

# A Guide to Composition Pedagogies

GARY TATE

*Texas Christian University*

AMY RUIPER TAGGART

*North Dakota State University*

KURT SCHICK

*James Madison University*

H. BROOKE HESSLER

*Oklahoma City University*

SECOND EDITION

New York Oxford

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

2014

## Researched Writing

Rebecca Moore Howard

Sandra Jamieson

Even at a time when the traditional “research” essay (e.g., write ten pages on censorship using ten sources) is fizzling out—thank goodness—those of us who teach composition still acknowledge that research skills are important.

—Jackie Grutsch McKinney

In 2007, the website *StudentHacks.org* published “How to Write a Great Term Paper in One Evening,” a stunning (yet sincere) parody of process theory. The purpose of this Web page is to teach students to construct a quick simulacrum of research. The unidentified writer declares procrastination to be his or her norm and then reorders the usual research process so that fellow procrastinators can start the paper the night before deadline and finish it in just over ten hours. To do this, one *begins* the research process with a thesis statement, followed by drafting a “killer introduction” and then “defend[ing] your thesis”—all in ninety minutes. *Then* procrastinators are urged to conduct their research—for no more than two hours. The writer’s rationale? “This is the part that most people wast [sic] time. . . .”

From this student’s perspective, researched writing is a meaningless activity, simply a hoop through which students must jump. The writer of “How to Write a Great Term Paper in One Evening” endeavors to protect peers from wasting time in the jump.

We begin our chapter with this anecdote as a way of highlighting the powerful conflicts in assigning and mentoring researched writing. These conflicts are evident in Ford’s 1995 edited collection: Many of the contributors identify the research paper as a troubled genre, and then proceed to offer solutions to the problem. Our own research—we are the principal researchers in the Citation Project, a multi-institution research project responding to educators’ concerns about plagiarism and the teaching of writing—contributes to the critiques. It is hard to look at the results of Citation Project research and imagine that the assigning of traditional research papers can be sustained in first-year writing (FYW) courses.

Even though the research paper itself is in question, the reasons for assigning it are more compelling than ever. The question is whether writing instructors will continue to assign this problematic genre or whether they will find other, better ways of teaching research *practices*. Toward that end, scholars and practitioners of Writing Studies have developed a variety of sound pedagogical moves that involve students in authentic research and research writing. To those we add our own recommendations, derived from our research and our combined fifty years of experience as writing instructors.

### RATIONALES AND GOALS FOR ASSIGNING RESEARCHED WRITING

Late nineteenth-century U.S. higher education was powerfully influenced by the German model of “rigorous ‘scientific’ philology and historical criticism,” and Russell explains that this influence caused research papers to become part of FYW instruction in the 1860s and 1870s (79–80). In a 1955 study, 33 percent of 1,309 courses surveyed assigned “documented papers” ranging from one thousand to five thousand words. The majority of these 433 courses were junior- and senior-level writing courses (CCCC, “Writing”).

That rate subsequently increased, and the research paper increasingly became a staple of FYW, not just advanced courses. Of the 171 colleges surveyed in 1961, 83 percent required a research paper in the first year (Manning), and that rate held steady thereafter. Of 397 institutions surveyed in 1982, 84 percent included a first-year research paper, and 78 percent required it (Ford, Rees, and Ward). Of 166 respondents to a 2010 survey on the listserv *WPA-L*, 86 percent reported giving some sort of researched assignment in FYW (Hood).

The research paper was originally assigned to help students learn research skills and practice incorporating sources in an extended, often argument-driven, paper. More recently those research skills have connected with the larger imperative to teach information literacy skills, and the “paper” has expanded to include multimedia. Despite concern over the form of the paper itself, over the model of research it represents, and over the transferability of the skills taught in the process, the research paper is still the major assignment in many FYW curricula.

The research paper as an academic genre endures, too, as a function of academic inertia: What has been done for so long cannot be undone without a revolution of Kuhnian proportions. Its durability also derives from the ideals held by many educators and articulated by Leverenz and by Davis and Shadle (“Building,” *Teaching*): teaching students how to inquire, evaluate, sift, sort, choose, argue, explain.

Instructors who assign the research paper in FYW are almost unanimous about what they want the paper to accomplish, and have been so since the first study of the paper by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1955 (“Objectives”). Yet Head and Eisenberg’s analysis of research handouts and assignments reveals that most faculty tend to issue open-ended invitations to research a question or topic of interest, with little or no discussion of purpose of larger questions of why we conduct research (“Assigning Inquiry”).

When asked, proponents of the assignment argue that it familiarizes students with the library and with online databases and research; engages them in the development of an extended paper (usually an argument) written in conversation with the voices and research of others; provides a vehicle for instruction in correct citation and preparation of works cited lists and bibliographies; and includes an emphasis on integration of the voices of others through summary, paraphrase, quotation, and synthesis. These benefits are articulated in textbooks, guides, and course descriptions nationwide, and were most recently endorsed in 2008 by the Council of Writing Program Administrators as part of their list of recommended outcomes for FYW (“Outcomes”).

### PROBLEMS WITH AND CRITIQUES OF “THE RESEARCH PAPER”

Despite its popularity, the problems with the genre are widely acknowledged, inescapable. Too often the word that comes to mind when people say “research paper” is “plagiarism.” The research paper is at the center of contemporary plagiarism hysteria, fanned by inflammatory discourse from the media and from corporations poised to accrue economic capital from that hysteria. In an undated Web page accessed in 2003, the iParadigms corporation, in its *Turnitin.com* iteration, declares,

Perhaps the greatest resources for would-be plagiarists are the hundreds of online paper-mills, or “cheatsites,” that exist solely for the purpose of providing students with quick-fix homework and term-paper solutions. Many of these services contain hundreds of thousands of papers on a wide variety of topics, and some even offer customized papers for an additional fee.

