CHAPTER 8.

LEARNING TO ARGUE ABOUT THE LITERATURE: DISCOURSE CHOICES AND STUDENTS' ITERATIVE LEARNING OF LITERATURE REVIEWS IN GEOGRAPHY

Misty Anne Winzenried
The Seattle School of Theology & Psychology

This chapter illustrates the incremental processes by which undergraduate students in a geography class learned to write the social science literature review. Situated within a larger ethnographic study, this microanalysis examines students' process of genre learning as they discovered and then attempted the discourse choices that helped them successfully enact the genre. Through three cases, the chapter examines one student's interactions with teaching assistant comments that illuminated his need for attribution, another who discovered through a rubric that her paper should be an "argument," and a third who Googled model genres in order to understand the genre he was being assigned. The case studies reveal moments of insight during which essential discursive signposts became available to students and. as a result, they shifted their discourse choices. This deeper understanding of students' processes for learning new disciplinary genres suggests a number of possible pedagogical interventions to make clearer the connections between genre characteristics and discourse-level choices.

What does it mean to have learned a genre? Writers' success at achieving their rhetorical aims—an invitation to interview for a job, a request to revise and resubmit for a journal, a strong grade received on a paper—might be one clear indication of having learned and effectively performed a genre. However, the processes of learning, and the various pathways writers take to arrive at those

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360.2.08

successful performative moments, are often invisible in the final iteration of a particularly successful genre performance. The processes of revising through trial and error, producing drafts, examining genre models, and receiving feedback from others are essential to the genre learning that takes place—and a rich site of study for Writing in the Disciplines (WID) scholars. This chapter analyzes three case studies to illustrate the incremental processes by which students in a geography class learned to write a new genre—the social science literature review. The microanalytic approach used in this chapter enables readers to see students' process of genre learning as they discovered and then attempted the discourse choices that helped them successfully enact the genre. This deeper understanding of students' processes for learning new disciplinary genres suggests a number of possible pedagogical interventions to make clearer the connections between genre characteristics and discourse-level choices.

The instructor of the junior-level geography course at the heart of this chapter, Dr. Graham, made the common assumption that genre learning is demonstrated primarily through successful production of the genre, in this case the social science literature review. The instructor considered the literature review central to understanding the socially constructed nature of knowledge production, a core theme he sought to teach in his class. He measured students' progress in the class, and the adequacy of his own teaching practices, by whether students were able to successfully produce the primary genre of the course, and thus take on the necessary habits of mind and discursive practices of an emerging geography student.

As it turned out, Graham and the course teaching assistants (TAs) seemed to be looking for particular rhetorical moves and discourse choices that signaled to them that students conceptually "got" what it meant to take on the perspective of a geographer and write a social sciences literature review. As I will explore, these signposts tended to be discourse choices that were at times invisible to students, but essential to their being recognized as having successfully learned the genre. By analyzing student's learning processes, I was able to see when and how they discovered the discursive signposts their instructors expected to see in the genre. In this case, I examined students' interactions with TA comments, rubrics, and model genres to reveal moments of insight during which these signposts became available to them and understand how they shifted their discourse choices as a result.

SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

Learning a new genre is a complex process. The WAC and WID literatures have a long-standing body of scholarship articulating the challenges students experience as they encounter new disciplinary genres and move through university curriculum (Beaufort, 2007; Carroll, 2002; McCarthy, 1987; Russell & Yañez, 2003; Sternglass, 1993) and the complicated experience of writers acquiring new genres while immersed in internships, professions, and graduate programs (Artemeva, 2005; Dias et al., 1999; Dias & Paré, 2000; Prior, 1998). For example, we learn from Marilyn Sternglass (1993) that students' writing development is not straightforward but rather recursive and iterative, depending on the familiarity and complexity of the task. Similarly, Anne Beaufort (1999) defined genre learning as "iterative" rather than sequential and found that writers had to limit their attention to a few elements at once. The present chapter acknowledges the challenges that these scholars name, particularly as they pertain to students writing disciplinary genres for the first time. Furthermore, this chapter builds on existing scholarship to investigate students' learning processes in the moment, as they are first encountering those genres and interacting with the classroom artifacts. The microanalytic approach used in this chapter focuses on the moments of insight students experienced while writing a new genre and the discourse-level changes they made to their writing as a result of those insights. This approach enabled me to see how students interacted with course artifacts and examine how they discovered and practiced the discourse-level markers that signaled to their instructors successful genre performance.

