REDESIGNING THE RESEARCH ARC OF FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION: RENEGOTIATING AND REMAPPING AN APPROACH TO INFORMATION LITERACY

Amy Locklear

An abundance of scholarship produced in the last several decades critiques the traditional college research paper and how it is taught in First-Year Writing (FYW) courses (e.g., Melzer and Zemliansky; Larson; Sutton; Downs and Wardle). One line of criticism is that the product-driven praxis of many research-writing FYW courses fails to successfully facilitate transferrable information literacy practices (Larson, Veach, Downs and Wardle). Other concerns focus on the habits of students when reading and using sources, particularly their online information-seeking behaviors (Corbett, Goodfellow, Purcell et al.). In 2011, Sandra Jamieson and Rebecca Moore Howard published the results of The Citation Project,[1] an empirical study that gathered data from "sixteen US colleges and universities" in order to create a "portrait of how students in [first-year] writing courses work with their sources" (Jamieson 1). The impetus for their study stemmed from an ongoing concern within English Studies (and other academic fields) with academic plagiarism and its prevention. Their research, however, operated on the premise that plagiarism prevention was only one "desired outcome"; the larger, more important goal was to promote changes in classroom pedagogy in order to help students better understand how to

effectively engage with source materials ("Sandra Jamieson"). As one of sixteen participating institutions in this study, Auburn University Montgomery (AUM) contributed student research paper samples culled from our second-semester First-Year Writing course sequence, hereafter referred to as FYW2. What the final Citation Project report uncovered was "a gap between the broad aims of college Writing instruction and the source-based papers students are actually producing in first-year Writing classes" (21). Drawing upon that study's results, this article outlines steps taken by the AUM Composition Program to reconceptualize our FYW2 course to address both Citation Project recommendations as well as concerns expressed by English Studies scholars over plagiarism and research writing skills. In this context, I examine two layers of change: (1) the rationale behind reframing our overall programmatic arc, and (2) my own classroom pedagogy and praxis following the new design. Couched in the intentional metaphors of **exploration**, **conversation**, and **remix**, both the programmatic and classroom redesigns reframed our researched argument process as inquiry- rather than proof-driven.

In Fall 2012, one of the original research team members of The Citation Project, Dr. Tricia Serviss, presented results specific to AUM's Composition Program to our teaching faculty, prompting our Program's director to call for large-scale curricular revisions in order to address these findings. Specifically, the results generated for our institution suggested that, not unlike the national results, our students were not deeply engaging with sources in ways that promoted critical meaning making ("Citation" 18), leading us to ask what changes we could make at both curricular and pedagogical levels. Several key findings of the Project are particularly relevant for this discussion. Among student papers submitted by our institution,

- 93% of citations "work with two or fewer sentences from the source rather than ***engaging*** [emphasis mine] with a sustained passage in the source" (12),

- 50% of citations are quotations (compared to 42% nationwide),
- 30% of papers demonstrate a misuse of source material in the form of either patchwriting or failure to correctly mark quotations,
- 48% of our students depend more on internet sites than sources such as books or journal articles (37%). Significantly, our student samples "cite[d] general websites with twice the frequency that they cite reliable informational sites such as…the CDC" (15), and
- 77% of citations are drawn from sources shorter in length (most fewer than four pages) and from material found in the first three pages.

And our program is not atypical. The Citation Project's authors observe that all of the institutional data suggest that, nationwide, "students are not engaging with texts in meaningful ways" (18). These results indicated to our instructional team a need for extended, deeper instruction on source use, not just teaching plagiarism avoidance—something our former course design was clearly not effectively providing. Our redesign team determined that *engagement* and *student agency* must become central to any shifts in pedagogy. Our thinking was that if students saw source materials as external objects of proofs, designed to be skimmed and positioned as authoritative data points, they may not see themselves as participants engaged in a dynamic relationship with sources when it comes to information-seeking behaviors. Such critical literacy is vital to achieving a transferable set of research behavior outcomes beyond the FYW classroom. The bulleted results above from The Citation Project became a diagnostic starting point with which we began to redesign the overall arc of our FYW2 framework and classroom practices.

Following the new curricular arc and the Citation Project's recommendations, these classroom-level efforts to reconceptualize FYW2 began with new framing metaphors

intended to (1) shift the nature of the student-source relationship (from exteriorization to interiorization via **exploration**, **conversation**, and **remix**), and (2) incorporate native digital literacies in order to foster a stronger sense of engagement as stakeholders in the process, in addition to (3) facilitate intentional rhetorical shifts in choices of course materials and assignment language, and (4) follow an extended arc of scaffolded, heuristic-based assignments to enhance opportunities for student information literacy and critical research practices. This article offers some of the key changes made to both our curriculum's overall assignment arc as well as my own pedagogical shifts as a representative classroom within this new arc.

The Wider Context: Where We Fit In

The Citation Project's data analysis results echo concerns found throughout Writing, Composition, and Information Literacy Studies' scholarship, specifically concerning the merit and shape of the research paper traditionally assigned to freshman students at the end of the FYW2 course. Considered together, results from The Citation Project, the Association of College and Research Libraries "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education," Purcell et al.'s report on "How Teens Do Research in the Digital World," as well as countless other anecdotal experiences represented in the scholarship are clear indicators that the way we teach the FYW2 research paper demands examination and even revision. A review of some of the recent scholarship focused on this question suggests that current approaches to teaching the research paper often seem to promote generalized skill set acquisition, largely centered on academic information search skills and plagiarism avoidance (Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue 178). Some scholars argue that the research project in FYW2 should be reconceived following a writing-across-the-disciplines alignment to better facilitate transfer (Sutton 46). Others, like Downs and Wardle, believe that the freshman research task would be better theorized and practiced through a writing studies' lens in order to broaden students' views of

writing's purpose in the academy (552-553). Still others (Larson) move the issue completely out of the FYW experience altogether, suggesting the research essay as currently taught ill-serves the academy and the student once beyond the first-year writing classroom. Given these discussions, it seems clear that the form of the traditional argument research paper as a *product* showcasing correctly cited authorities is no longer accepted as a monolithic standard for the first-year composition sequence. In fact, many compositionists argue that a generic research project may not effectively prepare students for one-to-one transfer of knowledge to other disciplines at all (Larson, Sutton).

What, then, is the solution? Writing and Information Literacy scholars offer a variety of proposed avenues for restructuring the freshman research essay as part of FYW2. Some, like Holliday and Fagerheim, focus on the primacy of the information literacy component, outlining a local curriculum design which more closely integrates the roles of the composition instructor and the library instruction staff (169). Grace Veach, Dean of Library Services at Southeastern University, proposes a similar partnership, calling for a purposeful revision of the operational metaphors in use, promoting a traditional rhetorical "place" or "topoi" filter in order to assist instructors in their efforts to address the tendency for students and composition courses to emphasize information gathering over critical inquiry (105, 110). However, such proposals seem to pivot to some degree on a focus that privileges a skills-practice-product approach, rather than students' agency when engaged as active knowledge-making discourse community members (similar to concerns expressed by Gee, Bodi, and Rossen-Knill and Bakhmetyeva). To the latter focus, recent scholarship by Joseph Bizup, Len Unsworth, and Patrick Corbett contributes critical elements that, when situated within the needs-context highlighted by The Citation Project, inform the curricular and pedagogical revisions outlined here.