*Turnitin.com* says nothing in this statement that has not been voiced by many college instructors, some of whom are reluctant to assign research for fear of having to deal with plagiarists (see Adler-Kassner and Estrem 119–20; Schmidt).

Questions about patchwriting, which some consider to be a misuse of sources and others plagiarism (Council, “Defining”; Howard, “Plagiarism”), led to the Citation Project and its study of the ways students use sources in researched writing. Pilot research at one institution found that students did not use summary to report the ideas in their sources, instead working from sentences in ways that did not suggest engagement with or sometimes even comprehension of source material. The findings “raise questions about problems students may have with source-based writing . . . that are both prior to and foundational to their correct citation of sources” (Howard, Rodrigue, and Serviss 188).

The subsequent Citation Project study of FYW students’ researched papers from sixteen colleges across twelve states supports many of the initial findings of the pilot. Of the 1,911 citations analyzed in eight hundred pages of students’ researched writing, only 6 percent were to summarized material, while 16 percent were to *patchwriting*, defined as “restating a phrase, clause, or one or more sentences while staying close to the language or syntax of the source” (“What Is Plagiarism?”). This small

percentage hides a more complex problem. Of the 174 papers studied, 52 percent included at least one incidence of cited patchwriting within the five pages examined within each paper; however, 78 percent of them included at least one incidence of cited paraphrase, and almost all of the students who patchwrote also paraphrased at least once (Jamieson and Howard). The high incidence of patchwriting co-occurring with paraphrase suggests that the students' patchwriting is not plagiarism but attempted, unsuccessful paraphrase: These students are still in the process of mastering the art of paraphrase.

Even more compelling is the finding that 46 percent of the 1,911 citations were to material from the first page of the source—and a total of 77 percent of the citations were to material no deeper than page 3 of the source. Of the 930 sources cited, 56 percent were cited only once, and 76 percent only twice. The research papers produced at the end of the FYW at sixteen institutions of higher education (including state universities, community colleges, religious colleges, Ivy League institutions, liberal arts colleges, and research universities in twelve states from around the country) paint a picture of students who are in the process of mastering the skills of paraphrase and summary and who are not yet able to reproduce the arguments and ideas of their sources in their own words. Those students do not seem to be engaging with the entire text, and they frequently simplify or partially misrepresent the source to make it fit their arguments. In ways too complex to explain here, the Citation Project student papers provide a convincing array of evidence that the student writers are earnestly striving to enact what they had been taught in FYW. We must assume that their instruction had not addressed practices of textual *engagement*; or that such instruction, if it was offered, did not suffice to give the students facility in understanding and engaging with entire texts, and successfully talking about them in paraphrase or summary; or that, despite such effective instruction, the students, when assigned The Research Paper, defaulted to vacuous genre practices.

Others' concerns about research papers precede our study. Scholars object to research papers for philosophical (McCormick) or ideological (Davis and Shadle, "Building") reasons. As they build their argument for inquiry-based research, Davis and Shadle describe traditional undergraduate research assignments as grounded in modernist ideology that values "expertise, detachment, and certainty" ("Building" 5–6). Marsh also associates the research paper with modernist ideals of students as conduits of information that others have developed—not as themselves originators (64). Anson, too, raises the question of students' relationship with new ideas or information, advocating constant interrogation of the purpose served by each citation (213).

Students and instructors hold different ideals for the research paper, and pedagogy may not resonate with instructors' goals for the assignment. Whereas students interviewed by Schwegler and Shamoon reported that the research paper is "an exercise in information gathering" that demonstrates their skills using the library and documenting sources (819), faculty they interviewed described their own research process as one of discovery that leads to exploratory, analytical, and interpretative writing. Alvarez and Dimmock's surveys of faculty two decades later

reveal that although "professors implicitly wish that students imitated their own research and writing styles" (4), they do not adopt pedagogies designed to accomplish this. Schwegler and Shamoon add that faculty expectations for the research paper reproduce the students' version of research as "close-ended, informative, skills-oriented" (820), as do the textbooks and pedagogies they select. Other studies have found a similar disjuncture between faculty and student expectations of, and commitment to, research (Leckie; Valentine, "Legitimate Effort").

Those who call for the abolition of the research paper from FYW frequently cite this disjuncture between what most academics consider to be "research" and the version taught in preparation for the first-year research paper. As far back as 1945, Farrison described those papers as simply "digests" (484) that do not involve research as any disciplines define it, and as such both misrepresent real research and confuse students. Forty years later, in 1982 Larson also condemned the assignment for reducing research to "looking up books in the library and taking down information from those books" (813). Today, Citation Project data suggest that, regardless of the assignment, undergraduates regard research papers as an inauthentic genre fit only for the sort of empty performance that Blum identifies as undergraduate students' objective throughout their academic work (61).

## BEST PRACTICES IN TEACHING STUDENT RESEARCH

The alternative is not to cease teaching research but to teach it differently. We writing instructors need to focus students' attention on the purposes of research more than on its mechanics. We need to teach students how to find relevant, reliable sources from the vast array of information available to them. We need to teach students how to understand and work with the ideas in the sources they find. We also need to teach them how to recognize the ways audience, purpose, perspective, and context shape the content of those sources and in turn invite readers to ask questions as they read. And we need to devise assignments that do not impel students to default to the vacuous exercise described by *StudentHacks.org*.