This research study began with the theoretical lens of Rhetorical Genre Studies, using qualitative, ethnographic methods for studying the social interactions and sociocultural context as students learned the genre in question. The frame of Rhetorical Genre Studies, which privileges the view of "genre as social action" (Miller, 1984), allows an examination of genres not merely as forms but as actions doing work in particular social contexts, and in this case, as opportunities to practice disciplinary thinking and writing. In this study, it became clear that student participants were adept at understanding and describing the genre's goals and purposes. That is, students talked about the "non-linguistic" social situations that surrounded the genre as it existed in their discipline (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010) in ways that mirrored their instructors' talk about the genre. However, students struggled with knowing how to enact those goals and purposes, and their struggle frequently occurred within their writing choices, on the sentence level.[1] By better understanding this disconnect, WAC/WID scholars can help teachers become more aware of the discourse choices that signal successful genre production in order to draw students' attention to those choices.

---

[1] Ann Johns (2008, 2011) made a distinction between genre learning and genre awareness, arguing that genre learning tends to focus on learning transferable text types, while genre awareness emphasizes the socio-rhetorical context of the genre and is often an approach advocated for in first-year composition courses (see Devitt, 2004). However, in disciplinary writing courses, instructors may not have the rhetorical training to teach specifically for genre awareness, and this is a pedagogical challenge of RSG acknowledged by Bawarshi & Reiff (2010).

Study of the linguistic choices used to enact academic genres is common practice in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and systemic functional linguistics (SFL) approaches to genre. ESP and SFL have long histories of using applied linguistics and corpus-based studies to undertake linguistic analysis of published academic texts across a range of disciplinary fields (Hyland, 2004; Swales, 1990; for an overview, see Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010). These studies examine the linguistic features of published academic texts, and out of this research, student-facing textbooks and pedagogies have emerged, particularly for non-native English speaking graduate students aiming to publish in English (Feak & Swales, 2009; Hyland, 2009; Swales & Feak, 1994, 2000). However, these linguistic-focused approaches are largely absent from disciplinary writing courses taught by instructors within their academic fields.

Recently, scholars have engaged in similar methods to analyze student texts, highlighting some of the discursive features that show up in students' academic writing (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Gere et al., 2013; Lancaster, 2014, 2016a, 2016b). In addition, Mary Soliday (2011) and Laura Wilder (2012) have examined student learning with regard to discourse choices within discipline-specific genres. Soliday and Wilder interviewed students and examined their writing in relation to particular discourse moves ("stance," for Soliday, and "literary topoi," for Wilder), with a focus on the discourse choices themselves, their emergence in student writing, and the supports that enabled students' successful genre performance.

My scholarship builds on the work of Soliday (2011) and Wilder (2012) by taking an ethnographic approach: in observing class sessions, interviewing students repeatedly throughout the course, and examining their papers with them, I was able to ask students to reflect on their understandings of the genre over time and examine their discourse choices during multiple attempts at the genre. While Soliday and Wilder interviewed students and examined their writing for particular rhetorical strategies, my focus was on students' learning processes, rather than on the discourse choices themselves. I analyzed students' learning in the moment, while students were encountering the rubric, submitting their papers, receiving feedback, and searching for model genres. Listening to students as they discovered and tried out discourse choices while reaching toward the genre of the literature review provided a window into the various ways instructors might better support students' learning processes.

If abstract descriptions of the genre's purpose, audience, and organization might be described as genre characteristics, then the patterned language choices at the sentence or paragraph level that help writers enact those genre characteristics might be described as discourse choices.[2] As I will demonstrate, the instructor's description of the genre of the literature review as an "argument" and as "about the literature" were successfully enacted at the sentence level through particular discourse choices—choices that were frequently invisible to students. Methodologically, by asking students to talk about their discourse choices in the midst of their learning process, I was able to document their moments of discovery and examine their learning processes as they tried out new discourse choices through their encounters with course artifacts.

James Gee's (2011) concept of "recognition" provides a helpful framework for thinking about what "counts" as successful genre production in classroom contexts:

> The key to Discourses is "recognition." If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (action), here and now, then you have pulled off a Discourse. . . . Whatever you have done must be similar enough to other performances to be recognizable. (p. 35)

Thus, the interplay of nonlinguistic and linguistic features is important, and links back to distinct Rhetorical Genre Studies, English for Specific Purposes, and Systemic Functional Linguistics approaches to genre (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010). Recognition as a concept emphasizes the social interaction, such that when a person "pull[s] off a Discourse," there is a someone (in this case, an instructor or TA) doing the recognizing. There is power involved in recognizing (or not) students' attempts at genre production: when instructors are assigning and then grading student writing in disciplinary classrooms, Gee's conception of recognition is at play.