Setting the Stage for Change: Curricular Remap

Prior to Citation Project-inspired revisions, the two-semester FYW sequence at AUM followed a pattern fairly common among university FYW programs. The focus of our first semester (FYW1) course, English 1010, was (and remains) expository writing; the second part of the sequence (English 1020 or FYW2) focused on producing a researched persuasive argument essay. Our state's Higher Education Council mandates six graded assignments for each semester – for a total of twelve for the entire first-year composition sequence. Prior to these outlined changes, our 1020 course design featured four stand-alone analytical projects, supplemented with minor writing assignments such as a mid-term or final exam and a writing journal or blog. The sequence followed a skills-based design: (1) analysis of one argument, (2) analytic comparison of two arguments, (3) synthesis of three arguments, and (4) a final persuasive research essay based on a student-selected arguable issue. (However, according to instructor preference, the focus text or issue was not always the same across all assignments.) Instructors used a common course textbook and assignments (including an *option* of digital technologies) to reinforce the workshop-based course, with outcomes of "understand[ing], describ[ing], and apply[ing] techniques of persuasion in a variety of situations" ("English 1020"). A significant problem with this sequence was that students often did not begin exploring a research topic until well into the semester, creating a sort of mad dash to the finish line for both students and instructors. This raised a question of transfer: how could we know if students were internalizing the progressive nature of the process-to-product *implied* by this sequence of skills-focused projects? Instructors and students alike often complained that there simply "wasn't enough time," a concern recently echoed by Kristin Arola and Michael Stancliff, who argue for a pedagogy of "slow composition." This process of teaching and writing that allows students (and, I would argue, instructors) to "slow down, take a breath, and think about what [they] are gathering and why

[they] want to gather it in the first place" (Arola) would play out in our redesign's new map.

After reviewing the Citation Project's recommendations for AUM, our program's Curriculum Coordinator proposed a curricular redesign based on a scaffolded sequence of unified assignments, beginning with a short topic-exploration essay that calls for students to write reflectively and informally about their own research interests. This assignment is followed by a progression-based series of linked "mini" writing projects emphasizing exploration and evaluation. Rather than emphasizing *product,* the sequence asks students to focus on research as *activity*, adding stages on a semester-long timeline much like a Russian nesting doll. As described by our Curriculum Coordinator, this curriculum remap emphasizes an

> interconnected, detailed, and gradual development of research practices.... The focus is on developing information literacy/citation practices (as emphasized by The Citation Project) in a structured manner that will still allow for the freedom of individual pedagogical approaches without sacrificing the program's ability to present students with a consistent and quality educational experience.

Such an arc might be best described as an approach promoting *heuristics*—teaching habits that can be repeated—rather than *product* (such as an analysis essay), allowing us to "slow down," deepen critical thinking opportunities, and make space for student literacies to play a larger role in moving deeper into the discourse of academic writing. The arc calls for reflective as well as formal assignments promoting critical, metacognitive thinking along an extended timeline, allowing students to dig into sources—a need suggested by The Citation Project results. Thus, instead of having only one assignment devoted to an exploratory task, the entire remapped sequence would facilitate multiple stages of inquiry and exploration.

For example, in our previous format, the first four weeks of the term focused on analysis practices based on a single source. Instructors often chose a single, common source based on the theme of the section or provided students with a selection of sources from which to choose. One drawback of this practice is that it created distance between the text and the students' interests, denying full student agency in the source topic choice. Even if some instructors allowed students freedom to choose their own text, the levels of students' unfamiliarity with the subject and discourse practices of analysis related to research were daunting. While the course outcomes emphasized critical reading for analysis, students rarely had any compelling internal motivation to see the product as anything more than practicing behaviors they had not yet internalized. When faced with such a task so early in the term, my students often claimed in end-of-course surveys that they had a hard time making connections between these early and the final projects, frequently using terms like "rushed" or "confusing." Reframed, such responses might reflect their novice status in the academic discourse community practices, but might also suggest a lack of personal presence (agency) in the meaning making expected of them. Simply put, they haven't had time to warm up, explore, invent, or familiarize themselves with the discourse environment in ways that promote constructive intellectual curiosity (one of NCTE's "Habits of Mind").

Such extended inquiry space is prominent in our revised curricular arc. Instead of beginning with a four-week analysis product, students writing in the new arc are asked to consider first their own discourse communities of family, friends, work, and play to discover conversations related to our themed course subject. Over several class periods, I ask students to use their pre-existing methods of knowledge-making (conversation, social media, Google searching) to create a list of ten topics they find personally interesting. From this basic list, students—individually and in groups—explore, revise, and narrow this list using a variety of filters (e.g., asking reporters' questions) and a series of critical reading exercises. Early in this process, I post large sheets

of paper around the classroom, each with subject headings based on an early survey of student interests: Business, Sciences, Education, Healthcare, Art & Music, Law/Politics, Social Media, and one simply marked "Other." Students visit each sheet and transfer from their lists as many one- or two-word topic phrases as possible. In a second round of writing, students then revisit each sheet and record a question (the 5 Ws + should/if) next to as many topics listed as possible (not their own). The result leads to such interesting student-generated questions as:

What would happen if all of the libraries closed down? (Education)	How will the business of hospitals change when genetic engineering becomes prevalent? (Business/Health)	When is the use of technology as an art form turning from true forms of art? (Art / Other)
What if animal testing was banned? (Science)	Where would life be better without the Internet? (Social media)	How will genetic engineering have effects on spreading of disease? (Health)

Students frequently remark such collaborative exploration sparks new questions and perspectives they had not previously considered on their own, making discovery a *topoi*.

This remap facilitates a pedagogy utilizing such "meaning-making structures" to invoke the multiliteracies of students (Unsworth 2). Similar to the contours of Corbett's "stage-process approach" design, this scaffolded arc encourages the adoption of an "inquiry-based writing" pedagogy (Corbett 268), drawing first upon students' familiar practices (what Corbett calls "exploration"), and adding regular metacognitive writing elements to build from reflective "generative" practices in a semester-long sequence of research activities (269). Thus, following the new map through the semester, students are asked to only move from

"the familiar to the new" (i.e., the help of "expert tools" or sources) after they have had an opportunity to "investigate" first, then "rethink, retool, and expand their research" in an ongoing trajectory framed as exploratory and conversational inquiry (Corbett 271). Such practices, we reasoned, would create what Kalantzis and Cope refer to as a "critical frame" (247), an opportunity to bridge students' native information literacy discourse skills toward those habits of mind promoted by the academy, a precept promoted by many in the fields of composition and education (e.g., Dewey; Bartholomae; Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola). Our reasoning was that such revisions to the former sequence would allow students time to "steep" in the practices; further, allowing for personalization of efforts framed as exploration might help student writers "own" the process.

