar sentiment: “I think it made me a little more open-minded about how I judge writing and how my writing will be judged [...] and when you let it go, it's fine. [Rejection] is not like a personal attack.” Previously, these students were afraid to take risks, thinking that their texts needed to be perfect before sending them off to readers or publishers. In the course of putting together a publication, students abandoned a product-based orientation to their writing in favor of a developmental orientation that views *risk-taking* and *failure* as normal features of the writing process. They learned to loosen their high standards for what counts as good writing.

Toyon Staff members added to their knowledge of process in other ways that had less to do with writing for publication and more to do with completing the responsibilities demanded of their particular role on staff. For example, one interview respondent, who served as the editorial team lead, recalled how they collaborated with other staff members to develop best practices for emailing authors about making changes to the writer's submissions. The participant said:

[T]hat was difficult, writing an email to them saying, “Hey, are you open to changing this?” But without, like, telling them that we're going to publish their piece even if we are going to publish their piece. [...] So, we would need to sort of talk about their email. And I consulted other people, like the other acquisitions editor and said, ‘Hey, does this email sound okay?’

In many first-year writing classrooms, writers are told that writing is a recursive and collaborative process. They are told to take risks in their writing and embrace failure “as

an opportunity for growth” (Brooke and Carr, 63). The editorial process, especially one that uses a developmental model of editing, *makes visible* and thus *legitimizes* recursivity, collaboration, risk-taking and failure as normal aspects of every successful (by which I mean *published*) writer’s process. An editorial course, then, offers students multiple opportunities to reflect on and revise their process knowledge. For example, students can be asked, at strategic points throughout the semester, to compare their previous knowledge of the writing process to what they see happening in developmental editing publishing context. Such reflective work can help students identify *recursivity* and *collaboration* as regular features of every successful writer’s process. Reflection can help students rethink notions of “the perfect text” by demonstrating to them that the texts submitted for publication rarely show up on the publisher’s table in “perfect” condition, even those that eventually do get published, which leads to discussions about, well, what is perfect. They can then turn this new knowledge back on themselves, as the interview participants quoted above did upon reflection. In sum, reflection in the publishing course to help students develop a working theory and practice of process keyed to such ideas as *recursivity*, *collaboration*, *risk-taking*, and *failure*.

### Points of Reflection

- The editorial process makes visible the *recursive* and *collaborative* aspects of writing. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote writing process knowledge by asking students to reflect on how their participation in the editorial process has either confirmed or challenged their prior knowledge about how writing is done.

Forward reaching reflection on the editorial process can help students abstract *recursive* and *collaborative* strategies for writing that they can use in future writing contexts.

- An editorial team receives many submissions, and sometimes even good submissions get passed up in the selection process. Many submissions get accepted on a conditional basis that requires authors to undergo a developmental editing process. An editorial course makes visible *risk-taking* and *failure* as unavoidable aspects of every successful writing life. A reflective editorial pedagogy can promote writing process knowledge by having students reflect on their prior knowledge about what they think constitutes a publishable text and whether the editorial process confirms or challenges that knowledge. Students can also be encouraged to adopt a stance towards writing that accepts risk-taking and failure as key aspects of the writing process.

### Questions for Further Research

This paper was meant to provide notes toward an editorial pedagogy designed to promote transfer beyond the first-year writing course. I proposed reflection as grounding activity that could help students generalize their knowledge about concepts such genre and the rhetorical situation into a theory of writing that they could use and revise as they journey through social, academic, and professional life. I focused exclusively on the possibilities afforded by a reflective framework in an editorial pedagogy. Are there other approaches that could be written into an editorial pedagogy that would help students

transfer beyond the first-year writing course? For example, what would a Writing about Writing approach, which is arguably less reflection-heavy than other transfer-based curriculum, offer in terms of an editorial pedagogy?