The students in the study I present here are working toward "pulling off" the genre and wrestling with understanding and then performing the specific discourse choices that were necessary in their texts in order for them to be recognized as having successfully enacted the genre. Like Peter Smagorinsky, Elizabeth Anne Daigle, Cindy O'Donnell-Allen, and Susan Bynum (2010), I view these attempts generously, as authentic and earnest movements toward the target genre, as evidence of partial and incremental learning and connection-making. As such, students' engagement with classroom artifacts became compelling opportunities for examining their learning and meaning making with regard to the disciplinary genre they were working to produce.

---

[2] See Gere et al. (2013) for a discussion of "meso-level rhetorical actions"—levels of text smaller than the text but larger than a sentence.

RESEARCH QUESTION, STUDY CONTEXT, AND METHODOLOGY

The central driving research question for this study was "What are the processes by which students learn a new disciplinary genre?" For this chapter specifically, I was interested in these two subquestions:

- What discourse choices help students get recognized as successfully producing that disciplinary genre?
- How do students discover and learn to employ those discourse choices over the span of a course?

This qualitative research was conducted at a large research university in the West in the Spring of 2014 under an IRB-determined exemption. The course was a Junior-level disciplinary writing course required of all Geography majors, and approximately 80 students enrolled in the course. Participants included Dr. Graham, a lecturer-level instructor, two graduate-student TAs, and seven undergraduate student participants who volunteered to participate in the research. The course was an introduction to research methods and writing in Geography, with an emphasis on epistemology. Students met three times per week in lecture, and again in small group "quiz" sections led by graduate-level TAs. The primary course genre was a literature review, and Graham taught this genre explicitly and had worked with the campus center for teaching to build scaffolding assignments into the paper sequence. The students first completed annotated bibliographies from instructor-provided articles, and then wrote a "mini" literature review about HIV/AIDS in Africa from those same articles before choosing their own topics to write an expanded literature review.

The study was part of a larger qualitative ethnographic case study that involved in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and collection of artifacts throughout a complete quarter. Though I offer examples from many of the seven students, the analysis for this chapter arises from the second of three semi-structured interviews with three of the student participants. Kyle[3] was a white male student studying linguistics and geography; he was in his sophomore year. Hope was a multilingual Korean American; she was a sophomore business major exploring the option of declaring geography as a second major. Finally, Roberto was a multilingual first-generation college student from Mexican immigrant parents; he was a junior majoring in geography. Together Kyle, Hope, and Roberto were typical among the seven student participants in terms of their development of genre knowledge over the course of the term. They were selected as comparative cases here because their second interviews illustrate the range of ways students were understanding the literature review mid-quarter and serve to highlight how students used their interactions with course artifacts to clarify their genre knowledge.

---

[3] All pseudonyms. Students' identities are self-described.

At the time of these interviews, Kyle, Hope, and Roberto had just received feedback on their first "mini" literature review. The interview protocol for the second interview involved describing their process for writing the paper, reading TA comments on their submitted papers—some of them for the first time—and then reflecting aloud on the sense they made of their TA comments. Thus, data collection for the findings represented here included a combination of semi-structured interviewing, stimulated elicitation interviewing, and analysis of student texts (Prior, 2004). This in-depth micro-analysis allows an examination of something instructors rarely see: students' meaning-making processes across time, in retrospect, as they draw connections between their prior understandings and their new learning. Through witnessing students' interactions with TA feedback on their papers, an assignment rubric, and the resources they sought out to better understand a new and difficult genre, readers are able to see how students wrestled with the discourse choices that helped them get recognized by their instructor and TAs as successfully performing the genre.

FINDINGS

In teaching the literature review, Graham spent an entire week of the course introducing the literature review: what it was, how it was used in the field of geography (and social sciences broadly), and its overarching genre characteristics. He emphasized a number of characteristics in class talk, rubrics, and other course documents—or what Janet Giltrow (2002) called "meta-genres." For the purposes of this chapter, I focus on students' interactions around two of these salient genre characteristics: a literature review is an "argument" and it is "about the literature." Graham defined an argument as "beyond a summary, involving both synthesis and evaluation" and contrasted the literature review to "a book report," saying to students in class, "Don't tell me about the topic. . . . Tell me what the authors are writing about the topic." This particular genre characteristic—that a literature review is "about the literature"—was identified by Graham as one of the most challenging aspects of the writing project for students, but also the most important for students' grasp of the socially constructed nature of knowledge in geography.

