Index

Abstract (scientific report), 185, 193
Ackerman, John, 3, 59, 131, 251
Alley, Michael, 186, 250
Anderson [Gazzam], Virginia Johnson, 1, 17, 178, 253, 261
Applebee, Arthur, 7, 8, 73, 97, 102, 111, 237, 250, 255
Arguer/debater role, 100, 145, 229
Argumentative essays, 98
Aristotle, 11, 66, 96, 250
Arriving at (and supporting a position). *See* Difficulties
Assignments, 179, 206
  assigning value to, 61
  features of, 52
  focus assignments, 22–23, 24
  genre labels, 59–60, 61
  similarities in, 7–8
Assignment sheet
  examples of, 57, 62, 101, 151
  language on, 56–57, 62, 66, 69–71, 82, 83, 84, 87, 89, 110–111, 113, 159, 233
  making improvements in, 95, 240
  as recipe, 57–58, 240
  stated expectations on, 152
  student strategies for using, 57–59, 234
Audience and self. *See also* Difficulties
  delineating the audience, 155–156
  and student roles, 66, 194–196
Automatic defense of previous position, 76–77, 81

Banton, Michael, 8, 250
Bartholomae, David, 3, 70, 153, 240, 250
Basseches, Michael, 117, 250
Bazerman, Charles, 46, 250
Beach, Richard, 240, 250
Bean, Daniel, 185, 251
Becher, Tony, 46, 250
Behrens, Laurence, 14, 250
Belenky, Mary Field, 142, 251
Berkenkotter, Carol, 3, 28, 29, 49, 59, 131, 251
Berlin, James, 20, 251
Bias, 48, 125
Biddle, Arthur, 185, 251
Bizzell, Patricia, 11, 251
Bloom, Benjamin S., 7, 251
Brandt, Kathleen M., 117, 254
Bransford, John, 96, 251, 257
Breihan, John R., 1, 17, 97, 251, 256, 259, 261
Bridgeman, Brent, 7*n*, 251
Britton, James, 2, 251
Brodkey, Linda, 49, 251
Bruffee, Kenneth, 21, 251
Burgess, Tony, 251
Burke, Carolyn L., 20, 254
Business decision-maker role, 51–52, 68, 145, 228–229
Butler-Nalan, Kay, 250

Carlson, Sybil B., 7*n*, 251
Chantry, Kathryn H., 117, 254
Charter documents, 234
Checksheet, 98, 102, 108
Cherry, Roger, 252
Chodorow, Nancy, 142, 251
Classes studied
  assumptions about, 20–22
  characteristics of, 18, 248–249
  differences in, 3, 4
  difficulties in, 14
  similarities among, 3, 4, 6–14
Classroom
  as a discourse community, 4, 21
  draft response, effects of, 94
  interaction in, 3–4
  negotiating critiques of, 47–48
  researchers' interpretation of, 2
  teacher research, effects of, 237–238
Classroom observations, 4, 32–33, 237
Clifford, Allan, 20, 44, 251
Clinchy, Blythe M., 251
Coauthoring, 44, 45
Cognitive development, 13

Cognitive perspective on composition study, 20
Cognitive process model, 10
Collins, Allan, 3, 251
Columb, Gregory, 49, 251
Comparison, 42, 43
Comparison/contrast *vs.* evaluation, 77, 84–85, 90
Competencies, 44
Complexity, managing, 231. *See also* Counterarguments, Difficulties
  demonstrating to students, 53–54
  role of writing in, 51
  strategies that circumvent, 167–168
  students' development in, 112
Comprehensive operational definitions, 47, 212
Concrete experiences, 177, 238
Connor, Ulla, 97, 251
Constructive negotiation, 20
Content-driven approach, 11
Context, 3, 21
Context of discovery, 13
Context of justification, 13
Contract, student, 30
Cooper, Charles, 3, 14, 49, 97, 111, 251, 252
Cooper, Marilyn, 28, 252
Cooptation, 45–46
Copley, Barbara, 252
Corey, G., 8, 252
Counterargument, 14, 53, 105, 106, 111, 134–135
CRAFT (Criteria, Role, Audience, Form, Theme) formula, 151, 240
Credibility checks, 48
Critical thinking, 13, 98, 108, 117
Cross-cultural conflict, 162
Cultural literacy, 99
Culture, 3, 233, 236