In the introduction, I suggested a second-year companion course as an ideal context for a reflective editorial pedagogy designed to promote transfer beyond the FYC course. I argued that such a placement of an editorial course could serve as a bridge for students moving from the FYC course to future writing contexts. The notes that I offer here had this ultimate goal in mind. I imagined the kinds of prior knowledge students would be bringing from the FYC course and sought to provide ideas for how to continue engaging students in the key ideas and concepts of writing studies in a reflective editorial pedagogy designed to promote writing transfer. Yet, I wonder what other contexts might work for editorial pedagogy. Could such a pedagogy work as a special topics first-year writing course? What would be the benefits and limitations of implementing a publishing apprenticeship model in FYC? How about a graduate English studies course? What might increased collaborations between graduate students in English and recent-FYC students look like? These are questions that I hope to one day take up in future research.

## CONCLUSION

In a publishing course, we find students working out all kinds of concepts, strategies, beliefs and approaches that are central themes of many first-year composition curricula in the U.S. They apprentice into and develop literate identities within the publishing community. They take up and perform a variety of genres. They respond to various individual and collective rhetorical challenges. They develop and practice ideas about the writing process. From a pedagogical standpoint, then, a publishing course offers a world of promise for writing programs that want to promote active writing identities beyond the first-year writing course. Engaging students in the publishing process can help them further develop knowledge about writing and themselves as writers. So long, of course, as they are explicitly guided to do so.

If I could offer one small note, it's that we make good on the promise of publishing by grounding an editorial pedagogy in a personal and public culture of reflection, what Yancey, in her concluding essay to *Rhetoric of Reflection*, refers to as "reflective semipublic spaces where learning is a communal process" (310). I maintain that a publishing pedagogy built on top of a reflective framework can provide students with meaningful opportunities to develop a working theory and practice of writing that they can take with them, use, and modify as they travel through the university and beyond. If we want writers to continue to develop writing knowledge after the first-year writing course, they need to be provided additional opportunities to reflect upon and identify, assess, and generalize what they are doing at particular moments and in particular contexts into a working theory and practice of writing. My study of the Toyon

course demonstrates that student-run publishing is rich with these very opportunities. The question is how to develop editorial pedagogies that motivate students to capitalize on them. I offer up reflection. It is a tried and true practice by which students develop metacognitive habits as readers, writers, and researchers.



## WORKS CITED &amp; REFERENCED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda and Wardle, Elizabeth, editors. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. Utah State UP, 2015.
- Adler-Kassner, L., Majewski, J. and Koshnick, D. “The Value of Troublesome Knowledge: Transfer and Threshold Concepts in Writing and History.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012. [compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php](http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php).
- Alexander, Laurie, Colman, Jason, Kahn, Meredith, Peters, Amanda, Watkinson, Charles, and Welzenbach, Rebecca. “Publishing as Pedagogy: Connecting Library Services and Technology.” *EDUCAUSEreview*, 11 Jan. 2016, <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2016/1/publishing-as-pedagogy-connecting-library-services-and-technology>.
- “Appendix A: The Elon Statement on Writing Transfer.” *Critical Transitions: Writing and Question of Transfer*, edited by Chris M. Anson and Jessie L. Moore, Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, 2013. Available at <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/ansonmoore/>
- Bauer, Benjamin J., et al. “Learning through Publishing The Pi Sigma Alpha Undergraduate Journal of Politics.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2009, pp. 565–569., doi:10.1017/S1049096509090908.
- Ball, Cheryl. “Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 1: A Professional Philosophy.” *Hybrid Pedagogy*, 5 Nov. 2012. [hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-1-a-professional-philosophy/](http://hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-1-a-professional-philosophy/)

Ball, Cheryl. "Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 2: Developing Authors." *Hybrid Pedagogy*, 27.

Nov. 2012. [hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-2-developing-authors/](http://hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-2-developing-authors/)

Ball, Cheryl. "Editorial Pedagogy, Pt. 3: Developing Editors." *Hybrid Pedagogy*, 12, Feb.

2013. [hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-3-developing-editors-designers/](http://hybridpedagogy.org/editorial-pedagogy-pt-3-developing-editors-designers/)

Bazerman, Charles. "Writing Speaks to Situations through Recognizable Forms." *Naming*

*What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler

Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 35-37.

Beaufort, Anne. *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing*

*Instruction*, Logan, Utah State University Press, 2007.

Beaufort, Anne. "Reflection: The Metacognitive Move Towards Transfer of Learning." A

*Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, University Press of

Colorado, Utah State University Press, 2016, pp. 23-40.