Throughout their interviews, all the students in the study generally talked about the literature review using language indicating that their understanding of the genres' salient characteristics matched their instructor's. All but one student called out the literature review as an argument, and every single student talked about the literature review being "about the literature." Yet despite their capacity to describe the genre of the literature review in ways that mirrored Graham's talk, students struggled with moving from articulating the genre's characteristics to enacting them, and they expressed hesitation about their confidence in producing the genre.

READING TA COMMENTS

I present Kyle's case first as the clearest example of a student's engagement with a discourse choice that signaled to their instructor and TAs successful enactment of the genre. For the larger group, some of the rhetorical characteristics of the literature review were invisible to students, even when they were earnestly trying to enact the genre. Kyle was among a number of students in the class who felt like he understood the primary purpose and characteristics of the genre of the literature review as Graham described it—but struggled enact the genre and get recognized by TAs as having done so. Kyle's case study is particularly illuminating because of the connections he made right in the interview that furthered his understanding. Kyle thought he was writing "about the literature" and claimed he understood that the paper was supposed to be about the literature, but his TA, Miles, highlighted particular sentences or phrases in Kyle's paper and requested that he write about the literature. Here I illustrate that although the discourse choices that would have signaled this genre knowledge to his instructor were at first invisible to Kyle, his interaction with the TAs comments demonstrate his ongoing, incremental learning process.

The last sentence of the introduction to Kyle's first literature review read as follows:

> This paper seeks to understand how underdeveloped countries in sub-Saharan Africa are seeking to expand efforts to help not only spread knowledge of the HIV/AIDS virus and protection from it among youth populations but also how these countries involve the adult population in this process through a review of five different current articles discussing the various topics surrounding this issue.

Miles highlighted this last sentence—a common student move to use the last sentence of the introduction to provide a roadmap rather than articulate an explicit argument—and made this comment: "Good, but for a lit review, rather than making an argument about HIV/AIDS itself, try to frame your argument around what the *authors* are saying about HIV/AIDS. Focus on the articles over their subject matter!" Here, Miles explicitly reminded Kyle that the literature review was "about the literature."

In his verbal response to me about this comment, Kyle said, "Mmm. This is like saying I was trying to use the paper to talk about HIV and AIDS itself. Which I guess I can understand, but at the same time, I was mostly just summarizing [the articles], and most of the articles were about like—they introduce some sort of program to teach the local population, and then they tracked it over time." The sentence in Kyle's text was tagged by Miles as an argument, but here, Kyle said he saw the work he was doing in this sentence as summarizing the articles. To him, this summarization was indeed writing "about the literature," but it was not recognized by Miles in the same way.

Kyle had similar insights when he read the last sentence of his paper: "In terms of the youth population of all of the areas analyzed throughout these five articles, it appears that they are ahead of the general knowledge, care, protection and prevention curve, and it should rather be their adult population counterparts that should perhaps a greater focus so that they can in turn ensure that the youth population stay on their current path to relative healthiness from the HIV/AIDS epidemic [TA highlighting preserved]." Kyle read part of this sentence aloud to me, then said: "Yeah. [Reading sentence] That was kind of the conclusion I drew." Here, the comment that Miles made on this sentence, which he had highlighted, was "Not your job to say what 'ought' to be done. Is this what the authors think should be done?"

In reading this comment, Kyle responded in the interview: "But it was because I said 'should' rather than just format it in sort of like an observational way. . . . And I think I should've phrased it like, 'Based on these articles, it appears that the youth populations in the test areas show less of a, um, improvement in terms of HIV and AIDS knowledge as opposed to their adult counterparts.'" That is, Kyle revoiced in his interview with me what his sentence would have sounded like with the appropriate attributive phrase.

Attributive phrasing, while it might seem like a simple discursive move, became a key to students being recognized by Graham and Miles as successfully writing "about the literature." Students were aware of their need to write "about the literature," but not always aware of the discourse choices that they needed to produce to do so, and attribution was not something that Graham ever spoke explicitly about in class. However, in an interview with me, Graham described an office hour appointment with another student from the class, in which he had prompted the student to revoice his talk about the paper to be not about the topic but about the literature. Such talk, with attribution, demonstrated to Graham that the student had taken up this important genre characteristic. Despite this, for many students, the move that signaled this important discourse choice—the attributive phrases—was invisible until someone explicitly pointed it out on their papers.