Deepening the Change: Pedagogy and Reintegration

In the individual classroom, revisions to pedagogy continue this curricular shift from *product* literacy (how to replicate the academic research essay's form) to a *rhetorical* literacy that reintegrates student agency. Such rhetorical design moves seek to reposition students *within* the discourse community as intentional agents, rather than as outsiders seeking access through imitation (Bartholomae 135). As an instructor, my goal was to reconceive and assign research activities as a process of **discovery** to help students find and integrate their own voices into the discourse. The heart of this reconceptualization takes place using framing metaphors to operationalize the shift, and deliberately rhetoricizes materials to reflect an approach to research that intentionally integrates student literacies. As the New London Group's research demonstrates, the role of students' native literacies in classroom learning has been too long undervalued. Taking cues from the Citation Project results, my classroom-based changes focus on facilitating deeper moments of engagement. To do so,

student literacies need to play an integral role in the design of course assignments and classroom activity spaces.

The Messy Art of Questioning Continues

Sonia Bodi suggests we bridge the gap "between what we teach and what they do" by focusing on the act of questioning (109). I refer to many of my in-class activities as "messy" because they do not immediately translate into what might look like "traditional" (i.e., standards of academic discourse) research writing. Instead, they allow students to receive credit for the part of research that had previously been relegated to "prewriting" in a larger, graded research project. By thus highlighting the value of the messy process of inquiry and exploration, the new sequence and implementation emphasize students' agency in the rhetorical act of research, not just the academically valued product. In my application of the new arc, like Bodi I recast student research as inquiry and conversation by making questions a visible part of the work, as much a goal as the final academic paper. In the first iteration of our new arc, I ask my students to write several short (two page) topic inquiry-to-proposal pieces based on answering a series of key questions outlined by our textbook (*The Bedford Researcher*). In the previous four-essay curricular format, many of my students would express frustration when asked to produce analysis papers—assignments based on an academic system that equates synthesis and analysis with research writing from the very start—so early in the semester because they felt as though a research project meant starting with an answer they had not yet discovered. In fact, they were unsure how to even formulate a productive series of questions to guide their search. As Bodi affirms, designing curricular material that both foregrounds and is driven by the power of questioning (inquiry) rather than product serves "to motivate students to learn and understand that what *they* do [emphasis mine] is important in the quest for knowledge" (112).

Text Expertise vs. Student Expertise

Under the new arc, an inquiry focus frames our view of texts. Clearly, our twenty-first century students' encounters with source texts have expanded beyond the book culture at the heart of more traditional research writing pedagogy (Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola), a reality not lost on my own revisions. I began by integrating into my workshop activities existing student discourse practices, including navigating digital media using moves far more similar to discovery and exploration. Putting this "native discourse literacy" to use, as they navigate a series of hyperlinks found in web texts assigned for class reading, my students move from idea to idea in a much more web-like motion, propelling them to discover a different text or reference or concept through a carefully placed embedded reference. Therefore, it made sense to begin introducing students to academic *discovery* by renegotiating the language of the research process, calling their attention to their existing practices (like following hyperlinks) that parallel academic practices. During group discussion of a web text, for example, my students are asked to discuss the additional, hyperlinked material in terms of what we call "informational forensics," seeing the links as offshoots or sidebar conversations. Students are then asked to see these rhetorically—as "forensic investigators" —when considering the new "speakers'" redirection of the discussion. What can they find out about this new voice? Student teams then work together in Google or in the web source itself to track down additional information about the author and publication. Such practices become the basis of later discussions of primary and secondary sources, as well as evaluation. This is in contrast to ways many of our program's past textbooks framed research literacies using terms like "authoritative support texts," phrasing which Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola point to as privileging book literacies over students' ("Blinded By The Letter"). Indeed, in restructuring my own assignment materials, I found that too often the pedagogy and materials associated with teaching a persuasive research assignment in FYW2 reinforce practices of formulaic constructedness rather than the more "messy"

exploration stages encouraged by our new curricular arc of assignments (Head and Eisenberg 2). Thus, assignment texts as well as activities were redesigned to rhetorically position students as **stakeholders** and **conversation partners**, asking them to begin with knowledge inventory (or intrinsic) activities designed to explore existing literacies before they begin looking for extrinsic search materials. To support this shift, our program's Curriculum Coordinator selected a text[2] that could provide the inquiry-friendly approach of our new arc design. In addition, the text incorporates extensive supplemental digital platform materials to incorporate digital literacy habits – both native and academic. Instructors were granted a degree of creative leeway in adapting their classroom practices to the new arc, with the stipulation that all assignments must connect to the textbook and follow the progression of the arc.

In the case of my course, this reinvigorated focus on *inquiry* begins with a carefully targeted metaphor—**the conversation of argument**—to frame both my course pedagogy as well as materials. Given the increasingly popular use of the conversation-vs.-argument metaphor in our field and in an effort to increase student engagement with sources, this metaphor seems well suited to help my students begin conceptualizing sources as their **conversation partners** (intrinsic focus) rather than quarries for mining quotes (extrinsic), the latter a phenomenon noted by the Citation Project's sentence-level data observations (Jamieson and Moore Howard 6).[3] This allows for valued "messiness" in, for example, early student journal-keeping activities. Students are asked to see their journals as a judgment-free sandbox zone, allowing them to reflect and discover broadly and freely in their weekly entries deemed "discovery posts." They are further encouraged to post images, memes, drawings, poetry—as long as it expresses a connection to the course purpose and their topic inquiry. By renegotiating the terms of writing in this way, from formal to informal, the key rhetorical moves become a guiding ethos of redesign and form the foundational pathway to facilitate enhanced critical engagement in research behaviors.

Remapping and Reorienting the Compass Points

The Citation Project's results suggest that students' relationships to and engagement with source texts was an area in need of attention. The question arose: why *aren't* students engaging with source texts on a level more in line with the critical thinking outcomes of our classroom, specifically to encourage them "to *generate* ideas rather than to [merely] support pre-existing arguments" (Jameison and Howard 21)? The answer seemed to lie—at least in part—with the stated goals of research. In our previous curricular designs, the goals of research writing as framed by the academy too often situated students in a role of a novice tasked with imitating accepted models. Our earlier model created a series of "stovepiped" products framed to produce academic behaviors (analysis, comparison, synthesis, research) based on an orientation valuing the source material, in academic voice. The problem with this is that students were being asked to navigate unfamiliar territory with a perspective that was equally unfamiliar, leading them too often to see source materials as an immutable support structure that replaced their own agency. In order to reorient these perceptions, I focused my classroom pedagogy redesign efforts on two key questions: how do students *choose* their source texts and how do they *use* them in their own writing.

Reorienting the Metaphors: A Tour of Burke's Parlor

One key to my classroom remap was to rhetorically situate research in terms of **motive**. In *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson observe that a "metaphorical concept" structures "what we do and how we understand what we do when we argue.... The metaphor is not merely in the words we use—it is in our very concept of an argument" (5). Variations on the current traditional approach to teaching FYW2 assignments too often lean heavily on metaphors of *replication*, mimicking the academic discourse conventions as a means of acquiring knowledge or skill training. Our previous course assignment sequence was certainly framed that way. As previously

mentioned, that metaphor frames literacy as a set of skills to be acquired, a concept that has been roundly challenged by a variety of scholars. Yet curiously, if our textbooks are any proof, many of our freshman composition courses seem to continue to operate within this definitional framework. A cursory glance at the language of textbooks or English Studies' scholarship describes Information Literacy instruction as grounded in metaphors of source-seeking behavior privileging the extrinsic (e.g., search results, support, proofs). In order to implement these curricular revisions at the classroom level, I needed a metaphoric framework that would promote a useful "cognitive [re]orientation" to help students—and instructors—reconceptualize and prioritize their roles in the research process (Luke 73), as well as reconfigure students' understanding of their relationship to sources.