Data analysis procedures, 33–44
  analyzing organizational structures in students' texts, 42–43
  analyzing students' revision practices, 40–42
  constructing primary trait scales for students' papers, 35–36
  constructing sequences of students' writing strategies, 37–38
  interpreting students' writing-process stories, 34–35
  organizing the data, 34
  of specific aspects of students' writing, 36–40
Data collection methods
  choosing the focus assignments, 22–23
  comparison of Anderson's 1983 and 1986 classes, 191–192
  data generated by students, 24–31
  data generated by teachers, 31–33
  explaining data production to students, 23–24
  for scientific reports, 246
Data interpretation, 184, 217–219, 246–247
Data sources
  classroom observations, 4, 32–33, 237
  final paper, 25
  interviews by outside researcher, 25, 26, 32
  limitations of, 33
  peer response/peer interviews, 25, 26–27
  student description of self as writer, 25, 27
  student evaluations of teachers, 25
  student logs, 24–25
  student plans/drafts, 25, 26
  taped interaction with others outside of class, 25, 27
  teacher logs, 31
  teacher presentations to faculty workshops, 32
  think-aloud tapes, 25, 28–31
Day, Robert, 185, 252
Dayton, C. Mitchell, 252
Debates. *See* In-class debates
Decision-making procedure, 80, 82–83, 86
Declarative knowledge, 59
Define/analyze/prescribe process, 52, 53, 74, 76, 79, 82, 88, 94, 110, 166
  modeling, 53
Definition
  confusing dictionary with "useful" definitions, 88–89, 210
  constructing, 235
  differing approaches to, 88–89, 230–231
  operational, 47, 182–183, 207–212, 213–214, 245
  Sherman's emphasis on, 82, 83, 94, 126
  shortcomings in formulating, 133–134
  students' approach to, 234–235
Dense language (textbook), 77–78
Denzin, Norman K., 252
Description (of an idea), 42
Dialogic thinking, 114–117, 121, 241
Discussions. *See* In-class discussions
Discussion section (scientific report), 188

Difficulty(ies)
in constructing audience and self, 14, 66–71, 153–165, 193–194, 196–200, 231
defined, 4, 231–232
in gathering specific information, 55–56, 64–65, 70, 203, 200–219
in managing complexity, 74–88, 111–120, 165–168, 200–219
in meeting teacher expectations, 14, 237
in organizing the papers, 88–90, 219–225
in role assumption, 226
similarities in, 14, 231
in stating a position, 71–74, 102–111, 165–168, 200–219
in arriving at (and supporting) a position, 14, 74–88, 120–121, 123, 131–140, 165–168
Discipline-based differences, 46–47
Discipline-based methods, 14, 73, 74, 231
application of, 7–8
contributing to an argument on an assigned opinion, 123, 126–131
difficulties in using, 14, 74–88, 120–121
learning and, 8
single reading as evidence, 121–122, 124–125
stages in learning to use (historical method), 121–141
Doheny-Farina, Stephen, 26, 252
Domain-specific knowledge, 64
Dominic, Joseph F., 3, 253
Dowling, H. Fil, Jr., 98, 259
Drafts, 2, 4, 26
Breihan's comments on, 107, 108, 113, 125
multiple coauthored, 45
response to, 92–94, 99, 171–175, 239–240
timing of responses to, 175, 241
Dual-axis pre-draft writing, 118–119. *See also* Factor rating
Durst, Russel, 250

Early guidance (of student drafts), 175, 241
Ede, Lisa, 96, 252
Educational objectives, taxonomy of (Bloom), 7
Elbow, Peter, 8, 252
Environmental mode, 98
Ericsson, K. Anders, 28, 252
Ethos, 11, 66, 68, 69, 71, 74, 195, 198
Evaluation, 6, 77, 78, 84
Examples, use of, 124
Expectations, teacher, 4
in constructing primary trait scales, 35–36
and construction of audience and self, 66
difficulties in meeting, 14, 237
for good/better/best reasoning, 12–14
for students' roles, 8–12, 51–52, 99–102, 150–153, 178–181, 228–229
importance of specifying, 70, 108
role of checksheet in clarifying, 108
validity of, 5–6
Experiential learning, 146
Experiment, design of, 14, 183, 245
difficulties in, 200–205
strategies for, 209
teaching methods to improve, 206–207
Expert self, 70, 158, 159–162, 240–241
Expressive perspective on composition study, 20
Extended engagement, 48
External checks, 48