Kyle's case was interesting because his initial self-assessment was that he had indeed been writing about the literature: he was summarizing the literature, and he knew—and knew his TA knew—he did not do this research himself. On the first round of this paper, he did not realize that there was a particular rhetorical signal that Miles was looking for to indicate that he had taken up this particular genre feature appropriately. Attribution seemed to be what Miles was looking for as the discourse marker for the paper being "about the literature." When Kyle realized this, he was quickly able to revoice the sentence he originally wrote and include the attribution. Throughout the rest of this interview, in other places where he received similar comments from Miles, he re-worded his sentences aloud for me: "So I should've just said, 'Author's Name.'. . ." Together, his talk, his writing, and his verbal response to TA comments show the process of his learning in the moment. In his final paper, Kyle included much more attribution throughout when referencing findings from articles, demonstrating his movement toward understanding the importance of this discourse choice in successfully producing the genre of the literature review in this class.

Discovering the Rubric

While Kyle's case illustrates one moment of insight through feedback on writing, in any given course there are a range of other opportunities for students to make the kinds of discoveries that Kyle made through TA comments. As I will show, Hope was a student whose insight came when she read the rubric right before submitting her paper, demonstrating that teachers may not always know how various classroom supports will resonate with students, and when, during their learning process.

Throughout my first, second, and third interviews with students, I asked them to talk both about the genre of the literature review in their class and about their writing and learning processes. Like many students in the study, Hope was grappling with an apparent contradiction in her instructors' genre descriptions: the literature review was simultaneously an argument, and it was "about the literature." For example, another student, Samantha, talked about how she imagined engaging the literature in her paper and put it this way: "Cause I was really thinking about the idea that the argument should be your own, but *it shouldn't seem like your own that much*. . . ." Generally, students in the study had difficulty conceiving how to craft an argument that was not an opinion while simultaneously integrating literature—and focusing their paper on the literature itself rather than the topic. Through iterative practice with the genre and her grappling with this apparent contradiction, Hope's conception of the literature review evolved—but not always in expected ways.

In her first interview, Hope articulated that she understood the literature review she was preparing to write as entirely source based, and excluding her ideas or her opinion altogether—in fact, she was concerned how the paper would look if it were all citations. However, during the second interview, Hope told me the story of a new understanding that came through writing and submitting her first "mini" literature review. Right as she was getting ready to submit the paper, she discovered the rubric provided online by Graham, where she realized for the first time that the literature review was actually supposed to be an argument. "Yeah, the rubric. And I did not see that until like 30 minutes before I was gonna submit my paper. So for the 15 minutes, I went through and tried to make it more, like, argument style because I didn't know we had to have an argument at all. . . . So I started going back and putting in certain sentences there that really made it seem like I'm focused on one side versus the other."

The rubric described an "excellent" literature review in this way: "Paper has a clear argument or research question; both the 'summary' and 'analysis' aspects of the lit review are present; literature is organized to support the argument." Upon reading the rubric, Hope had to first recognize that she did not previously have an argument in her paper, and second, she had to have some sense of what to do about that. Interestingly, it was at least two of these "added last minute" sentences that solicited comments by her TA, Miles.

One prominent example of this occurred at the end of the paper's first paragraph. In her first draft, she had ended her paragraph, "The two main focuses, including the similarities and differences between the articles, will be the topics/issues researched along with the methodological approach of the research conducted." Again, this common student move at the end of the introduction provided a "roadmap" for what followed but was not necessarily an argument. Hope added these sentences before submitting the paper:

> The *theories of the articles* [emphasis added] largely target the prevention of this disease as well as the future outcome due to HIV/AIDS, but also lack efforts for those already infected by this disease. *The concern here is* [emphasis added] not to focus on just the preventative efforts, but the underlying issues that come as a result of HIV/AIDS spreading and how to effectively implement ideas to aid those with AIDS.

The comment Miles made, pointed with an electronic flag at the end of this paragraph, was "Good, concise argument that focuses on the articles (rather than the virus itself)." Here, Miles highlighted what Hope had done well—she both made an argument and had written "about the literature" instead of about the topic. Indeed, her sentence's subject is "the theories of the articles"—indicating to Miles that she understood she was supposed to write "about the literature."