[www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.5](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.5).

Beaufort, Anne. "Transferring Writing Knowledge to the Workplace, Are We on Track?"

*Expanding Literacies: English Teaching and the New Workplace*, edited by Mary

Sue Garay and Stephen A. Bernhardt, State University of New York Press, 1998,

pp. 179-200.

Beach, King. "Consequential Transitions: A Sociocultural Expedition Beyond Transfer in

Education." *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 24, 1999, pp. 101-139. *JSTOR*,

[jstor.org/stable/1167268](http://jstor.org/stable/1167268).

Bergman, Linda S. and Zepernick, Janet. "Disciplinary and Transfer: Students'

Perceptions of Learning to Write." *Writing Program Administration*, vol. 31, no.

1-2 (Fall/Winter), 2007, <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2bergmann-zepernick.pdf>

Brandt, Deborah. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 49, no. 2, May 1998, pp. 165-185. *JSTOR*, doi: 10.2307/358929

Brooke, Collin and Carr, Allison. "Failure Can Be an Important Part of Writing Development." *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 62-64.

Carr, Allison. "Failure Is Not an Option." *Bad Ideas about Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Libraries Digital Publishing Institute, 2017, pp. 76-81.

<https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>

Clark, Irene and Hernandez, Andrea. "Genre Awareness, Academic Argument, and Transferability." *The WAC Journal*, vol. 22, 2011, pp. 65-78.  
wac.colostate.edu/journal/vol22/clark.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2019.

Detterman, Douglass K. "The case for the prosecution: Transfer as an epiphenomenon." *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction*, edited by Douglass K. Detterman & R.J. Sternberg, Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing, 1993, pp. 1-24.

Detterman, Douglass K. and Sternberg, R.J. (eds.). *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing, 1993, pp. 1-24.

Devitt, Amy J. "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 573-586.

- Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552–584. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/20456966](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20456966).
- Driscoll, Dana Lynn and Wells, Jennifer. "Beyond Knowledge and Skills: Writing Transfer and the Role of Student Dispositions." *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012. [compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php](http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php).
- Driscoll, Dana Lynn. "Connected, Disconnected, or Uncertain: Student Attitudes about Future Writing Contexts and Perceptions of Transfer from First-Year Writing to the Disciplines." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing*, vol. 2, no.2, 2011, pp. 1-29. [wac.colostate.edu/atd/archives/volume8](http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/archives/volume8).
- Estrem, Heidi. "Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity." *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 18-19.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. "Accommodating Science: The Rhetorical Life of Scientific Facts." *Written Communication*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1986, pp. 275–296, *Sage Journals*, doi:10.1177/0741088386003003001.
- Farmer, Frank. *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counterpublics, and the Citizen Bricoleur*, Utah State University Press, 2013. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/humboldt/detail.action?docID=3442903>.
- Frazier, Dan. "First Steps Beyond First Year: Coaching Transfer After FYC." *Writing*

*Program Administration*, vol. 33, no. 3, Spring 2010.

Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction." *Journal of Education*, vol. 171, no. 1, Jan. 1989, pp. 5-17. *Sage Journals*, doi: 10.1177/002205748917100101

Gee, James Paul. "What is Literacy?" *Journal of Education*, vol. 171, no. 1, 1989, pp. 18-25.

Gorzelsky, Gwen, Hayes, Carol, Jones, Ed, and Driscoll, Dana Lynn. "Cueing and Adapting First-Year Writing Knowledge: Support for Transfer into Disciplinary Writing" *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Randall Bass, and Jessie L. Moore, Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2017. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/humboldt/detail.action?docID=4791229>.

Gorzelsky, Gwen, Driscoll, Dana Lynn, Paszek, Joe, Jones, Ed, and Hayes, Carol. "Chapter 8: Cultivating Constructive Metacognition: A New Taxonomy for Writing Studies." *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*, edited by Chris Anson and Jessie Moore, Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 215-46.

Grant-Davie, Keith. "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1997, pp. 264–279. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/465644](http://www.jstor.org/stable/465644).

Hart-Davidson, Bill. "Genres are Enacted by Writers and Readers." *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 39-40.

