FINDING SPACE FOR TRANSFER OF WRITING IN COMMON CORE CURRICULAR STANDARDS

Mary Frances Rice

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are a major reformative force shaping United States curriculum. According to a government press release, the standards should enable teachers to prepare students to compete nationally and internationally (Abreveya). Since the standards are positioned in educational reform and since reform measures have been largely unsuccessful in the past, the standards are in the midst of considerable scrutiny, particularly from scholars. For instance, Richard Beach has traded arguments in *Educational Researcher* with Andrew Porter and his colleagues as to whether the standards can be used to make reliable assessments. In the quest to measure whether students meet the standards, some scholars such as Vicki Philips and Carina Wong have looked at CCSS alignment with previous standards. Other scholars have been asking broader questions about whether CCSS represent genuinely desirable learning outcomes for children in kindergarten through twelfth grade. Aimee Papola-Ellis' inquiry into the CCSS directives regarding the appropriateness of the text complexity parts of the standards is an example of such work.

These inquiries into standardization are contextualized by discussion about whether standards are a worthy goal in a social democracy. Nel Noddings, for example, asks whether standards are really productive since new economies are going to favor a labor force with diverse skills, rather than a force where everyone has the same or highly similar skills (7). For writing teachers

specifically, a major concern is whether it is possible to draft standards that provide guidance for writing instruction without prescribing or privileging certain kinds of writing over others. Particularly Patrick Dias, Aviva Freedman, Peter Medway, and Anthony Paré have depicted university writing as having mainly epistemic goals, where writing is used to demonstrate knowledge to a limited audience, usually a teacher, and the purpose is to achieve a grade (5). The problem with the epistemic orientation, in their view, is that it does not prepare writers to move into professional workplaces where writing shapes and is shaped by nuanced, complex social actions, as Carolyn Miller so famously argued over thirty years ago in her article "Genre as Social Action." Later, genre scholar Amy Devitt went on to suggest in her article in *College Composition and Communication* that one issue that teachers grapple with, then, is what writing knowledge, skills, and dispositions can or even *should* transfer.

Such interest in reform and standardization is an appropriate way to start thinking about the standards since the group that created them, the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers, specifically indicated that the CCSS were created for the purpose of preparing young Americans for college and career. While the CCSS do not specifically state that the transfer of writing skills between and across assignments and contexts was an aim, it would seem implicit that students should transfer writing skills beyond preK-12 settings. The purpose of this investigation was to describe potential sites of writing transfer that might be embedded in the 6-12 writing in English/Language arts (ELA) and writing in history, science and technical subjects (WHST) standards of the CCSS for the purpose of exploring the ways in which writing standards engage with arguments about what writing in educational contexts should be. The specific research question was "What is the nature and context of the sites for transfer of writing articulated or implied in the CCSS?"

Perspectives on Transfer

A 2013 article by George Bunch in the *Review of Educational Research* highlighting concern over the CCSS standards' legitimacy is the latest development in a longer trajectory of concerns about literacy instruction, assessment, and outcomes in the United States. This concern runs alongside a longer-standing interest in the teaching of writing and learning to write in school across disciplines and in the workplace as outlined by Robert Connors in 1997. In order to meet these challenges, composition scholars have proposed that improving the full spectrum of writing lies within transfer research studies.

The current study drew on evolving theories of transfer, with a particular interest in studying writing-related transfer. Major theories of transfer come from several perspectives: behaviorist, cognitive, dispositional, curricular, and sociocultural. Each of these perspectives has made a contribution to the concept of transfer and the terminology used to describe it in the teaching of writing. The terminology is important to consider because when learning composition skills, students also have to learn to translate the academic jargon embedded in the description of the task in order to determine how to approach it (Nelms and Dively 215). The terms are clues to the worldview of the scholars involved in constructing a given conception of writing.

Behaviorist Views

Transfer as the use of something learned in one context to do a new task grows out of quantitative paradigms, according to Stephen M. Cormier and Joseph D. Hagman's work *Transfer of Learning: Contemporary Research Applications*. The concept of transfer under the behaviorist paradigm was initially popularized in the animal experiments of Edward Thorndike. In behaviorism, transfer is contingent on the degree to which prior and current tasks share identical elements (Lobato). Behaviorism was especially influential in language acquisition research where singular features of language were isolated and studied. Contrastive Analysis was a method developed by researchers and

later used by students of language in order to study grammar features by looking across two or more languages and looking for similarities and differences for individual features (see Ertmer and Newby's work for an example). These contrastive techniques are still popular in language classes today, although this is changing (see Watcharapunyawong and Usaha for an example). Transfer of writing knowledge from a behavioral perspective asks the question: What writing behaviors facilitate transfer? Behaviorist views do not support intermittent or contested space.