Factor rating, 74–76, 78, 86, 87, 118, 182, 230
Faigley, Lester, 3, 6, 20, 40, 41, 252
Failure, 5
False starts, 41
Familiar topics and settings, use of, 61, 73–74, 77, 240
Feelings *vs.* evidence, 134–135, 203–204, 235–236
Find-good-things strategy, 129, 131, 132, 133
Find-reasons strategy, 77, 80–81, 95, 111, 129, 233
Fish, Stanley Eugene, 21, 252
Fisher, Donald, 252
Fleischer, Stefan, 252
Flower, Linda S., 10, 28, 29, 49, 73, 80, 252, 253, 254
Focus, 9, 10
Focus assignments, 22–23, 24
Focus group, 40, 179, 96, 248–249
Focused pair, 2
Focused writing, daily, 98, 103–104
Franks, Jeffery J., 96, 257
Frederiksen, Carl H., 3, 253
Free association, 64
Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, 41, 258
Freewriting, 26, 63, 86, 92
Fulwiler, Toby, 251

Garvey, Catherine, 41, 253
Gathering specific information. *See* Difficulties
Gazzam [Anderson] Virginia Johnson. *See* Anderson
Geertz, Clifford, 1, 6, 19, 49, 242, 253
Gender, 3, 4, 40, 44, 68, 71, 95, 142, 233, 236
Generalization, 19
Gentner, Dedre, 3, 251
Gere, Anne R., 14, 253
Gilligan, Carol, 142, 253
Gilmore, Perry, 33, 35, 253
Glatthorn, Allan A., 33, 35, 253
Goetz, Judith Preissle, 22, 34, 49, 255
Good/better/best reasoning. *See also* Rationale-building; Solution-searching
  Anderson's expectations for, 181–189
  Breihan's expectations for, 100, 126–128, 142, 166, 181
  examples of in a classroom setting, 13–14
  five tasks of, 12, 95, 230
  general expectations for, 229–231
  prevalence of in assignments, 7–8
  Robison's expectations for, 165–166, 181
  Sherman's expectations for, 13, 52–55, 74–76, 82–83, 142, 166, 181
Goswami, Dixie, 2, 26, 253, 257
Graphics (scientific report), 189, 216–217, 218
Greene, Terry R., 13, 239
Greeno, James G., 64, 96, 253, 255
Guba, Egon, 2, 34, 35, 40, 49, 254
Gumperz, John Joseph, 21, 254

Handouts, 100, 148
Hansen, Kristine, 3, 6, 252
Harste, Jerome C., 20, 254
Hayes, John R., 3, 10–11, 28, 29, 49, 80, 254, 256
Hays, Janice, 117, 254
Heath, Shirley Brice, 21, 33, 254
Heller, Joan I., 64, 96, 255
Henderson, Carl E., 259
Herrington, Anne Jeannette, 3, 6, 26, 93, 94, 230, 239, 254, 257
High-investment group, 11
High-success students, 36, 44, 63, 117, 159, 170, 236, 238–239
Hillocks, George Jr., 92, 98, 254
Holzman, Michael, 28, 252
Hopkins, Gertrude B., 259
Huberman, A. Michael, 34, 256
Huckin, Thomas N., 3, 59, 131, 251
Hymes, Dell, 2, 21, 254
Hypothesis, formulating, 182

Idea-generating strategy(ies), 80
  find-reasons strategy as, 80–81
  student roles and, 155–156
  webbing technique as, 156–158
Ill-structured problems, 12–13
In-class debates, 98, 104, 114–120, 140, 145
  as aid to dialogic thinking, 114–117
  as aid to pre-draft writing, 118–120
In-class discussions, 83, 98, 105–107, 114, 125, 147–150, 157
Informal writing, 239
Informants, 44, 48
Information
  interrelating different types, 85
  role of in creating the self, 69, 158
Information gathering, 14, 231
  assignment sheet and, 56–58
  difficulties in, 55–56, 64–65, 70, 203
  observation as, 62–63
  peers in, 61–62
  strategies for, 56–66, 72–73
  textbook for, 59
  use of models from other settings, 59–61
Inquiry paradigm, 19
Interaction, 21
Interdisciplinary collaboration, 2
Internal checks, 48
Interviews
  peer, 26–27
  of students by outside researcher, 4, 26
  of teachers by outside researcher, 32
Introductions (scientific reports), 185, 197–200, 243
Issue-driven approach, 11
Issue orientation, 98, 103

Janik, Allan, 127, 258
Jenkins, Lynn B., 250

Kahane, Howard, 13, 255
Kantor, Kenneth, 34, 255
Kennedy, Mary Lynch, 96, 255
Klemp, George O., Jr., 44, 255
Kurfiss, Joanne Gainen, 98, 108, 255