The former course design model, based on a cumulative tier of teaching analytical and research skill sets, asked students to analyze and compare others' arguments. Given the Citation Project findings, this may have unwittingly contributed to a tendency to see argument source texts as objects, whether for analysis or as resources from which to pluck quotations. Students' metaphoric frame under the previous model, then, was one of "proving a case," much as a lawyer might do. While not uncommon or unproductive in discussions of argument, this approach seems to facilitate and reinforce a student's relationship to source material as an externalized object of use, not as an interactive conversational voice involved in a student's journey of inquiry. And while such a metaphor is not invalid, the purpose of the revised arc is to facilitate complex critical thinking. If students too early settle on this legal metaphor as a path forward, too often the research boils down to a familiar pro/con binary; the problem is that both academic and public discourse are rarely that simple. Our new arc, instead, promotes a more complex web of inquiry. To increase the potential for transfer beyond the semester, we wanted the revised curriculum to allow for time to explore the web-like nuances characteristic of potential, dynamic conversation. At the classroom level, in order to help students

reconceptualize their own role in the research process through Luke's "cognitive [re]orientation" (73), during the first week of class I invite students to see themselves entering the Burkean Parlor, a metaphor that then becomes the operational framework with which to introduce the new assignment arc. I begin by introducing students to the following quote from Kenneth Burke:

> Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before.

This offers a useful and rhetorically significant segue into the first curve of the arc, a topic exploration essay. By asking students to see themselves as part of an existing conversation, one involving many perspectives and stakeholders, they are encouraged to see that their research focus need not be limited to a binary, pro/con approach—a familiar go-to for many freshman writers.

When used as a semester-long touchstone, this metaphor also encourages students to pay attention to related perspectives—to listen as one would in a conversation. By the time we reach the next assignment point in the curricular arc a few weeks later, students are instructed to continue exploring their topic by using their existing search (Google) habits in order to find as wide a variety of "voices" as possible as a means of shaping and informing their perception of the conversation *before* adding their voice. As they do, they are asked to layer in additional search engines and assess the variations in results. At this point, Burke's metaphor continues to be a rhetorical guide along the arc:

> You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar.

At this phase, Burke's conversational framework situates students in the dynamics of a conversation, highlighting possible paths and opening up potential rhetorical movements to examination with students as dialogic participants. To further cement this perspective, one of our first collaborative online activities is designed to promote group interaction as an interplay of voices, providing more of the "messiness factor" mentioned previously. For this step, I ask my class to use a web-based concept mapping program like Mindomo or Popplet to visualize how a topic invites variously phrased questions that reflect the needs and interests of stakeholders. I prepare a Popplet space that includes all students as collaborators and contains topics gleaned from students' early exploratory writing. As a group, students identify stakeholders who might be interested in that topic, then co-create questions those stakeholders might ask. Similar to our earlier subject-based crowdsourced question activity, this next inquiry activity helps student researchers think more critically about their topic as an exploratory continuum.

The final contribution by Burke's metaphor forecasts the type of deepening engagement asked of students in their assignment arc:

> Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending on the quality of your ally's assistance. However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress.

With this final thought, students are invited to see themselves relieved of the pressure to singlehandedly "solve" a problem they have identified, a mindset that often accompanies a product-based perception of research. Instead, however, the metaphor allows me to ask students to frame their "writer-ly" orientation in a set of a semester-long activities that privilege student agency, developing

heuristics of inquiry and critical thinking as transferable behaviors and addressing one of the stated concerns of the Citation Project's findings. Although introduced as an orientation to the scope of our course work, Burke's metaphor soon becomes a persistent thread and touchstone throughout the semester, allowing the concept to "sink in" over time and with repeated application.

Remapping the Metaphors: From Conversation to Remix

Once our conversational metaphor has been established, this conceptual shift is further reinforced using the concept of *remix*. In brief, a *remix* is defined in terms of recombination, to produce a new thing via "transformation" (Ferguson). The term has more recently been used as a variant of synthesis, often linked to multimodal writing (Johnson). However, a quick survey of recent literature suggests that when the term *remix* is used in connection with FYW composition, it often refers to teaching students to *do* remix as an extension of native discourses rather than as an overt call to critically examine their approach to research material literacies (New London Group, Cope and Kalantzis, Devoss and Ridolfo, or Kress). Building upon these foundations in that direction helps to put a finer point on using this term as an instructional metaphor for freshman research/inquiry writing. In other words, rather than emphasizing digital remix assignments, I use *remix* to frame an overt shift in our composing *vocabulary* to resituate student *identities* and native discourse practices to address student-to-source relationship concerns. My goal is to help students see their sources not in terms of data-mining but as resources to be remixed, in which they are asked to see themselves as active agents in knowledge making. To this end, students may begin to see the potential for synthesizing patterns and relationships between sources.

To illustrate this research habit, early in the term I introduce the Kirby Ferguson video series "Everything Is A Remix." As a pedagogical tool, the videos draw upon student discourse literacies by incorporating several multimedia commonplace

references familiar to most freshman students: music, music videos, popular movies (*Star Wars*), and culturally embedded technologies like the computer. The Ferguson videos introduce the term *remix* to students as a means of explaining ways we commonly synthesize existing materials in other situations by collecting, combining, and transforming materials to create something new. Ferguson provides a series of examples drawn from the entertainment industry to show how familiar cultural artifacts are created through remixing. By emphasizing the creative industries of music and movie-making, the concept formally referred to as synthesis moves away from unfamiliar territory in which they may see themselves as novice outsiders (to academia) and onto more familiar ground. In our classroom, this allows us to further renegotiate the terminology of research to facilitate students' agency and areas of discourse. By discussing information literacy from the vantage point of creation, our in-class conversations and related assignment artifacts foreground *student* contexts and experiences, emphasizing pre-existing strategies. Thus, when we move on to discuss their sources ("conversation partners"), the question becomes, "How can you remix these materials?" To collect (not copy), then combine (synthesize) their materials, the original ideas contributed by their conversation partners can then be transformed thanks to the new framing provided by the students' own perspectives on the topic.

This heuristic approach allows me to explore existing student literacies with them, then transfer these practices into their research behaviors. An added rhetorical bonus is the chance to recast the term *synthesis* in a new light of creative agency. After showing these videos in class, group discussion breaks down Ferguson's terms of "copy/combine/transform," taking care to discuss why the term "copy" is such a problematic term outside of academia (as well as in). Instead, students are asked to explore the premise that they are already adept at the practice of taking existing materials ("collect" rather than copy) and "combine" them to make new connections ("transform"). For example, I ask my students to consider this scenario: whenever they review a movie

after discussing it among friends, or draw upon online reviews before making a purchase, they are *remixing* ideas drawn from inquiry and conversation in order to form an opinion or suggest action. Guided by their working thesis ideas, students are then encouraged to see their early acts of exploratory research (inquiry) and writing as a way to create something new that "transforms" or shifts the conversation in new directions.