When we arrived at this comment in the interview, Hope said to me, "Cause this is what I think I added, kind of last minute, saying that instead of just focusing on the preventative efforts, we should also work on the treatment. I think that's what he's saying—it's not just the virus itself. It's like the argument that I'm trying to have. And then this [the original roadmap sentence] is like the two things I'm focusing on. It's similarities and differences. And then methodological approach." Hope's phrase "The concern here is . . ." emphasizes the contrast between her contribution and the synthesis of the articles' findings in her previous sentence.

While Hope's approach of tacking on "argument-style" sentences throughout her paper might not have led to a fully developed argument, her awareness that something was missing and her move to add "argument style" sentences demonstrated some interesting last-minute, incremental learning. Hope had a sense, first, that arguments could be enacted (at least in part) at the sentence level, and second, that there were particular sorts of rhetorical moves made in "argument style" sentences. As she encountered the rubric after writing her own paper, her understanding evolved, and she made a pointed revision by adding sentences throughout her paper to make it more of an argument.

By the third interview, the idea of a literature review being both about the literature and an argument was central to her understanding: there, she emphasized argumentative nature of a literature review and spent time describing the shift she had made from thinking about the literature review as being "just talking about, this article's this, and this author said this" to "what I'll be arguing about or what I'll be saying." We can see that her facility with argument and her ability to integrate "argument style" sentences became more sophisticated between her first and second paper. For example, in her introduction to her final paper on global poverty, she writes: "Most academics agree that estimates produce different results and emphasize why and how that occurs[;] however, an important concept lacking within this perspective is the overlooked lack of published analysis that target improved human and health development." Here, Hope uses attribution to synthesize a consensus among the articles she read and uses "however" to contrast her argument as an insight about what was overlooked in the studies: one conventional articulation of a "gap" in many social science research studies (Swales, 1990).

Googling for Model Texts

The cases of Kyle and Hope illustrate their interactions with classroom artifacts and their iterative attempts to learn and perform the genre in their class.

Throughout my interviews, I also asked students to identify any resources they sought out themselves that were useful to their learning. In general, students were eager to find genre samples as part of their learning process. When they did not feel that the class materials they had been provided were sufficient, they sought out additional resources on their own but, in doing so, were left alone to make sense of how close the "literature reviews" they found through Google searches matched the genre as it emerged in their classroom.

Four of the seven students in the study took the initiative to find a sample paper on their own. Samantha found a published literature review in geography through the library guides, and Thomas, Roberto, and Jun Googled to find sample papers on the Web. Jun was able to find a sample paper from another university that also had some instruction and annotation, and Thomas used the empirical articles he was reading for his research as a model.

Roberto's search was particularly interesting because it surfaced an iterative meaning-making process as he wrestled with the samples in a more complex way. Like his classmates, Roberto also Googled for sample papers, but he had a keen awareness that the samples he found when he Googled "Literature Review" weren't necessarily the same genre his teacher was looking for:

> I went online, and I looked at other lit reviews that had been done, and a lot of them are these peer-reviewed academic lit reviews that had been published. And they are—though they're similar in what the objective is, learning what's already been done, kind of assessing the conversations between academics on subject, I saw that they were very, very specific to like a case. They were more, like, scientific in terms of . . . not necessarily talking about how it's looked at, but more talking about the actual issue itself and . . . so, I was like, OK, this is one way of doing a literature review. But this is not really how I'm being taught to do it. So I'm kind of confused. This is a really good lit review. It makes, you know, good, strong points. But it's just kind of—I just saw—it wasn't necessarily the same as I would've thought.

This quote provides a window into Roberto's meaning making around the sample genre he sought out. First, he quickly became aware that the genre samples he found online did not exactly match the genre as it was presented in his class. In fact, his observation of the peer-reviewed published literature reviews, even though they made "good, strong points," was that they were "more talking about the actual issue itself"—something Graham regularly reminded students to avoid. In this quote, Roberto articulated that he made sense of this contradiction by concluding that there might be more than one way to write a literature review and that what Graham was asking was particular and nuanced: "So I was like, OK, this is one way of doing a literature review. But this is not really how I'm being taught to do it." His desire for more samples, which he sought out on his own, was linked to his hope that samples might help him "understand the structure of them."