Langer, Judith A., 3, 7, 8, 64, 237, 250, 255

Language, 21, 56–59, 77–78, 230, 241
Lanham, Richard A., 77, 255
Larkin, Jill H., 64, 96, 255
Larson, Richard L., 60, 255
Latour, Bruno, 20, 255
Lauer, Janice, 97, 251
Layperson role, 9, 60, 63, 155, 235
Learning, role of discipline-based methods in, 8
Learning styles, 33, 95, 142
LeCompte, Margaret, 22, 34, 49, 255
Lecture classroom, 53
Lincoln, Yvonna S., 2, 34, 35, 40, 49, 255
Linear *vs.* recursive solution-searching, 76, 83, 95
Literacy, 3
Literature review (scientific report), 186
Lloyd-Jones, Richard, 35, 255
Low-investment and text processors group, 11, 79
Low-success papers, 76–77
Low-success students, 36, 44, 63, 71, 76–77, 170, 236
Lunsford, Andrea, 96, 252

Macro-structure revisions, 40
Main-article strategy, 72–73
Mallonee, Barbara C., 17, 97, 256, 259
Manipulation (variables), 183
Marshall, James D., 237, 250, 256
Martin, Nancy, 251
Mathison, Sandra March, 34, 256
McCarthy, Lucille Parkinson, 1, 3, 6, 96, 234, 256, 262
McLeod, Alex, 251
McMillan, Victoria E., 186, 187, 256
McNelis, Sally, 259
McPeck, John E., 13, 256
Meaning-changing revisions, 40, 93, 96, 97, 113, 171, 172
Meese, George P., 3, 256
Member checks, 48
Meyer, Bonnie J. F., 42, 116, 256
Micro-structure revisions, 40
Miles, Matthew B., 34, 256
Modeling, 53, 147–149, 158–159
Models from other settings, students' use of, 59–61, 73, 233–234

National Assessment of Educational Progress, 35, 102, 111
Naturalistic inquiry paradigm, 19
Naturalistic research, 2
Negative cases, 48
Negotiated *we*, 44–48
Nelson, Jennie, 46–48, 256
Newell, George, 250
Nisbett, Richard E., 28, 256
Nonexperimental information (scientific report), 244–245
North, Stephen M., 3, 256
Notes, 4, 63, 72–73, 85, 96
  composing from, 169–170, 173
Novice writers, 3, 71
Nystrand, Martin, 20, 257

Observation, 4, 32–33, 237
  categories for, 62–63, 235
Odell, Lee, 3, 26, 257
Ong, Walter J., 96, 257
Operational definitions
  comprehensive, 47, 212
  constructing, 182–183, 207–212, 245
  specific, 47, 212
  worksheet, 213–214
Organizing the paper, 14, 231. *See also* Difficulties
  chronological, 225
  and the composing process, 223–224, 238
  distinguished from decision-making, 80, 87, 95
  format (scientific), 219–224
  by high-success students, 64
  research report with scientific format, 184–189
  section, 224–225
  teacher's methods and student strategies for, 88–90
Outlines, 63, 86, 156, 236
Outside raters, 192–193
Overgeneralization, 14
Oversimplification, 14, 53

Park, Douglas B., 96, 257
Pechenik, Jan A., 179, 257
Peer audience, 61, 66, 68, 70, 153, 240–241
Peer information
  advantages of, 207
  and controlling variables, 215
  student strategies for using, 61–62
Peer response/peer interviews, 26–27, 94, 171–174, 189, 211, 239
Peer Review Sheet, 152, 164, 173, 174, 220
Penner, Barbara C., 13, 259
Perfetto, Greg A., 96, 257

Performance, student, 4, 14
Perkins, David, 97, 111, 257
Perl, Sondra Anne, 29, 49, 257
Perry, William G., Jr., 236, 257
Personal narrative form, 195–196
Philips, Susan U., 31, 257
Physical conditions, 29, 33
Pilot projects, 202, 215, 216
Points of discord, 3
Pollard, Rita, 252
Polyphonic discourse, 20
Post, Timothy A., 13, 259
Power, 3, 71
Pratt, Mary L., 21, 257
Pre-draft writing, 26, 50
  in arriving at and supporting a position, 168–170
  and the decision-making process, 85–88
  and grade success, 90–92
  in-class debates as an aid to, 118–120
  students' strategies for, 63–64, 236–237
  use of notes in, 169–170
  versus pre-writing, *n*, 3, 96
Presentational mode, 98
Primary trait analysis, 35–36, 102, 143, 152, 163, 192–193
  purposes of, 36
  scoring sheet for Anderson's class, 243–247
Problem-solving process, 13, 54, 64, 71
Procedural knowledge, 59, 79, 95, 177, 234, 238–239
Professional-in-training role, 8–9, 54–55, 63, 70, 115, 179
  arguer/debater, 100, 145, 229
  business decision-maker, 51–52, 68, 145, 228
  expectations for, 228–229
  scientist-in-training, 178–181, 229
  social scientist/counselor/friend, 145, 152, 229
Prose analysis schemes, 49
Pugh, Sharon Lynn, 49, 258
Purposive sampling, 40