Information literacy is thereby intentionally recast in new rhetorical terms, emphasizing the relationship between writers and existing texts as one that promotes more thoughtful source selection as well as deeper engagement. Both of these are Citation Project-inspired goals of the new curricular arc. As frameworks, Burke's Parlor and Ferguson's Remix offer students and instructors new vocabularies to facilitate our redesigned approach to writing and research, something Devoss and Ridolfo call "recomposition." While the Burkean Parlor/Conversation element is not new to FYW pedagogy, using it with remix in our new curricular arc and revised pedagogy practices have become regular features of our teacher training activities. Immediately after our curricular shift, several training sessions were devoted to collaborative revision activities designed to re-align classroom artifacts to focus on ongoing moments of inquiry discovery, not end-products, in an effort to deepen the conversations about the two key areas of student agency and identity that emerged from the Citation Project's findings—source choice and source use.

Changing Frames: Reintegrating Digital Literacies and Native Discourses

In the field of Writing Studies, recent focus on "expanding concepts of 'literacy'" or literacies as socially constituted practices (Goodfellow 131; Gee 13) points to the role of students' native discourses—and specifically how their native "information-seeking behaviors" are often marginalized as "un-academic" (Corbett 265). Another facet of this reframed pedagogy is helping students renegotiate their perceptions of research as "data gathering." As

Patricia Bizell and Bruce Herzberg observe, encouraging students to engage in the research process "not as a sterile exercise in recovering what is already known but as a *socially embedded act of inquiry* that aims to further the collective understanding of a particular discourse community" is key to this research-as-conversation remapping approach (as cited in Bizup 72). The Citation Project's results could be interpreted as an indication that our earlier FYW2 framework and accompanying materials/practices may have been asking students to make what likely seemed to be an abrupt rhetorical shift toward an orientation centered on emulation, not inquiry (Corbett 266). Recent research suggests this may also reflect how students respond to unfamiliar discourse environments (Gee). However, as Bartholomae points out, emulative praxis is often limited in success—and transfer potential —if students are unable to see the connection to "prior texts," which must necessarily include their existing literacy experiences if we are to encourage student agency in the research process (141). Therefore, when our students' writing practices depend heavily on source materials superficially skimmed at the surface, the writer's argument often becomes a string of quotations or paraphrases serving as proofs, subsuming the student voice and falling far short of the sort of "authentic" writing we want to see happening in FYW2 student work.

To counter this, once the classroom's conversational framework is set using the Burkean / Remix metaphor, the next phase of change focuses on inquiry-based search and application practices. Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola suggest that student Information Literacy behaviors (part of which is source retrieval practice) already lean toward familiar discourse spaces (the Internet) rather than toward those promoted by the "new" academic discourse community (e.g., library databases). Results of the Citation Project affirm this (Serviss 13), offering evidence that student attitudes toward the research paper and process suggest the way first-year students conceptualize their place within the academic research writing experience as reporters, distanced from a meaning-making role, is directly connected to

the ways they *perceive* and *use* research sources. This trend begins before they even enter the college writing classroom, as illustrated by a 2012 research study conducted by Purcell et al., which examines research practices evidenced in Advanced Placement high school classrooms. According to this research, the pattern of students' research behaviors are grounded in Internet use, constituting what Dewey refers to as life experiences or native discourse literacies (44). Yet such search behaviors are all too commonly treated in FYW2 classrooms as something to be corrected or expunged. To address such embedded cultural practices, Goodfellow and Corbett suggest that digital literacy as currently used in our pedagogy and praxis should be reexamined (and, in our case reframed) as *more* than simply search skills (which is how "Information Literacy" is often represented). To that end, the curricular revisions in my classroom integrate digital writing spaces and demystify search engines by making them objects of critical analysis.

Because students bring into the FYW2 classroom existing information literacies drawn from their own encounters with digital spaces and media, such elements must be seen as part of their social "'identity kit,'" one which informs learning and practice (Gee 18). What we found, however, was that our previous texts and classroom praxis too often promoted research literacy as something to be acquired or "mastered through acquisition" (Gee 23) or imitation. On the classroom level, I found that my students seemed to operate on a simplistic binary label system of "good research" vs. "bad research," with library databases cast as "good," and sites like Google or Wikipedia (part of students' existing discourse practices) deemed "bad," perhaps a reflection of prohibitions against their use in college research. (Every semester, when I poll my students with the question, "How many of you have been told NEVER to use Google or Wikipedia when writing a research paper?," nearly all of them raise their hands.) In order to encourage students' sense of agency in this process, early in the semester they are asked to read James P. Purdy's "Wikipedia Is Good For You!?" along with Randall

McClure's "Googlepedia: Turning Information Behaviors Into Research Skills," two open source articles that encourage students to see beyond the labels and approach these familiar resources using strategic, analytical consideration of how these might impact research behaviors and strategies. To promote this in my revised classroom, we watch and discuss the TED talk video of Eli Pariser's "Filter Bubbles," after which students are asked to crowdsource keyword searches using various search engines (Google Scholar, Google News, Google, and Wikipedia) and then discuss the resulting variations. Results became fodder for discussions of ways to fine tune their results by understanding the filters at work in such websites.

Luke's definition of "critical literacies" became an important part of this activity. When our students arrive in the FYW2 classroom, they do so with an abundance of information literacy experience; however, as the Citation Project and the PEW research report illustrate, much of this is grounded in behaviors Corbett describes as "the Google Effect," reflecting student perceptions of how the search engine actually works (267). More to the point, students have rarely considered how the search engine works and its impact on what they discover. Here, Kalantzis and Cope's schema terms of Situated Practice and Overt Instruction offer a useful set of terms with which to view this shift in practices. Situated Practice "works from a base of students' own interests and … experience" (Kalantzis and Cope 240), while Overt Instruction involves instructor-centered efforts that move students "away from the experience of the lifeworld" by overtly guiding them to "examine underlying system and structure … [of] how meaning works" (241). Redesigned course assignments, therefore, ask students to engage in Situated Practice activities that explore and compare the features and functions of search engines versus library databases, drawing upon existing student practices to introduce new knowledge. For example, I ask student groups to keep a record of search terms used to find several sites related to an assigned topic using Google Scholar, Google, and the university's library database. Their findings then lead to a class-

wide discussion of how their search engine choices and key search term choices produce different discoveries. Such activity employed in the sort of extended inquiry arc created by our new curriculum design maintains an openness to the role of student literacies, as opposed to the limits and controls of the more Overt Information Literacy instruction based on one-day librarian-led classroom sessions that were the norm in our earlier curriculum.