Roberto had an easier time than other students navigating the conceptual tension between the genre characteristics. Instead, his struggle was wondering what exactly his argument was supposed to be about. In his interviews, Roberto posed the question that troubled him: What do we argue about? At the end of his first interview, he said, "I understand that we're arguing about other people's arguments and that we're kind of linking them together and saying, OK, this is how this person looks at it. . . . But in the conclusion part, I'm still wondering how—like, what, essentially, we're going to be discussing. Like do we just continue talking about how different they are . . . or do we try to propose our own way of going about studying this now that we know all the different approaches that have been taken?"

A comparison between Roberto's discourse choices in his thesis statements in Paper 1 and Paper 2 illustrate both a decision to focus his argument on methodology and a growing comfort with taking an argumentative stance (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1. Comparison of Roberto's discourse choices in his thesis statements between Paper 1 and Paper 2

Roberto's Paper 1 Thesis	Roberto's Paper 2 Thesis
This review will focus on how five geographic studies outline the impact of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa (or a particular sub-Saharan area) in order to understand the type of responses that have derived from strictly geographic perspectives on the HIV/AIDS epidemic and most importantly how data quality affect the stigma of HIV/AIDS.	However, I assert in this paper that among these studies, the measurement of food security among participants is not thoroughly being considered as having an association to understanding the high obesity rates in the US. I think some research attention to the quality of work lives and household income that are typical of food insecurity and obesity interventions is needed.

In his first paper, Roberto's thesis was clearly focused on the literature but went beyond that to say something about the literature: that data quality affects how people understand HIV/AIDS. His argument on articles' data quality was present but subtle. However, by his third interview, Roberto had determined that his argument should actually be about the methods themselves: "The thesis [in my second paper] is kind of like, what is driving all these research methods and all these studies." His second paper's thesis illustrates more comfort with the discourse choices that emphasize an argument: "However, I assert in this paper . . ." Moreover, Roberto foregrounded a methodological argument early and as the subject of his thesis sentence: "The *measurement* [emphasis added] of food security among participants is not thoroughly being considered." Roberto's case illustrates movement over time toward more sophisticated enactments of the discourse choices that helped him get recognized as producing a literature review that was both an argument and about the literature.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The cases of Kyle, Hope, and Roberto give readers three snapshots of learning moments that occurred between students' first encounter with the genre and their final papers. Together, the cases illuminate insights students had as they interacted with course artifacts and talked with me about their writing. These insights illustrate students' discovery of the discourse choices that were not made explicit in the class but that were key to getting recognized as successfully enacting the genre of the literature review in their geography class. By taking a microanalytic approach, I was able to trace students' discovery of those discourse choices and attempts to practice them, giving us a picture of their learning processes and movements toward the genre at key moments.

For instructors and WAC/WID directors who work with faculty, this research supports a large and long-standing body of scholarship in the field advocating for faculty development around increased awareness of the rhetorical moves and discourse choices used to enact their disciplinary genres (McLeod, 2001; McLeod et al., 2001; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006). As Angela Glotfelter, Ann Updike, and Elizabeth Wardle (this volume) demonstrate, faculty who engage in WAC/WID development often become aware of the tacit assumptions they have about writing, and the ways those assumptions are linked to disciplinary understandings.

Even in classrooms like this one, where Graham was working to scaffold students' learning, illuminate the disciplinary thinking behind disciplinary genres, and give students multiple opportunities to practice, more can be done to connect discourse-level choices to the general genre characteristics instructors use to talk about genres. Instructors' clarity about the discourse choices they are looking for in disciplinary genres—those choices that, whether explicitly or implicitly, give students the ability to be recognized as successfully performing the genre—is central to providing students access to disciplinary genre knowledge. Scholarship by Zak Lancaster and Laura Aull examines some of the linguistic features that are valued in academic writing (Aull, 2015; Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Lancaster, 2014, 2016a, 2016b; see also, Hyland, 2004), and this kind of linguistics or corpus-based research is valuable for unmasking the particularities of academic discourse for new students. This chapter demonstrates that classroom artifacts such as instructor and TA feedback, assignment rubrics, and model genres might be productive sites for highlighting the particular discourse choices instructors are looking for students to emulate.

One key finding of this research is that in students' talk with me, they articulated increasing understanding about the genre and how to go about performing it successfully, though sometimes this learning occurred after the paper had been submitted and graded. WAC and WID scholars, faculty, and advocates are well positioned to help instructors across their campuses not only be more effective in supporting students' learning of disciplinary genres—and identifying the particular discourse choices that are used to enact those genres—but also more aware of the iterative processes that students are engaged in as they learn new genres.