Cognitive Views

Building on behaviorist work, David Perkins and Gavriel Salomon authored several articles suggesting a number of conceptualizations of transfer grounded in the cognitive and metacognitive domains. Their terms for transfer include: *near/far*; *high road/low road*; *backward reaching/forward reaching*; and *positive/negative transfer*. These terms were generated to describe transfer in learning in general but have been applied to writing by composition scholars such as Gerald Nelms and Rhonda Dively in their work on transferring knowledge from first-year composition to writing-intensive major courses.

Popular teaching techniques for *near transfer* include hugging, where new tasks resemble past ones. To teach *far transfer*, bridging strategies are used that include explicit linkages between previous tasks and new ones. These strategies clearly illustrate cognitivism's behavioral roots as they focus on behavior to elicit cognition. Transfer can also be conscious or not, according to Perkins and Salomon (16).

Ultimately, transfer research stemming from a cognitive view determined that transfer is infrequent, ephemeral, and unpredictable, which aligned with behaviorist assertions. Perkins and Salomon ("Are Cognitive Skills Context Bound?") attended to this by building a metaphor around learners as sheep. The first idea is that transfer occurs automatically (the Bo Peep theory—"leave them alone and they will come home"); the second is that it does not occur (the lost sheep theory); and the third option is that

transfer requires scaffolds (the good shepherd theory). In these metaphors, the sheep are homogeneous, which might explain the durability of cognitive approaches to writing. The instructor can presume control through scaffolding instead of leaving transfer to chance. However, cognitive views also presume that students can learn to do things like writing by applying fairly interchangeable sets of strategies. While the interest in strategy is a key component of process writing, it stops short of helping students identify initial ideas for their writing and to use idea generation as the driving force behind writing, according to Anis S. Bawarshi in his book *Genre and the Invention of the Writer*. In the end, while cognitivist views have remained anchored to behaviorist paradigms, they ask a slightly different question: What supports transfer of cognitive understandings about writing into new tasks?

Motivation/Dispositional Views

Although they do not address motivation directly, David N. Perkins and Gavriel Salomon ("Knowledge to Go") acknowledged motivation as a factor in transfer. The model they described was called *detect-elect-connect*, where transferable skills or aspects of knowledge have to be noticed (detected) and a conscious decision must be made (elected) to use the knowledge or skill in a new context (connected). Election is contingent on a learner's motivation to make a connection. Thus, when opportunities for transfer are not pursued, meaningful connections will not be made. Applying theory to writing instruction means that writers can choose not to transfer, even when they realize they can.

Motivation has been a highly studied operationalized construct and research on transfer views it as a desirable trait with three components: the belief that one can do a task, the level to which the task aligns with other goals, and the emotional reaction to the task, according to the perspective popularized by Paul Pintrich and Elizabeth DeGroot. Motivation to write can lead to a *disposition* to write, which is highly desirable according to Marlene Scardamalia and Carl Bereiter. More recently, Robert Jackson wrote an article on genre process writing and testing, arguing that

good writers are not merely metacognitive; they have developed a disposition to actively engage with writing tasks. Dana Driscoll and Jennifer Wells also propound this notion, saying that the disposition to transfer in first-year writing contexts is supported through the cultivation of goal setting and other habits of self-awareness (11). This means that feedback from instructors on writing assignments should attend more fully not just to motivation to write but to the overall disposition to manage one's own writing. From the disposition to write, an identity as a writer emerges (Park).

Further, the disposition-based researchers, like their motivational counterparts, assert that opportunities to transfer are mostly missed because students are not positioned to bring together cognitive resources with dispositional ones in order to use and reuse knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet new exigencies. What is notable about the research on motivation/disposition in writing transfer is that it demonstrated that transfer was not merely a task-to-task operation but was part of larger forces that individuals grapple with while mediating identities in social contexts. The question for transfer researchers looking at motivation in writing is: What is the role of motivation in transfer and developing a disposition to write?

Curricular Views

Curriculum for writing courses, especially during the first year in higher-education contexts is a major focus of composition studies, according to David Smit and others. The interest in curriculum focuses on classroom assignments and activities. Developing curriculum that promotes transfer requires a teacher to attend carefully, explicitly, and directly to creating contexts where transfer can occur and not just teaching cognitive strategies. Curricular approaches to transfer might take on cognitive characteristics where teaching is very explicit, but they can also take more implicit paths. Transfer studies built around curriculum have a primary focus on learning outcomes that are limited to whether transfer occurred as a test for curriculum quality.

Ann Beaufort's case study work is one example of a curricular orientation. Her work focused on Tim, a university student whose writing at various points in his college career was collected and analyzed for evidence of transfer, along with observations of him in other classes and some interviews with teachers. Her analysis revealed that Tim was unable to transfer skills and knowledge between the history and engineering writing communities because he lacked awareness of the interactions between domain knowledge and genre. Further, he lacked these because the first-year writing curriculum did not foster this awareness.