Race, 3, 4, 40
Randomization, 183
Rationale-building, 12–13, 54, 75, 76, 81, 184, 235–236
Rationalistic paradigm, 49
Reading
  comprehension, 77–79, 114, 234
  as an interactive language process, 21
Reality, 19, 48
Reflection paper, 59–60, 61, 85, 233
Research assumptions
  about classrooms, 20–22
  concerning language use, 21
Research design, 19
Researchers. *See also* Teachers
  characteristics of, 1, 5, 17, 145–146, 178, 261–262
  data generated by, 31–33
  effects of research on, 242
  shared assumptions and ways of working, 19–20, 44–48
Research findings, trustworthiness of, 2, 48–49
Research methods, 4
  characteristics of the classes, 19
  characteristics of the students, 18–19
  characteristics of the teachers, 17–18
  compared to other studies, 10–11
  determining similarities among the classrooms, 6–14
  perspectives on, 20
Research outcomes, negotiating, 19
Research paper. *See* Term paper
Research questions, 3–4
  in organization of chapters, 15–16
  summary of findings on, 228–241
Response rounds, 41
Results section (scientific report), 187–188
Review writing, 7
Revision(s)
  analysis of, 40–42
  definition of, 40–41
  differences between peer and teacher response, 173–174
  distinguished from false starts, 41
  low rate of, 171
  macro-structure, 40
  mandating, 171–172
  meaning-changing, 40, 93, 96, 97, 113, 171, 172
  micro-structure, 40
  sequence of peer and teacher responses, 172–173
  sequencing the writer's attention, 174
  success of, 41–42, 143
  and teacher response to drafts, 239–240
Rieke, Richard, 127, 258
Rieser, J., 251
Robison, Susan Miller, 1, 17, 151, 257, 262
Rohman, D. Gordon, 96, 257
Role(s), student
  arguer/debater, 100, 145, 229
  business decision-maker, 51–52, 68, 145, 228

in constructing audience and self, 11–12, 66, 194–196
definition of, 8
difficulties with, 226
as expert, 158, 159–162
factors influencing, 232–233
full assumption of, 140–141
and idea-generating strategies, 155–156
information-giving, 158
layperson, 8–9, 60, 63, 65, 155, 235
modeling, 147–149
multiple, 8
professional-in-training, 8–9, 54–55, 63, 65, 115, 179, 228–229
scientist-in-training, 178–181, 229
social scientist/counselor/friend, 145, 152, 229
teachers' expectations for, 8–12, 51–52, 55, 144–145, 228–229
text processor, 8–9, 10–11, 59, 65, 67–68, 72, 79, 80, 102, 112, 153, 194, 198, 200
variety of, 194–196
Role-others, 8
Rorty, Richard, 21, 257
Rose, Mike, 7n, 257
Rosen, Harold, 251
Rosenblatt, Louise, 257