The fundamental difficulty, we believe, is that a single Writing course, or especially a single unit in a Writing course, is insufficient to teach first-year students how to produce an authentic academic research paper. All it can do is teach them how to produce a simulacrum of such a paper, while expending syllabus time that might better be focused on component research practices such as finding, evaluating, reading, comprehending, synthesizing, and talking about (not just quoting from) complex, lengthy sources.

With very few exceptions, that characterizes the papers analyzed in the Citation Project: They are simulacrums of research. We are confident that a great deal of good pedagogy preceded the students' production of these papers, yet when those papers were produced, the students seemed to be doing little more than what *StudentHacks.org* describes. They appear to have defaulted to an empty genre, regardless of what instruction they may have received.

The best answer we can offer is to remove The Research Paper from FYW, to make space for more extensive and intensive mentoring of research *practices*, in

the hope that students who have become comfortable with these practices will more readily be able to put them to work when they produce research papers in their other classes. Toward that end, we offer a variety of recommendations for writing instructors' consideration.

### Devise Alternatives to the Research Paper

There are many ways to teach research and source-based writing without assigning "The Research Paper" of old. Rooted in a print-only universe, the very concept of "research paper" has now become an anachronism. Dirk, for example, now assigns small research texts, but never The Research Paper. Head and Eisenberg, however, find that the majority of instructors in other disciplines do still assign the traditional paper ("Assigning Inquiry"), which may explain why many also hold firm to the belief that it should be taught in FYW—even though every discipline has different research conventions and expectations (to the extent that, as Bizup observes, what constitutes a "primary" source in one discipline may count as "secondary" in another). Some instructors within Writing Studies do, too, but the majority of Hood's survey respondents have turned to what might be called *research projects*. Built into this terminological shift is the idea that genres and media might felicitously mix when undergraduates conduct research.

Foster's argument for scaled-back research assignments would seem an appropriate consideration. She calls on instructors to "focus on the skills the students really need to know by a process of scaffolding in which experts and novices collaborate" through what she calls an "information retrieval scaffold" (IRS) that both "foregrounds the importance" of information retrieval and reveals the "multiple embedded tasks" within the process. In her model, the instructor selects a topic or topic area based on course content, professorial expertise, and/or availability of resources, and then selects appropriate sources and designs activities around them. She suggests creating an "appropriate research domain" from library databases; "an instructor-prepared webliography of reputable links"; or one of the commercially prepared research databases made available by publishers (174). Classroom activities allow students to practice the skills embedded within the IRS, including the development of keywords and decisions about which sources are appropriate (172).

While the Citation Project findings do not necessarily suggest that FYW should cease to assign formal, multisource researched papers, both of our institutions have chosen to do so as a result of this research. At Syracuse University, Rebecca teaches a required fourth-semester Writing course dedicated to research. In direct response to the Citation Project findings, she and many of her colleagues no longer assign The Research Paper in the course, instead focusing on component practices. Indeed, The Research Paper is no longer among the learning outcomes identified for that research writing course at Syracuse.

### Focus on Engagement Rather Than Mechanics

Leading the way in the refocusing of research instruction are two key books: Ballenger's *Beyond Notecards: Rethinking the Freshman Research Paper* and Davis

and Shadle's *Teaching Multiwriting*. Though dated by occasional assumptions of print-dominated literacy—Ballenger speaks, for example, of the "mail-order term paper business" (6)—*Beyond Notecards* remains an important touchstone in the discipline-wide search for research assignments that foster authentic, engaged learning. Ballenger argues for replacing a research paper with a researched essay that positions students as meaning-making inquirers (75). Writing eight years later, Davis and Shadle also advocate research assignments that are based in inquiry, but they urge "an open method of composing—where different genres, media, disciplines, and cultures may be useful or essential, depending on rhetorical situations . . ." (3). At the heart of Davis and Shadle's recommended pedagogy is the practice of asking questions (45), an openness to multiple discourses (56), reading as a form of inquiry (67), and a rhetorical foundation for that inquiry (103). Implicitly or explicitly endorsing Davis and Shadle's agenda, instructors have answered this call in an inventive variety of ways, including mixed-genre research; archival research; multimedia research; field research; a critical engagement with secondary sources; and a revived interest in information literacy.

As digital products expand and complicate print-based notions of research, writing instructors may struggle to stay abreast and thus find themselves making quantified assignments: "Your paper must include references to at least two books"; "You may not cite websites"; "You may not cite *Wikipedia*"; "All of your sources must be scholarly"; and so forth. For students, many of whom have never produced a research project before, lost in such an approach is any reason for *doing* research, beyond demonstrating the researcher's obedience to seemingly arbitrary instructors' demands.

The response of many vanguard writing instructors is to focus on students' engagement with their sources. Writing before the Internet became part of our cultural fabric, Chappell, Hensley, and O'Neill worried about students' information overload and recommended Evaluating Sources workshops as an antidote. Austin starts from the student's voice, asking her class to highlight places in their drafts where they are themselves speaking, in order not only to encourage that voice but also to illuminate the passages in which citations and clear integration are needed. Kennedy's research suggests that fluent writers engage fully with their sources before writing, whereas the "not-so-fluent" do so as they write (450)—perhaps somewhat in the spirit of *StudentHacks*'s recommended limitations on time spent with sources. Responding to Citation Project data, Kleinfeld positions the writing center tutorial as an ideal place for "excessive research: helping students see the initial sources they're drawn to as starting points and resisting the urge to immediately narrow and focus on the first few sources located."