Holbrook, Teri and Hundley, Melanie. "Writers are Mythical, Magical, and Damaged."

*Bad Ideas about Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe,  
Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Libraries Digital Publishing  
Institute, 2017, pp. 53-59.

<https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>

Horner, Bruce. "Re-valuing Student Writing." *Teaching with Student Texts*, edited by

Joseph Harris, John D. Miles, and Charles Paine, Utah State UP, 2010, pp. 9-23.

House, Veronica. "Community Engagement in Writing Program Design and

Administration." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 2015.

Johns, Ann. "Discourse Communities and Communities of Practice: Membership

Conflict and Diversity." *Writing about Writing: A College Reader, 1<sup>st</sup> ed.*, edited  
by Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs, Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011,  
pp. 499-518.

Jo Reiff, Mary and Bawarshi, Anis. "Tracing Discursive Resources: How Students Use

Prior Knowledge to Negotiate New Writing Contexts in First-Year Writing  
Contexts." *Written Communication*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2011, pp. 312-37. *Sage  
Journals*, DOI: 10.1177/0741088311410183.

Lamott, Anne. "Shitty First Drafts." *Language Awareness: Readings for College Writers*,

edited by Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa, and Virginia Clark. 9th ed. Boston:  
Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005: 93-96.

- Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2005. Print.
- Mathieu, Paula, Parks, Steve and Rousculp, Tiffany. "Introduction: Circulating Communities: The Tactics and Strategies of Community Publishing." *Circulating Communities: The Tactics and Strategies of Community Publishing*, edited by Paula Mathieu, Steve Parks, and Tiffany Rousculp. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2012, pp. 1-20.
- McCarthy, Lucille. "A Stranger in Strange Lands: A College Student Writing across the Curriculum." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 21, no. 3, Oct. 1987, pp. 233-265. *JSTOR*, [jstor.org/stable/40171114](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171114).
- McDonnell, Karen and Jefferson, Kevin. "Product as Process: Teaching Publication to Students." *Teaching with Student Texts*, edited by Joseph Harris, John D. Miles, and Charles Paine, Utah State UP, 2010, pp. 108-28
- McManigell Grijalva, Regina A. "Chapter 5: Minding the Gap: Writing-Related Learning Across/With Multiple Activity Systems." *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*, edited by Chris M. Anson and Jessie L. Moore, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 139-60.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 70, 1984, *Taylor & Francis Online*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383686>
- Miller, Susan. *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition*. Southern Illinois University, 1991.

- Moore, Jessie L. "Five Essential Principles about Writing Transfer." *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Randall Bass, and Jessie L. Moore, Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/humboldt/detail.action?docID=4791229>.
- Moore, Jessie. "Mapping the Questions: The State of Writing-Related Transfer Research." *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012. <https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/map-questions-transfer-research.php>
- Nelms, Gerald and Dively, Ronda Leathers. "Perceived Roadblocks to Transferring Knowledge from First-Year Composition to Writing Intensive Major Courses: A Pilot Study" *Writing Program Administration*, vol. 31, no. 1-2 (Fall/Winter), 2007, <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2dively-nelms.pdf>
- Nowacek, Rebecca S. *Agents of Integration: Understanding Transfer as a Rhetorical Act*. CCCC of NCTE, 2011.
- Perkins, David N. and Salomon, Gavriel. "Are Cognitive Skills Context-Bound?" *Educational Researcher*, vol. 18, no. 1, Jan. and Feb. 1989, pp.16-25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1176006>.
- Perkins, David N. and Salomon, Gavriel. "Knowledge to Go: A Motivational and Dispositional View of Transfer." *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2012, pp. 248-258. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2012.693354.
- Perkins, David N. and Salomon, Gavriel. "Teaching for Transfer." *Educational Leadership*, vol. 46, no. 1, Sep 1988, pp. 22-32. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ376242>