Moreover, this research suggests that scholars too might benefit from expanding studies to examine incremental yet imperfect movement toward target genres. In this chapter, I focused on three moments of insight that allow readers to see students' learning processes unfold. My microanalysis of students' texts and talk about their interactions with TA feedback, assignment rubrics, and genre models gives readers a window into student learning that interviews or analyses of student writing alone do not. Students' iterative meaning-making processes across time, and in retrospect, illustrate their "reaches" toward, their attempts at enacting a new genre, their genre knowledge becoming more precise, complex, and nuanced. This view of their process—how they went about learning the genres through interaction with course artifacts and concrete discourse choices across drafts—offers WAC/WID instructors and scholars both ways of identifying and supporting those key learning moments before the "aha" happens and ways of valuing students' movement toward a target genre, even if their genre knowledge and the writing they produce are still emerging.

REFERENCES

Artemeva, N. (2005). A time to speak, a time to act: A rhetorical genre analysis of novice engineer's calculated risk taking. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication 19,* 389-421. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651905278309

Aull, L. (2015). *First-year university writing: A corpus-based study with implications for pedagogy.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137350466

Aull, L., & Lancaster, Z. (2014). Linguistic markers of stance in early and advanced academic writing: A corpus-based comparison. *Written Communication, 31*, 151-183. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088314527055

Bawarshi, A., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy.* Parlor Press; The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/genre/

Beaufort, A. (1999). *Writing in the real world: Making the transition from school to work*. Teachers College Press.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgnk0

Carroll, L. A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Devitt, A. J. (2004). *Writing genres.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Paré, A. (1999). *Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dias, P., & Paré, A. (2000). *Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings*. Hampton.

Feak, C. B., & Swales, J. M. (2009). *Telling a research story: Writing a literature review*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.309338

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203847886

Gere, A. R., Aull, L., Perales Escudero, M. D., Lancaster, Z., & Vander Lei, E. (2013). Local assessment: Using genre analysis to validate directed self-placement. *College Composition and Communication, 64*, 605-633.

Giltrow, J. (2002). Meta-genre. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre: Strategies for stability and change* (pp. 187-205). Hampton.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing* (Michigan Classics Edition). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.6719

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Johns, A. M. (2008). The future of genre in L2 writing: Fundamental, but contested, instructional decision. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*, 56-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.12.003

Johns, A. M. (2011). Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An ongoing quest. *Language Teaching, 41*, 237-252. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004892

Lancaster, Z. (2014). Exploring valued patterns of stance in upper-level student writing in the disciplines. *Written Communication, 31*, 27-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088313515170

Lancaster, Z. (2016a). Do academics really write this way? A corpus investigation of moves and templates in "They say/I say." *College Composition and Communication, 67*, 437-464.

Lancaster, Z. (2016b). Using corpus results to guide the discourse-based interview: A study of one student's awareness of stance in academic writing in philosophy. *Journal of Writing Research, 8*(1), 119-148. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2016.08.01.04

McCarthy, L. P. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21*, 233-265.

McLeod, S. (2001). The pedagogy of writing across the curriculum. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 149-164). Oxford University Press.

McLeod, S., Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C. (Eds.). (2001). *WAC for a new millennium: Strategies for continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/landmarks/millennium/

Miller, C. (1984). Genre as social action. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 23-42). Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383686

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Prior, P. (2004). Tracing process: How texts come into being. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing is and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual Practices* (pp. 167-200). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Russell, D. R., & Yañez, A. (2003). "Big picture people rarely become historians": Genre systems and the contradictions of general education. In C. Bazerman & D. R. Russell (Eds.), *Writing selves/writing societies* (pp. 331-362). The WAC Clearinghouse; Mind, Culture, and Activity. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/selves-societies/

Smagorinksy, P., Daigle, E. A., O'Donnell-Allen, C., & Bynum, S. (2010). Bullshit in academic writing: A protocol analysis of a high school senior's process of interpreting *Much ado about nothing. Research in the Teaching of English, 44*, 368-405.

Soliday, M. (2011). *Everyday genres: Writing assignments across the disciplines*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Sternglass, M. (1993). Writing development as seen through longitudinal research: A case study. *Written Communication*, *10*, 231-261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010002004

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9059

Thaiss, C. J., & Zawacki, T. M. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. Boynton/Cook.

Wilder, L. (2012). *Rhetorical strategies and genre conventions in literary studies: Teaching and writing in the disciplines*. Southern Illinois University Press.