### Collaborate with Librarians

Research described by Kolowich shows how little students understand libraries and how little they consult librarians. Those findings can apply not just to students but to their instructors as well. With information retrieval and evaluation more complex than ever, responsible researched writing instruction in FYW must be offered in collaboration with information specialists—librarians.

There are significant theoretical, pedagogical, and ideological differences between the fields of Information Science and Writing Studies, some of which reveal themselves in the use of the term “information literacy” itself. The emphasis on finding and evaluating *information* at the heart of the work of the library definition can sometimes overshadow the *literacy* aspect for writing instructors, who tend to perceive finding and evaluating as only the first step in a process of inquiry. Fister observes that “the portion of library instruction that deals with finding materials tends to emphasize a sequential, tool-oriented search technique,” which differs significantly from “the processes scholars go through when they do research” (163). Eadie complains that such instruction “provides the answer before the question has arisen” (45). Syllabi for FYW should be crafted to surmount these limitations and to create *dialogic* collaboration (see Kennedy and Howard, this volume).

Many of the established practices in writing instructors’ pedagogical collaborations with librarians are dismal, indeed. Norgaard explains that libraries “evoke, for composition instructors and their students, images of the quick field trip, the scavenger hunt, the generic stand-alone tutorial, or the dreary research paper” (124). Such arrangements may be partnerships, but they are hardly collaborative. They also fail to help students overcome their resistance or indifference to academic research. Mellon describes students who are intimidated by the complexities of college libraries but afraid to reveal their “ignorance” by asking questions (75). When they are confused, they report themselves more likely to consult family members (Foster and Gibbons 81) or friends (Valentine, “Undergraduate” 302). The FYW instructor can alleviate this fear and help students feel comfortable using library resources by presenting reference librarians as an essential part of the research and writing process. By familiarizing themselves with the Association of College and Research Libraries’ “Information Literacy Competency Standards,” instructors may discover new collaborative possibilities and bridge some of the terminology gaps. Instead of focusing on writing and researching as discrete skills that are a “means to an end,” FYW instructors should present both as part of the “practice of making knowledge and inseparably integrated with the intellectual project undertaken by the student” (Corbett 266).

Real collaboration of the sort advocated by Norgaard and others is less a physical exchange of time and skills than an intellectual one. His argument is that the fields of Writing Studies and Information Studies should actively inform each other, because “information literacy informed by work in rhetoric and composition would help yield a more situated, process-oriented literacy relevant to a broad range of rhetorical and intellectual activities” (125). It is this “situated, process-oriented” version of information literacy that we need to develop if the research paper is to be a useful part of FYW.

Writing instructors and librarians might undertake some form of team teaching, with each responsible for her or his own area of expertise. Or they might undertake what Kesselman and Watstein call “embedded librarians” working within writing classes to foster students’ information literacy (388). The team-teaching model is relatively common, and embedded librarians are increasingly popular in Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs. A third option, a cross-training model in

which librarians and writing instructors gain expertise in each other’s areas, is very rare (see Alvarez and Dimmock; Deitering and Jameson). An examination of successful collaborations may reveal other models or suggest adaptations appropriate for different institutions (see Jacobs and Jacobs; Jacobson and Mackey).

### Teach the Rhetoric of Finding and Evaluating Sources

Today’s students seem no wiser about how to find or use information than were their pre-Internet predecessors. Head and Eisenberg’s multi-institutional study of student information-seeking practices “suggest[s] that students conceptualize research, especially tasks associated with seeking information, as a competency learned by rote, rather than as an opportunity to learn, develop, or expand upon an information-gathering strategy” (“Lessons Learned” 1).

Gavin describes a sequence of five collaboratively designed research lab sessions taught by librarians collaborating with writing instructors. Each session incorporates “inquiry, problem solving and critical thinking skills” along with research skills that parallel the writing being completed in the writing courses (231). Other programs integrate a sequence of information literacy lessons into FYW (Holliday and Fagerheim). According to Gavin, detailed, context-specific library research instruction that is reinforced in the writing course challenges students to “re-think their assumptions about research”; to realize that it is not acceptable to “haphazardly pick a few sources and simply rephrase facts and ideas of others and fit the data into a term paper”; and instead to “examine points of view as well as verify facts and statistics from a variety of sources” (232).

As a result of Drew University’s participation in the Citation Project, a revised FYW sequence was designed that includes instruction on finding relevant sources that can be used to create a dialogue with assigned readings, in a version of the controlled model of scaled-back research assignments that Foster advocates. Sandra and her colleagues at Drew assign specific texts, which they teach their students to assess, paraphrase, summarize, and correctly cite. Working with the works cited lists of those articles, they then invite students to explore the broader conversations revealed by the sources that are cited. Whose voice seems important to the author? With whom does the author disagree? Selecting sources from the works cited list, students then repeat the process of assessment, paraphrase, summary, and correct citation. As they enter deeper into the network of sources, the students begin to understand citations as a trail writers lay out for others who might wish to find and read the same sources and thereby join the conversation. In other words, Drew students achieve the goals of the information literacy component of the program without going near a “research paper.”

### Teach Engaged and Critical Reading

Despite the importance of teaching information literacy, too much of contemporary pedagogy is focused on finding and citing sources, and the result is evident in the Citation Project statistics described previously. When 75 percent of students’ citations come from the first three pages of the source, it seems obvious that the students are often not reading the entire source, but instead mining it for good

quotations. When the “killer quote” has been located, the student quits reading, leading to only 44 percent of the sources being cited more than once.