Scardamalia, Marlene, 13, 257
Schwegler, Robert, 73, 258
Scientific paradigm, 49
Scientist-in-training role, 178–181, 229
Second-chance exercise, 128–131
Selfe, Cynthia, 49, 258
Shaughnessy, Mina P., 228, 242, 258
Sherman, A. Kimbrough, 1, 262
Shih, May, 14, 258
Significative world, 6, 242
Simon, Herbert A., 28, 64, 96, 258
Singer, Daniel, 94, 258
Small-group activities, 180, 211
Social context, 3
Social perspective on composition study, 20
Social scientist/counselor/friend role, 145, 152, 229
Solution-searching, 12–13, 54, 76, 81, 184, 235
Specific operational definitions, 47, 212
Sperling, Melanie, 41, 258
Spindler, George, 22, 258
Spradley, James P., 258
Stating a position, 14. *See also* Difficulties
Breihan's teaching methods for, 103–111
familiar topics and settings, 73–74
textbook in, 72–73
use of models from other settings, 73
Stein, Nancy L., 233, 258
Sternglass, Marilyn S., 49, 258
Stillman, Peter R., 2, 253
Stimulus-response revision, 93
Strategy (definition), 4–5
difficulty and, 5
Streetcorner debate model, 60–61, 69, 233
Stretch-thesis strategy, 73
Struggle, 5
Student(s)
affective conditions, 29, 33
characteristics of, 4, 248–249
data generated by, 24–31
interviews by outside researchers, 4, 26
learning styles, 33
lives outside of classroom, 33
logs, 2, 4, 24–25
peer response/peer interviews, 4, 26–27
performance, 4, 14
plans/drafts, 26
strategies, 4, 38–39, 232–237
taped interactions with others outside of class, 27
think-aloud tapes, 4, 23, 27, 28–31
Study groups, 104
Stunkard, Clayton L., 252
Subtheses, 81, 233
Successful writing, 36
Sullivan, Francis J., 22, 258
Swarts, Heidi, 28, 49, 258
Synthesis, 7, 128

Tarule, Jill M., 251
Teachers' methods, 4, 237–241
auxiliary activities, 190–191
in Breihan's classroom, 98
difficulty and, 5
effects of changes in, 192, 237
effects of teacher research in the classroom, 237–238
four stages for teaching historical method, 121–140
in learning to state a position, 103–111
lecture/demonstrations/response to questions, 189–190
peer and teacher response, 172–174, 190, 226, 239–240
power of teaching, 237

principles for effective teaching, 238–241
to raise counterarguments, 112–120
Teacher(s)
characteristics of, 17
classroom observations of, 32–33
data generated by, 31–33
early guidance by, 175, 241
expectations, 4, 5–6, 8–14, 51–52, 108, 150–153
as facilitator of learning, 189
interviews by outside researchers, 32
judgment, 36
logs, 4, 31
presentations to faculty workshops, 32
Term paper, 59–60, 73, 85, 233
Textbook
choice of, 112–113
differing approaches to, 59, 72, 90
issue orientation and, 104
language in, 77–78
note taking focused on, 72–73
students' approaches to, 234
students' use of procedural information from, 79
and taking a stand, 105–106, 125
Textbook-items-as-points strategy, 65–66, 78–79, 95
Text-processor role, 9, 10–11, 59, 67–68, 72, 79, 80, 102, 112, 153, 194, 200
Thesis, 42, 108, 110, 202. *See also* Top-level text structure analysis
and facts, 127–128
students' use of, 81–82, 87, 88, 95, 233
and success, 82
testing against counterarguments, 134–135
Thesis-first format, 109–110, 127
Think-aloud tapes, 25, 27, 28–31
awareness of taping, 30–31
deficiencies of, 30
information gleaned from, 29–31
student compliance, 30
training for, 23
Titles (scientific reports), 185, 196–197, 243
Tomlinson, Barbara, 25, 258
Tone, 163–165
Topic-specific knowledge, 64–66
Top-level text structure analysis, 42–43
Toulmin model, 127, 142, 230
Toulmin, Stephen, 127, 258
Trabasso, Tom, 233, 258
Transitions, 58, 89–90, 224
Tree diagram (Meyer), 42–43
Triangulation, 48
Trust, establishing, 45
Trustworthiness (of research findings), 2, 48–49
Turns in the conversation, 37
Tyler, Sherman W., 13, 258

Variables
control of, 183–184, 212–216, 245–246
writing out of the design, 183–184
Vocabulary definitions, 210
Voss, James F., 13, 71, 81, 258, 259

Walvoord, Barbara, 1, 17, 94, 98, 253, 256, 258, 259, 262
Webbing technique, 156–158, 238
Whiteman, Marcia, 33, 259
Williams, Joseph M., 49, 251
Wilson, Timothy DeCamp, 28, 256
Witte, Stephen, 40, 41, 252
Woodward, Virginia A., 20, 254
Woolgar, Steve, 20, 255
Writing
defining successful, 36
to enhance learning, 8
as a goal-centered activity, 105
informal, ungraded, 239
as an interactive language process, 21–22
perspectives on composition study, 20–21
reasons to study, 3
as a social process, 22, 49
Writing-across-the-curriculum workshops, 1, 17, 32, 45, 82, 94, 97, 145, 156, 178

Yates, Frank, 252
Yengo, Laurie A., 13, 258