Another benefit of exploring information literacy through the variant of native digital literacies centers on the types of reading students may conduct online on a regular basis. As Luke observes, the nature of such reading experiences avails itself to a discussion of "intertextuality" as a means toward "an understanding of the relations among ideas" (73), the type of rhetorical move or "cognitive orientation" (73) we want our writing students to make and which is facilitated by conversation/remix metaphors. The Academic discourse community's research conventions and rhetoric promote research as a recognition and search for "the connection among related pieces of information, not" to simply gather "bare decontextualised facts" (Luke 73). Yet, when research studies like The Citation Project suggest that students' information literacy practices illustrate a tendency to engage with sources not as "complex texts" but simply as "quote-mining" materials (Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue 186), the level of knowledge construction is restricted to accumulation of sentence-level reporting—what might be seen as a linear approach to texts (Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola), not deeper understanding and engagement. To counter this, and to help frame these proposed changes, I have students write into public discourse spaces like group blogs to extend the conversational metaphor's use. Incorporating blog writing as a semester-long part of the revamped curriculum not only opens the pedagogical space to discussions of digital media and related literacy concerns (for example, the rhetoric of audience and design), but also emulates the discursive nature of conversation when students are asked to comment on one another's blog ideas, deepening opportunities to reframe students' constructive control over their research theses.

Finally, blogging beomes a locus in which to develop a critical meta-language, "position[ing] students not only to comprehend and compose the text forms of their school subjects but also to critique the perspectives on knowledge they construct" in what may feel like non-academic writing (Unsworth 11). When specifically rhetoricized in this way, incorporating digital literacies into this pedagogical reframe combines students' "prior learning" or discourse community experience (Corbett 267) with the mission of the academy, creating opportunities for transition. The digital space provides them with Situated Practice opportunities (Kalantzis and Cope 244) similar to small group discussion, but with writing as the central media.

Retranslating the Map: Revising Our Meta-Language and Materials

Reframing my classroom praxis also required renegotiating the rhetoric of information literacy in order to address the Citation Project's findings regarding student relationships to source materials. If, as the Project suggests, students perceive research sources—particularly those published by discourse community insiders (professional voices) —as material to be consumed, their level of engagement with that material is likely to be as discourse outsiders, lacking what Gee calls the requisite "'identity kit'" that informs how they "act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (7). Gee's theories led me to consider that the value of rhetorical thinking in the FYW2 classroom is not simply for students; as teachers, we must also rethink the assignment—and the students—rhetorically. Knoblauch and Bizup both argue that the rhetoric of argument—how it's perceived and framed by students, instructors, as well as academic publishing houses—must be critically examined and reframed in order to help students bridge and navigate research discourse conventions of the academy. As an example of this, Knoblauch surveyed the most popular (i.e., most frequently required) textbooks adopted by colleges teaching a sequenced

freshman research-argument writing course and found that the dominant metaphoric language used to frame discussions of argument in these texts is biased toward images of "winning," and gives limited if any sustained emphasis to a view of persuasion as "understanding across difference" (245). Additionally, she observes that these texts frequently privilege language that promotes "classical or traditional argument" structures, which foregrounds language and structures of proving or "pro vs. con" approaches to source materials (245). While I am not proposing abandoning classical argument for this renegotiation effort, Knoblauch's proposal highlights the importance of critically considering the *influence* such rhetorical factors as texts, materials, and classroom metaphoric frames have upon the way students learn to see themselves in relation to meaning making and—most important to this project—their "relationship to the texts" (Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola).

As important, perhaps, is how these same texts might lead us as writing teachers to frame and rhetoricize the language of the classroom. In my classroom, for example, my reoriented pedagogy was operationalized through a reconsidered meta-language, specifically in terms of student-source relationship. The metaphors of conversation and remix "trickle down" into classroom-level praxis in terms not only of written assignments, but also readings, activities, and vocabulary used to frame them. While planning to implement, I found Bizup's research especially thought-provoking. Bizup's concern with student source use in his own first-year research writing course and his "alternative vocabulary that emphasizes use" could help students see their research behaviors through an intentionally rhetorical lens (75). Bizup's substitution of the terms "background, exhibits, arguments, and methods" or BEAM—terms designed to emphasize what sources *do*—for terms that traditionally emphasize what sources *are* (expert or professional authorities, opinion, news, etc.) illustrates one example of how we can intentionally reorient classroom vocabulary to in turn reorient students' relationships toward resource texts (75). Bizup asserts

that the advantage of such rhetorical reorientation "over the standard nomenclature" of teaching research as a skill-based process of acquisition "is that it allows us to describe writers' [source] materials straightforwardly in terms of what [student] writers **do** with them" (76). This sort of intentional rhetorical repositioning in the research writing classroom is not unlike Bizup's intentional rhetoricization of source labeling, which highlights student writers' agency in the relationship to a source: "Writers *rely* on **background** sources, *interpret or analyze* **exhibits**, *engage* **arguments**, and *follow* **methods**" (76). Once refocused this way, my classroom praxis integrates metaphor-related terms as critical framing devices, encouraging students to work with source materials not just as objects to mine for quotable material, but as a means of exploration situated within the "ways writers *use* their materials," adopting a "posture toward" these sources as part of their own creation of knowledge and texts. Conscious revisions were made to both assignment artifacts and discussion to reinforce this move at every stage of the arc.

Given the Citation Project's call to increase student engagement with texts, it seems logical that a move away from treating sources as "external" agents and toward understanding their function would allow students increased agency when deciding how to engage with the information in a "dialogic nature" (Bizup 76). Bizup's BEAM terminology[4] was not explicitly part of my early retooled classroom rhetoric to minimize new vocabulary and mixed-metaphor overload. However, the reorientation it represents—for both reading and writing—became a key rhetorical strategy for breaking out of the previous curricular mold that constructed students' relationships to research as gatherer/reporter, not explorer/creative agent. The simplest example of this is the terminology used in both assignment as well as activity directions that frame research sources using terms of conversation, exploration, and remix. In my own course material reorientation, Bizup's B/Background corresponds to my remap approach that asks students to regularly see their research sources/conversation partners in terms of stakeholder's

perspectives. Therefore, they are asked "What does your conversation partner provide you in terms of facts?" The E/Exhibit becomes a discussion of examples and illustrations to "show, not tell" in paragraph development. The A/Argument becomes part of our discussion of Claim Types used by their conversation partners (Bizup 75-76) to persuade us. In their weekly journal writing, students must regularly point to the arguments made by their selected resources as part of an annotated bibliography entry. We explore claim types early in the term and practice recognizing them in class-wide shared readings. As part of this, we examine the types of evidence most common to these claim types, following the model provided by Nancy Wood's *Perspectives On Argument*. Finally, the M/Method becomes a discussion of rhetorical appeals—"How do these materials persuade us? How do they work?" The concepts or lenses illustrated by this acronym thereby become operationalized, undergirding the patterning of key rhetorical and functional questions we practice throughout our inquiry-based research design.

Classroom readings further this shift in reorientation. Early in the semester, I assign multimodal texts such as Lynda Stephenson's *Kairos* article "Road Trip: A Writer's Exploration of Cyberspace As Literary Space" (an open source text) as a way to reorient student perspectives of their role in the research writing process. Using Stephenson's article as a way to illustrate the value of exploration in meaning making, I ask my students to consider the *functionality* of hyperlinks as a way to move readers through the text. This allows me to build on earlier framing efforts as well as existing digital literacies, this time as a way of discussing how we "build upon" texts to *move us forward* in knowledge creation and information sharing. Through such digital media incorporation, the early weeks of the revised approach to research writing practices transform what many students carry into the classroom in terms of what source materials "do." That is, writing a research paper is not just unreflective "decoding [of] textual information" gleaned from information seeking that merely mimics students'

preexisting ideas on a topic or what the language of the assignment directs them to find (Unsworth 19). Such an approach to information literacy may be one cause for the types of sentence-level quotation-mining practices represented in papers analyzed by The Citation Project. It is a practice that cannot, alone, be a means of developing the type of "meta-knowledge" that leads to "transformative knowledge" valued in our field (Unsworth 19).