The search for the perfect quotation is not new; most of us probably remember it from our own undergraduate days. However, the transition to digital sources makes it easier, which requires instructors to understand how students read. Research suggests that reading habits are changing as we spend more time online, and Carr is one of the leading voices arguing that thinking patterns are changing as well, becoming more “staccato” as we skim and scroll through pages. His claims gain credence in a study of users of the British Library’s digital collection; readers “from undergraduates to professors” tend to read in a “shallow, horizontal, ‘flicking’” way (300), reading only a few pages from each text on scholarly sites and “power browsing” without doing “any real reading” (Rowlands, Nicholas, Williams, Huntington, and Fieldhouse 306). As part of the rhetoric of research, FYW instruction must include attention to *how* sources should be read: not just for a quotation or thesis but also for the evidence for the thesis; the ways in which the source makes its argument; whether the source itself cites other sources; whether it argues only one point of view or explores all the possibilities; what kinds of evidence it uses; and so forth.

To accomplish such an objective, FYW instructors need to slow the reading process down and teach students how to read for content rather than quotations. Even this may be insufficient. Kantz describes sophomores struggling to overcome a naive understanding of “truth” and “facts” in sources, leading them to unquestioningly reproduce chunks of information without comment or explanation. She argues that students must be taught to read rhetorically, using heuristic questions to explore texts and “discover what is worth writing about” (85).

For first-year students to absorb such instruction and be able to enact it, a good deal of the course will necessarily be devoted to what has traditionally been called *critical reading*, which we propose might better be reframed as *engaged reading*. Engaged reading will of course incorporate the critical stance but also Elbow’s “believing game” (see Kennedy and Howard, this volume). It will *explore* a source, looking at it from a variety of angles and perspectives, considering what arguments it makes and what arguments might be made from it, uncovering its assumptions. This, we argue, is necessarily the center of researched writing instruction in FYW. Without practice in engaged reading, students can do *nothing more than* find killer quotes, stitch them together, cite them accurately, insert a thesis, and call it a day.

### Teach Summary and Paraphrase

Paraphrase, summary, and rhetorical analysis of sources are essential components of teaching engaged reading. In Rebecca’s FYW course, analysis comes first, and the instruction begins with students finding claims and identifying evidence in shared sources (Howard, “Comp 1”). Simple techniques of rhetorical analysis come next, as the class explores elements of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* in the sources; weighs the balance between evidence and counterevidence; and considers how (and how well) the author commands readers’ adherence. They then begin picking out key sentences and paraphrasing them, working deliberately to avoid patchwriting.

Next comes summary of the sources, figuring out how to capture the main claims in the source while including but backgrounding the evidence. Then synthesis. *Then* students begin searching for additional sources to expand an argument that they wish to make from the shared sources. This includes intensive evaluation of sources, looking both at intrinsic issues such as the validity of the source’s evidence and at extrinsic issues such as the quality of the publisher or the qualifications of the author. The class pauses for a day or two on citation of sources—not just the mechanics, but how to blend in quotation, paraphrase, and summary in ways that highlight the student’s own voice and put it *in conversation with* the source. In the written argument that concludes the semester, the culminating assignment in the course, students are *limited to* three sources. When Rebecca teaches the course again next fall, she intends to choose the shared sources not just according to the common topic they address but also according to the range of rhetorical strategies they illustrate.

In a number of ways, such a syllabus departs from traditional research instruction. Its components, nevertheless, are available in established pedagogical scholarship and textbook publishing. The first edition of Behrens and Rosen’s textbook *Writing and Reading across the Curriculum*, published in 1982, offered summary-writing as one of three keys, and subsequent texts have duplicated that emphasis. In her scholarship Rebecca has described summary as an essential skill for text comprehension (Howard, “Plagiarism”). Shi’s research demonstrates how challenging summary-writing is for multilingual writers. Summary-writing is a learned skill, and as Bean concludes, “Writing summaries or précis of articles or lectures is a superb way to develop reading and listening skills, to practice decentering, and to develop the skills of precision, clarity, and succinctness” (128). It is not a “simple” skill that should have been learned in secondary school; it is an advanced practice that academic writers are always developing. Instructors interested in including summary-writing in FYW might consult Bean, as well as other entries in the “Summary and Paraphrase” bibliography at Rebecca’s website (Howard, “Bibliographies”).

The same is true of paraphrase. Roig demonstrates that even professors have a difficult time avoiding patchwriting when they summarize texts on an unfamiliar topic. Writing instructors wishing to consider possibilities for paraphrase instruction might begin with Shirley’s “The Art of Paraphrase” and then explore other entries in the “Summary and Paraphrase” bibliography.

Pedagogies of rhetorical analysis, though hardly a dominant force, are more familiar in Writing Studies. D’Angelo offers an overview of rhetorical criticism, and Rebecca’s website provides a “Rhetorical Analysis” bibliography (Howard, “Bibliographies”).

### Explore Multimedia Genres

Multiple media are becoming increasingly common in researched assignments. Instructors may ask students to publish their research in two media, making the necessary adaptations for medium and audience. Perry, for example, describes *PowerPoint* presentations as a staple of his inquiry-based research instruction. Pegram asks his students to write a proposal for solving a local problem.