- Perkins, David N. and Salomon, Gavriel. "Transfer of Learning." *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford, England: Pergamon Press, 1992.
- Prather, D. C. "Trial-and-error versus errorless learning: Training, transfer, and stress." *The American Journal of Psychology*, vol. 84, no. 3. 377-386. *APA PsychNET*, doi: 10.2307/1420469.
- Robertson, Lianne and Taczak Cara. "Teaching for Transfer." *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Randall Bass, and Jessie L. Moore, Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2017. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/humboldt/detail.action?docID=4791229>.
- Roizen, Kevin. "Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity." *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 17-18.
- Rounsaville, Angela. "Selecting Genres for Transfer: The Role of Uptake in Students Antecedent Genre Knowledge." *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012.
- Russell, David. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*, edited by Joseph Petraglia, Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum, 1995, pp. 51-78.
- Scott, David, and Marlene. Morrison. *Key Ideas in Educational Research*. Continuum, 2006.
- Silver, Naomi. "Reflection in Digital Spaces: Publication, Conversation, Collaboration." *A Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, University Press of

Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 2016, pp. 166–200. JSTOR,

[www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.12](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.12).

Smit, David. *The End of Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. “The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year.”

*College Composition and Communication*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2004, pp. 124–149.

JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/4140684](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4140684).

Stommel, Jesse. “Publishing as Pedagogy.” *PhD2Published.com*, 21 April 2012,

<http://www.phd2published.com/2012/04/12/2020/>

Swales, John. “The Concept of Discourse Community.” *Writing about Writing: A*

*College Reader*, edited by Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs, Boston/New York:

Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2011, pp. 215-229.

Taczak, Kara. “Reflection is Critical for Writers’ Development.” *Naming What We*

*Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and

Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 78-81.

Taczak, Kara, and Liane Robertson. “Reiterative Reflection in the Twenty-First Century

Writing Classroom: An Integrated Approach to Teaching for Transfer.” A

*Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, University Press of

Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 2016, pp. 42–63. JSTOR,

[www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.6](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhf.6).

- Thorndike, Edward L. and Woodworth, R.S. “The influence of improvement in one mental function upon the efficiency of other functions.” *Psychological Review*, vol. 8, no. 4, 1901, pp. 384-395. *APA PsychNET*, doi: 10.1037/h0071280
- Tinberg, Howard. “Metacognition is Not Cognition.” *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 75-76.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake, Robertson, Liane, and Taczak, Kara. *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*. Utah State UP, 2014.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. “Defining Reflection: The Rhetorical Nature and Qualities of Reflection.” *A Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, University Press of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 2016, pp. 303–320. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhfq.18](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1djmhfq.18).
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. “Re-designing Graduate Education in Composition and Rhetoric: The Use of Remix as Concept, Material, and Method.” *Computers and Composition*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2009, pp. 4-12, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2008.11.004>
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. *Reflection in The Writing Classroom*. University Press of Colorado, 1998. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46nsh0](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46nsh0).
- Wardle Elizabeth. “Creative Repurposing for Expansive Learning: Considering ‘Problem-Exploring’ and ‘Answer-Getting’ Dispositions in Individuals and Fields.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012. [compositionforum.com/issue/26/creative-repurposing.php](http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/creative-repurposing.php).

Wardle, Elizabeth. "Understanding 'Transfer' from FYC: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study." *Writing Program Administration*, vol. 31, no. 1-2

(Fall/Winter), 2007, <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2wardle.pdf>

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: Interview Guide

1. Tell me about how you understand the journal publication process from start to finish.
2. Tell me a bit about your specific role on the Toyon staff.
  - a. How do you see your role and how it fits into the larger picture? How do you see your role as contributing to the editorial-production schedule?
  - b. Describe any challenges or experiences you've experienced in performing this role.
3. Tell me about some of the texts you have composed in order to fulfill the responsibilities demanded of your particular role.
  - a. Describe any challenges you experienced in composing these texts.
  - b. Describe how you responded to those challenges.
4. Early in the semester, you collaborated with classmates to generate assessment criteria for evaluating journal submissions. Tell me a bit about this experience.
  - a. Has your work reviewing submissions changed your own approach to writing?
5. Tell me a bit about how your experience on the Toyon staff has affected your identity as a writer and/or reader.
  - a. Has there been an occasion where you used something you learned as part of your experience on the Toyon Staff in another context?
  - b. Are there things you learned in this course that might be useful for you in the future?
  - c. In what ways have you thought about writing or yourself as a writer differently in this course?