As the 16-week arc progresses, students are encouraged to continue operating within this reoriented framework, exploring and analyzing perspectives found along their path. The new curricular arc facilitates this, extending students' inquiry practices at every stage through reflective activities that reinforce the idea of intrinsically-focused student behaviors and needs ("What kind of information might you need to illustrate your point, and what purpose will that serve rhetorically?"). This exploration/inquiry metaphor consciously incorporates some of the basic principles found in Macrorie's I-Search paper, but on a semester-long scale, intent on becoming a "Transformational Practice" (Kalantzis and Cope 242) in our retooled FYW2 curriculum. Reading and activity selections appropriate to the more recursive stages of research-as-inquiry become part of a **writing assignment** [activity] progression that looks something like this: **[knowledge inventory]** question–search–draft, **[introduction to perspectives]** question–search-conversational connections-analyze, **[entrance to the conversation]** respond-question-search–draft, **[reorient as argument proposal]** annotated bibliographies-conversational connections-application of function-search-draft, and final **[argument construction]**. Each of these stages incorporate layers of recursive mini-writing tasks, digital journaling or blog writing, student-discovered and assigned readings, and information literacy exercises that rhetoricize student agency and student engagement through every phase, culminating in a final research-based academic argument designed to promote student entry into a wider conversation.

Conclusion

For those who teach writing in higher education classrooms, and specifically first-year writing, the terms "information literacy" and "plagiarism" inevitably appear in conversations about teaching the student research paper. Some of the frustration emerging from these conversations centers on students' information search and synthesis practices. Patchwriting, quote-mining, copy and paste, citation errors, critical evaluation of sources—these key phrases appear over and over again in scholarly publications that all seem to ask the same question: how do we get our students to practice information literacy in ways suitable to post-secondary discourse community expectations? However, part of the problem may be the premise of the question itself, as it may presuppose the existence of certain privileged gateway behaviors and perspectives, often contextualizing (whether inadvertently or purposely) the knowledge building process of first-year research writing courses as if external (or scholarly) sources are—first and foremost—"repositories of factual information" (Haas 46). However, this complex set of pedagogical and theoretical frameworks often situates the student writers' relationship to these source materials as extrinsic. Christina Haas refers to this relationship in terms of a student's use of source materials as "'*The book says*,'" privileging not the student's ideas but those of the authors (59). The student's role as a reader and a writer becomes "one of extracting and retaining information," not *engaging* it as a *participant* in knowledge shaping and building (Haas 60). Such perspectives on the part of curriculum design as well as instructor pedagogy often lead students entering the academic discourse community to perceive research and source-based writing as practices to which they can have no relationship other than extrinsic. In other words, the rhetorical frameworks surrounding a first-year composition research writing (FYW2) course may in fact reflect a teacher- or discourse community expert-centered perception of the relationship between student and texts. Such a premise is critically problematic, given the socio-cultural emphasis of numerous theorists in the fields of English and Education

(Freire, Scribner and Cole, Dewey, Bartholomae, Unsworth, Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola). When FYW2 curriculum and pedagogy overtly (or inadvertently, through unexamined repetition) present texts as extrinsic authorities whose privileged knowledge-building positions trump any expertise which the first-year student writers may bring as part of their discourse identity, students see the act of research as a linear construction (or re-construction via re-search) of others' ideas and words, a reflection of the materials provided to them through textbooks and framing discourse (Knoblauch, Corbett, Goodfellow, Wyscoki and Johnson-Eilola).

The recommendations drawn from the Citation Report have spurred calls for a deep revision of the pedagogical frame and praxis of the FYW2 curriculum at AUM. As a start, this shift has been implemented at our own institution through a series of faculty workshops, during which assignment and activity samples are shared and discussed. In answer to the Project's call to "develop pedagogies that encourage students to engage with sources and use them to generate ideas rather than to support pre-existing arguments" (21), this article provides an overview of our revised framework and rationale as situated within the context of a wider awareness of this very need. (A detailed outline of practical applications may be found on my blog page, Adventures in Rhetoric.) After a full year of implementation, the AUM program is in the process of continuing to fine tune our revisions, following feedback from instructor training and student writers. The potential benefits of this redesign may take some time to sift through, but our work with the Citation Project has demonstrated that a shift of this type is timely and warranted. In fact, our textbook selection (The Bedford Researcher) begins its Table of Contents with "Joining the Conversation." We take this as a good omen.

Notes

[1] More details on The Citation Project may be found at the research team's website: <http://site.citationproject.net/>.

[2] The textbook assigned, *The Bedford Researcher,* 4th ed., by Mike Palmquist, was offered to students in both print and e-Book form. The accompanying online resources of bedforedresearcher.com were also incorporated as companion materials; as an open-source platform, this was introduced to students as both an integrated part of the class as well as a lifelong learning resource.

[3] An additional textbook, *They Say/I Say: The Moves That Matter In Academic Writing*, was also incorporated as its framing metaphor of conversational elements coincided with our dominant metaphor, and provided vocabulary and syntax models mirroring conversational structures.

[4] See Appendix A for an overview of Bizup's terms.

Works Cited

Arola, Kristin. "Slow Composition: An Indigenous Approach to Things (and Multimodal Composition)." National Conference on College Composition and Communication. Washington State University, Pullman, WA. 2014. Conference Presentation.

Assaf, Lori Czop, Gwynne Ellen Ash, Jane Saunders, and Joel Johnson. "Renewing Two Seminal Literacy Practices: I-Charts and I-Search Papers." *Voices From The Middle* 18.4 (2011). Web. 17 March 2013.

Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *When Writers Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems.* Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Guilford Press, 1985. Print.

Bizup, Joseph. "BEAM: A Rhetorical Vocabulary for Teaching Research-Based Writing." *Rhetoric Review* 27(1): 2008. 72-86. Web. 23 Feb. 2013.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. "Research As a Social Act." *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas* 60.7 (1987): 30-306. Web

Bodi, Sonia. "How Do We Bridge the Gap Between What We Teach and What They Do: Some Thoughts On the Place of Questions in the Process of Research." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28.3 (2003): 109-114. Web. 1 Jan. 2016.

Burke, Kenneth. *The Philosophy of Literary Form*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941.

The Citation Project. Web. 27 Jan. 2013. <http://site.citationproject.net/>.

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. Web. 25 Feb. 2013.

DeVoss, Danielle, and Jim Ridolfo. "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 13.2 (2009). Web.

Dewey, John. *Democracy in Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1916. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication* 58.4 (June 2007): 552-84. Print.

"English 1020." *AUM Composition.* Department of English and Philosophy, Auburn University Montgomery. 2012.

Ferguson, Kirby. "Everything Is A Remix: Part 1 The Song Remains The Same." *Everything Is A Remix,* 2010. Web. <http://www.everythingisaremix.info/watch-the-series/>.

- - -. "Everything Is A Remix: Part 2 Remix Inc." *Everything Is A Remix,* 2011. Web. < http://www.everythingisaremix.info/watch-the-series/>.