Other instructors may ask for the research to be published in any medium *except* writing. They may ask for multiple media to be integrated in a single project—embedding sound files in an online text or inserting visuals into a print text, for example. Or they may begin the researched assignment with a response to a visual text. Such assignments challenge the notion of FYW researched assignments as procedural exercises in knowledge-reporting, and they also open up opportunities for discussing ethical and legal issues in using visual and audio texts produced by others.

The theoretical foundations for multimedia research vary; Jones, for example, draws on performance studies and multimodal discourse studies to explain why she asks her students to develop researched podcasts. Although Jones' students are taking an advanced writing course, her principles are readily applicable in FYW as well.

### ASSESSING RESEARCHED WRITING

Just as the relationship between information selection, assessment, and retrieval needs to be wrapped into the process of reading, writing, and thinking, so assessment should treat all parts of the research and writing process as equal. Effective assessment recognizes that information literacy and research writing are intrinsically linked and cannot be assessed by a series of separate rubrics or criteria. Students who select sources they do not understand will be unable to use them meaningfully in their papers. Students who select sources that are themselves summaries of other sources will find themselves unable to further summarize or paraphrase those sources, leaving them at risk of unintentional misuse of sources. Students who select sources based on the title of the article will be less likely to be able to create a dialogue between those sources than those who develop a list of sources from works cited lists and in consultation with instructors who have some familiarity with the topic. In contrast, students who select sources intentionally rather than by rote can write more effective papers. Because failures to retrieve appropriate sources lead to weaker papers, assessing each set of skills separately penalizes students twice.

Reducing the research component of the course to a set of skills to be measured in the final written product risks undermining the critical thinking, information-seeking, and reading skills that structure the collaboration between research and writing instruction (Norgaard 127). As information literacy instruction is woven into the fabric of writing instruction and as we pay greater attention to the ways students incorporate source material, we also need to develop new ways to assess their success.

As the findings of the Citation Project suggest, students tend to produce research papers that include frequent quotation and very little summary. The ubiquity of such papers suggests that this kind of writing is being rewarded when instructors grade it. Simply reading a research paper as a finished product does not reveal the ways students misread or misuse sources. If FYW is to reward students who “re-think their assumptions about research” (Gavin 232) and change their practices

accordingly, instructors need to change both the kinds of assignments they give and the ways they assess them.

One way to evaluate the research process as a whole is portfolio assessment, either a digital portfolio or a traditional folder of printed work. The advantage of the former is that it allows an exchange of work throughout the process that is more “provisional [and] . . . much more revisable than words committed to a printed page” (Howard, “Memoranda” 155), moving from teaching through the recursive process of research and writing with the student while also gathering work for a holistic assessment of the process and final product. In a digital or print project portfolio students can include a research proposal, a working or annotated bibliography, a research log, and other exploratory work in addition to the final paper. In such portfolios they also include a metacognitive essay or letter that reflects on and assesses their own writing process (Yancey). Initially, online portfolios were collected on public websites, allowing students to showcase their work but also raising intellectual property issues. The majority are now collected as part of a closed course management program such as Blackboard or Moodle or on a local or commercial password-protected Cloud server such as Dropbox. Many writing programs still prefer to collect printed copies of work in a final portfolio, partly because this is administratively easier, but also because some believe it creates a deeper sense of professionalism in the students.

Ideally, in their responses to student work, instructors explain how errors in an area of information literacy (such as source selection) lead to difficulties in developing papers (such as explaining terms or supporting claims). Similarly, no matter how diligent and thorough the research may be, murky prose style or rhetorical blunders such as inattention to audience prevent writers from sharing the found information. In tracing these connections and emphasizing the interrelatedness of writing and researching, instructors reinforce the connectedness between form and content and help students produce a “more situated, process-oriented literacy relevant to a broad range of rhetorical and intellectual activities” (Norgaard 125) and perhaps a “genuine intellectual engagement” (124).

\*\*\*\*

Emerging from the long-established critiques of the traditional FYW term paper is a significant discipline-wide trend toward affirming the need for research instruction and the need for researched assignments that value knowledge production and critical thinking over rote performance of pre-established conventions of researched writing. Schick's is an important voice in articulating this movement: “What I advocate . . . is not to dispense with teaching students how to use sources but rather to abandon our fixation on the form rather than the function of source attribution.” College courses are finite; will a course, unit, or assignment on research be consumed with transmitting and practicing citation conventions, or will it be focused on rationales and methods for the pursuit and production of knowledge? The answer from Davis and Shadle (*Teaching*), from Ballenger, from Schick, and from now legions of writing instructors is clear: Research will be taught, it will be taught more successfully than it was using the hoary term paper assignment, and it will be assessed in ways sensitive to its goals.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Heidi Estrem. "Rethinking Research Writing: Public Literacy in the Composition Classroom." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 26.3 (2003): 119–31. Print.
- Alvarez, Barbara, and Nora Dimmock. "Faculty Expectations of Student Research." *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester*. Ed. Nancy Foster and Susan Gibbons. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2007. 1–7. PDF file.
- Anson, Chris M. "Citation as Speech Act: Exploring the Pragmatics of Reference." *Research Writing Revisited: A Sourcebook for Teachers*. Ed. Pavel Zemliansky and Wendy Bishop. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004. 203–13. Print.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. "Information Literacy Competency for Higher Education: Standards, Performance Indicators, and Outcomes." American Library Association, 2000. PDF file.
- Austin, Barbara. "A Revision Technique for Research Papers." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 30.1 (2002): 83. *Proquest Central New Platform*. Web. 27 June 2012.
- Ballenger, Bruce. *Beyond Notecards: Rethinking the Freshman Research Paper*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1999. Print.
- Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996. Print.
- Behrens, Laurence, and Leonard J. Rosen. *Writing and Reading across the Curriculum*. Boston: Little Brown, 1982. Print.
- Bizup, Joseph. "BEAM: A Rhetorical Vocabulary for Teaching Research-Based Writing." *Rhetoric Review* 27.1 (2008): 72–86. *EBSCO Host*. Web. 22 Mar. 2009.
- Blum, Susan D. *My Word! Plagiarism and College Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2009. Print.
- Carr, Nicholas. *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains*. New York: Norton, 2011. Print.
- Chappell, Virginia, Randall Hensley, and Elizabeth Simmons O'Neill. "Beyond Information Retrieval: Transforming Research Assignments into Genuine Inquiry." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 13.1–2 (1994): 209–24. Print.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). "Objectives and Organization of the Composition Course." The Report of Workshop No. 3. *College Composition and Communication* 1.2 (May 1950): 9–14. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Writing from Source Materials: The Documented Paper." The Report of Workshop No. 10. *College Composition and Communication*, 6.3 (Oct. 1955): 143–45. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
- Corbett, Patrick. "What About the 'Google Effect'? Improving the Library Research Habits of First-Year Composition Students." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 37.3 (2010): 265–77. *Proquest Central*. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. "Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices." Jan. 2003. Web. 21 Jan. 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." July 2008. Web. 29 July 2012.
- D'Angelo, Frank J. "Rhetorical Criticism." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Garland, 1996. 604–608. Print.
- Davis, Robert L., and Mark Shadle. "Building a Mystery: Alternative Research Writing and the Academic Act of Seeking." *College Composition and Communication* 51.3 (2000): 417–47. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Dec. 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Teaching Multiwriting: Researching and Composing with Multiple Genres, Media, Disciplines, and Cultures*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2007. Print.
- Deitering, Anne-Marie, and Sara Jameson. "Step by Step through the Scholarly Conversation: A Collaborative Library/Writing Faculty Project to Embed Information Literacy and Promote Critical Thinking in First Year Composition at Oregon State University." *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 15.1–2 (Spring 2008): 47–59. Print.
- Dirk, Kerry. "The 'Research Paper' Prompt: A Dialogic Opportunity for Transfer." *Composition Forum* 25 (Spring 2012). Web. 29 July 2012.
- Eadie, Tom. "Immodest Proposals: User Instruction for Students Does Not Work." *Library Journal* 115.17 (1990): 42–45. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 28 July 2012.
- Farrison, W. Edward. "Those Research Papers Again." *Journal of Higher Education* 16.9 (Dec. 1945): 484–87. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 April 2012.
- Fister, Barbara. "The Research Processes of Undergraduate Students." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 18.3 (1992): 163–69. Web. 8 May 2012.
- Ford, James E., ed. *Teaching the Research Paper: From Theory to Practice, From Research to Writing*. Lanham: Scarecrow P, 1995. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Sharla Rees, and David L. Ward. "Research Paper Instruction: Comprehensive Bibliography of Periodical Sources, 1923–1980." *Bulletin of Bibliography* 39 (1982): 84–98. Print.
- Foster, Helen. "Growing Researchers Using an Information-Retrieval Scaffold." *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 31.2 (2003): 170–78. *Proquest Central*. Web. 27 July 2012.
- Foster, Nancy, and Susan Gibbons. Eds. *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2007. PDF file.
- Gavin, Christy. "Guiding Students along the Information Highway: Librarians Collaborating with Composition Instructors." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 13.1–2 (1995): 225–36. Web. 28 July 2012.
- Head, Alison J., and Michael B. Eisenberg. "Assigning Inquiry: How Handouts for Research Assignments Guide Today's College Students." *Project Information Literacy Progress Report: University of Washington Information School*. 13 July 2010. 1–41. Web. 27 July 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lessons Learned: How College Students Seek Information in the Digital Age." *Project Information Literacy Progress Report: University of Washington Information School*. 1 Dec. 2009. 1–42. Web. 10 Dec. 2012.
- Holliday, Wendy, and Fagerheim, Britt. "Integrating Information Literacy with a Sequenced English Composition Curriculum." *PORTAL: Libraries and the Academy* 6.2 (2006): 169–84. *Project Muse*. Web. 27 July 2012.
- Hood, Carra Leah. "Ways of Research: The Status of the Traditional Research Paper Assignment in Assignment in First-Year Writing/Composition Courses." *Composition Forum* 22 (Summer 2010). Web. 29 July 2012.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore. "Bibliographies." *Rebecca Moore Howard: Writing Matters*. n.d. Web. 5 Jan. 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Comp 1 Applications of Citation Project Research." *Chenango Metonymy*. 22 Feb. 2013. Web. 25 Feb. 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Plagiarism Pentimento." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 11.3 (Summer 1993): 233–46. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Memoranda to Myself: Maxims for the Online Portfolio." *Computers and Composition* 13.2 (1996): 155–67. Print.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore, Tanya K. Rodrigue, and Tricia C. Serviss. "Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences." *Writing and Pedagogy* 2.2 (Fall 2010): 177–92. Print.