- - -. "Everything Is A Remix: Part 3 The Elements of Creativity." *Everything Is A Remix,* 2012. Web. <http://www.everythingisaremix.info/watch-the-series/>.

Fishman, Jenn and Mary Jo Reiff. "Taking It On the Road: Transferring Knowledge About Rhetoric and Writing Across Curricula and Campuses." *Composition Studies* 39.2 (2011): 121-144. Print.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* 30th Anniversary ed. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2005.

Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction." *Journal of Education* 171.1 (1989): 5-19. Web. 1 Feb. 2013.

Goodfellow, Robin. "Literacy, Literacies and the Digital in Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 16.1 (2011): 131-41. Web. 25 Jan. 2013.

Haas, Christina. "Learning to Read Biology: One Student's Rhetorical Development in College." *Written Communication* 11.1 (1994): 43-84. Web. 8 Feb. 2013.

Haller, Cynthia R. "Walk, Talk, Cook, Eat: A Guide To Using Sources." *Writing Spaces: Readings On Writing Volume 2*. Eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemlansky. 2011. eBook. Web. <http://writingspaces.org/haller--walk-talk-cook-eat>.

Head, Alison J., and Michael B. Eisenberg. "Assigning Inquiry: How Handouts for Research Assignments Guide Today's College Students." *Project Information Literacy Progress Report* (13 July 2010): 2-41. University of Washington's Information School. Web.

Holliday, Wendy, and Britt A. Fagerheim. "Integrating Information Literacy with a Sequenced English Composition Curriculum." *Library and the Academy* 6.2 (2006): 169-84. Web.

Howard, Rebecca Moore, Tricia Serviss, and Tanya K. Rodrigue. "Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences." *Writing & Pedagogy* 2.2 (2010): 177-92. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.

"Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." 2000. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). Web. 2 Feb. 2012.

Jamieson, Sandra, and Rebecca Moore Howard. "Report of Citation Project Findings: Auburn University of Montgomery in a National Context." Unpublished Report. Nov. 2011. Print.

Johnson, Steven. "The Genius of the Tinkerer." *The Wall Street Journal.* 25 Sept. 2010. Web. 1 Mar. 2016.

Kalantzis, Mary, and Bill Cope. "A Multiliteracies Pedagogy." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Eds. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. New York: Routledge, 2000. 239-48. Print.

Knoblauch, A. Abby. "A Textbook Argument: Definitions of Argument in Leading Composition Textbooks." *College Composition and Communication* 63:2 (2011): 244-68. Print.

Kress, Gunther. "Multimodality." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Eds. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. New York: Routledge, 2000. 182-202. Print.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.

Larson, Richard. "The 'Research Paper' in the Writing Course: A Non-Form of Writing." *College English* 44.8 (1982): 811-16. Web. 19 Apr. 2013.

Luke, Carmen. "Cyber-Schooling and Technological Change: Multiliteracies For New Times." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Eds. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. New York: Routledge, 2000. 69-91. Print.

Melzer, Daniel, and Pavel Zemliansky. "Research Writing in First-Year Composition and Across Disciplines: Assignments, Attitudes, and Student Performance." *Kairos* 8:1 (2003): Web. 15 March 2013.

McClure, Randall. "Googlepedia: Turning Information Behaviors Into Research." *Writing Spaces: Readings On Writing* Volume 2. (2011): 221-241. Web.

The New London Group. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies Designing Social Futures." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Eds. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. New York: Routledge, 2003. 9-37. Print.

Purcell, Kristen, Lee Rainie, Alan Heaps, Judy Buchanan, Linda Friedrich, Amanda Jacklin, Clara Chen, Kathryn Zickuhr. "How Teens Do Research in the Digital World: Main Report." *Pew Internet & American Life Project.* 1 Nov. 2012. Web. 1 Feb. 2012. <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Student-Research/Main-Report/Part-1.aspx>.

Purdy, James P. "Wikipedia Is Good for You?!." *Writing Spaces: Readings On Writing* Vol. 1. (2010): 205-224. Web.

Rossen-Knill, Deborah, and Tatyana Bakhmetyeva. *Including Students in Academic Conversations: Principles and Strategies of Theme-Based Writing Courses Across the Disciplines.* New York: Hampton Press, 2011. Print.

"Sandra Jamieson and Rebecca Moore Howard: Unraveling the Citation Trail." *Project Information Literacy Smart Talk,* no. 8. 16 Aug. 2011. Web. 11 March 2013.

Scribner, Sylvia, and Michael Cole. "Unpackaging Literacy." *Writing: The Nature, Development, and Teaching of Written Communication.* Ed. Marcia Farr Whiteman. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1981. 57-70. Print.

Serviss, Tricia. "Report of Citation Project Findings: Auburn University of Montgomery in a National Context." Presentation. Auburn University at Montgomery, Montgomery, AL. Nov. 2012. Print.

Stancliff, Michael. "Slow Composition." *Conference on College Composition and Communication.* San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, CA. Conference Presentation. Mar. 2009.

Stephenson, Lynda. "Road Trip: A Writer's Exploration of Cyberspace As Literary Space." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 15.2 (Spring 2011). Web. 4 Feb. 2013. <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/15.2/praxis/stephenson/index.html>.

Sutton, Brian. "Writing in the Disciplines, First-Year Composition, and the Research Paper." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 2.1 (1997): 46-57. Web. 15 March 2013.

Turchi, Peter. *Maps of the Imagination: The Writer as Cartographer.* San Antonio: Trinity UP, 2004. Print.

Unsworth, Len. *Teaching Multiliteracies Across the Curriculum: Changing Contexts of Text and Image in Classroom Practice.* Philadelphia: Open UP, 2001. 1-20. Print.

Veach, Grace. "At the Intersection: Librarianship, Writing Studies, and Sources as *Topoi*." *Journal of Literacy and Technology* 13.1 (2012): 102-29. Web. 23 Feb. 2013.

Wysocki, Anne, and Johndan Johnson-Eilola. "Blinded by the Letter: Why Are We Using Literacy as a Metaphor for Everything Else?" *Passions, Pedagogies, and 21st Century Technologies.* Eds. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 1999. 349-68. Print.

Appendix A

Bizup defines key terms of BEAM on pages 75-76 of his article:

Term	Definition
Background / Background Source	● “materials whose claims a writer accepts as ‘facts’” (75).
Exhibit / Exhibit Source	● “materials a writer offers for explication, analysis, or interpretation.” ● “exhibit…is not synonymous with the conventional term *evidence*, which designates data offered in support of a claim.” ● “Exhibits can lend support *to* claims, but they can also provide occasions *for* claims.” ● “Understood in this way, the exhibits in a piece of writing work much like the exhibits in a museum or a trial.” ● Students “know they must do rhetorical work to establish their exhibits’ meanings and significance” (75)
Argument / Argument Source	● “materials whose claims a writer affirms, disputes, refines, or extends in some way.” ● “argument sources are those with which writers enter into ‘conversation’” (75-76).
Method / Method Source	● “materials from which a writer derives a governing concept or a manner of working.” ● “can offer a set of key terms, lay out a particular procedure, or furnish a general model or perspective” (76).