- Jacobs, Heidi L. M., and Dale Jacobs. "Transforming the Library One-Shot into Pedagogical Collaboration: Information Literacy and the English Composition Class." *Reference & Users Quarterly* 49.1 (2009): 72–82. Web. 12 Dec. 2012.
- Jacobson, Trudi E., and Thomas P. Mackey. Eds. *Information Literacy Collaborations That Work*. New York: Neal-Schuman, 2007. Print.
- Jamieson, Sandra, and Rebecca Moore Howard. "Sentence-Mining: Uncovering the Amount of Reading and Reading Comprehension in College Writers' Researched Writing." *The New Digital Scholar: Exploring and Enriching the Research and Writing Practices of NextGen Students*. Ed. Randall McClure and James P. Purdy. Medford: Information Today, 2013. 111–33. PDF file.
- Jones, Leigh A. "Podcasting and Performativity: Multimodal Invention in an Advanced Writing Class." *Composition Studies* 38.2 (2010): 75–91. Web. 29 July 2012.
- Kantz, Margaret. "Helping Students Use Textual Sources Persuasively." *College English* 52.1 (Jan. 1990): 74–91. JSTOR. Web. 1 Nov. 2012.
- Kennedy, Mary Lynch. "The Composing Process of Students Writing from Sources." *Written Communication* 2 (October 1985): 434–56. Print.
- Kesselman, Martin A., and Sarah Barbara Watstein. "Creating Opportunities: Embedded Librarians." *Journal of Library Administration* 49.4 (2009): 383–400. EBSCO Host. Web. 29 July 2012.
- Kleinfeld, Elizabeth. "Writing Centers, Ethics, and Excessive Research." *Computers and Composition Online* (Fall 2011). Web. 31 July 2012.
- Kolowich, Steve. "What Students Don't Know." *Inside Higher Ed* 22 Aug. 2011. Web. 15 Jan. 2012.
- Larson, Richard L. "The 'Research Paper' in the Writing Course: A Non-Form of Writing." *College English* 44.8 (Dec. 1982): 811–16. JSTOR. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
- Leckie, Gloria J. "Desperately Seeking Citations: Uncovering Faculty Assumptions about the Undergraduate Research Process." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22.3 (Mar. 1996): 201–208. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 3 May 2012.
- Leverenz, Carrie Shively. "Citing Cybersources: A Challenge to Disciplinary Values." *Computers and Composition* 15.2 (1998): 185–200. Print.
- Manning, Ambrose N. "The Present Status of the Research Paper in Freshman English: A National Survey." *College Composition and Communication* 12.2 (1961): 73–78. JSTOR. Web. 5 April 2012.
- Marsh, Bill. *Plagiarism: Alchemy and Remedy in Higher Education*. Albany: SUNY P, 2007. Print.
- McCormick, Kathleen. "On a Topic of Your Own Choosing . . ." *Writing Theory and Critical Theory*. Ed. John Clifford and John Schilb. New York: Modern Language Association, 1994. Print. 33–52.
- McKinney, Jackie Grutsch. "The American Scholar Writes the 'New' Research Essay." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 20.1–2 (2002): 71–86. Print.
- Mellon, Constance A., ed. *Bibliographic Instruction: The Second Generation*. Littleton: Libraries Unlimited, 1987. Print.
- Norgaard, Rolf. "Writing Information Literacy: Contributions to a Concept." *Reference and User Services Quarterly* 43.2 (2003): 124–30. *Proquest Central*. Web. 27 July 2012.
- Pegram, David M. "What If? Teaching Research and Creative-Thinking Skills through Proposal Writing." *English Journal* 95.4 (Mar. 2006): 18–22. JSTOR. Web. 13 July 2012.
- Perry, Alan E. "PowerPoint Presentations: A Creative Addition to the Research Process." *English Journal* 92.6 (July 2003). JSTOR. Web. 31 May 2012.

- Roig, Miguel. "Plagiarism and Paraphrasing Criteria of College and University Professors." *Ethics and Behavior* 11.3 (July 2001): 307–324. Print.
- Rowlands, Ian, David Nicholas, Peter Williams, Paul Huntington, and Maggie Fieldhouse. "The Google Generation: The Information Behavior of the Researcher of the Future." *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives* 60.4 (2008): 290–310. Web. 15 Dec. 2012.
- Russell, David R. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870–1990: A Curricular History*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. 2nd ed. 2002.
- Schick, Kurt. "Citation Obsession? Get Over It!" *Chronicle of Higher Education* 30 Oct. 2011. Web. 31 Oct. 2011.
- Schmidt, Sarah. "Term Papers Axed to Obliterate Plagiarism." *Calgary (Canada) Herald* 31 Mar. 2004. Web. 4 Apr. 2004.
- Schwiegler, Robert A., and Linda K. Shamoan. "The Aims and Process of the Research Paper." *College English* 44.8 (Dec. 1982): 817–24. JSTOR. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
- Shi, Ling. "Textual Borrowing in Second-Language Writing." *Written Communication* 21.2 (Apr. 2004): 171–200. Print.
- Shirley, Sue. "The Art of Paraphrase." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* (Dec. 2004): 186–89. Print.
- StudentHacks.org. "How to Write a Great Term Paper in One Evening." 30 Oct. 2007. Web.
- Turnitin.com. "Plagiarism and the Internet." n.d. Web. 17 July 2003.
- Valentine, Barbara. "The Legitimate Effort in Research Papers: Student Commitment Versus Faculty Expectations." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27.2 (2001): 107–15. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 17 May 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Undergraduate Research Behavior: Using Focus Groups to Generate Theory." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19.5 (Nov. 1993): 300–304. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 17 May 2012.
- "What Is Plagiarism?" The Citation Project. n.d. Web. 5 Jan. 2013.
- Yancey, Kathleen. *Reflection in the Writing Classroom*. Logan: Utah State UP, 1998. Print.