In addition to arguing for a first-year writing curriculum that attended more directly to preparing students to write across subjects and disciplines, Beaufort recommended that specialists in fields take a more active part in apprenticing novices into the thinking and writing germane to their areas of expertise. Beaufort suggested a focus on overlapping knowledge domains to explain how writing knowledge transfers from the university to the workplace. These knowledge domains are: writing process knowledge, subject matter knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. These domains were supposed to form the foundation of writing curriculum.

Another researcher focusing on curriculum was Angela Rounsaville, who also argued that transfer needed terms more focused on curricular applications in order for the promises of transfer to illuminate situated theories of learning, rhetorical theory, and activity theory as paradigms for writing instructions. One important term in her argument about strengthening curriculum was *uptake,* a concept from speech-act theory popularized by Ann Freadman. In uptake, writers see their work as social action; what they write contributes to a conversation. When uptake is the goal, according to Rounsaville, *transitions*, where writers incorporate understandings from one genre into another, can take place. The goal of a transfer-oriented curriculum is to move away from writing classes and from their traditional roles as gatekeeping classes and towards a new role as a

ate opening opportunity to engage with ideas within and across disciplines and communities.

Finally, Liane Roberston, Kara Taczak, and Kathleen Blake Yancey offered various descriptions of transfer as processes of *assemblage*, *remixing*, and *critical incidents*. These terms attempt to describe how writers engage with prior knowledge of genres as they work in new or unfamiliar ones. They also suggest that writing is inherently a process of incorporation and critical decision-making, allowing for the dispositions that are so highly prized to be developed. In these curricular conceptions writing knowledge is fluid, ever developing, and shifting, but is a visible part of the writing involved in directed learning activities. The overall question in this orientation is: What writing curriculum supports transfer?

Sociocultural Theories of Activity and Identity

Situated and activity driven notions have gained traction in many areas of learning but are especially popular in transfer of writing knowledge in composition research. Patrick Dias, Aviva Freedman, Peter Medway, and Anthony Paré were among the earliest to use David Russell's description of activity theory as a way to distinguish between motives to write, actions of writing, and the conditions under which writing occurs. A central premise of this orientation is that writers need to recognize themselves as writers and that this is more important than being able to specifically articulate their writing moves. Sociocultural writing instruction cares about behaviors of students and teachers, but it is not driven by it; it requires strategic thinking, but understands intuition; it acknowledges personal interest and goals but allows those to evolve from moment to moment, and it privileges authentic classroom activities but does not prescribe them. Sociocultural views assert that *generalization* is a better way to describe transfer. In the process of generalization dialogue occurs, where both entities are changed or transformed as the result of a composition project. Richard Beach described the relationship between generalization and transition:

> Transition, then, is the concept we use to understand how knowledge is generalized, or propagated, across social space and time. A transition is consequential when it is consciously reflected on, struggled with, and shifts the individual's sense of self or social position. Thus, consequential transitions link identity with knowledge propagation. (42)

In Beach's view, transfer of writing is problem-solving for the purpose of knowing the self. Other more recent applications of the sociocultural view include Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi's identification of sites of transfer as boundaries that could be either guarded or crossed by students (330). These boundaries are not described as being a single line in time and space, but rather an expansive space for knowledge building and decision-making. Dealing with these boundaries requires students to draw on discursive resources writers bring to a task. These resources are not a specific list, but rather are fluid and varied.

Another application of the sociocultural perspective is Rebecca Nowacek's conceptualization of transfer in writing not as merely an individual effort, but rather as a negotiation of *seeing* and *selling* between writers and their audiences. A writer must recognize that a situation lends itself to transfer (or some concept related to the idea of transfer) and then argue that the transfer is appropriate (25).

It is only in the sociocultural views of activity and identity that transfer or related processes are assumed to be occurring or have the assumed potential to occur on a near constant basis. The question for this line of transfer inquiry is: What experiences encourage acts of participation that lead to writing identities where transfer is enacted?

The multiplicity of views on transfer yields important terminologies that can be used to find spaces for transfer in documents like the CCSS. They can also be used to uncover broad classifications for terms and orientations to writing transfer research. Figure 1 summarizes the essential questions and the

implications the questions have for writing instruction within the various views on transfer.

View of Transfer	Essential Question	Implication for writing instruction
Behaviorist	What writing behaviors facilitate transfer?	Writing can be taught as a series of closely linked tasks that form behaviors over time.
Cognitive	What supports transfer of cognitive understandings about writing into new tasks?	Writing instruction is about helping students think through (and talk about) assignments.
Motivation or dispositional	What is the role of motivation in transfer and developing a disposition to write?	Students are assumed to be more successful with writing tasks they want to do, but a disposition to write will also maintain a writer's effort.
Curricular or situated	What writing curriculum supports transfer?	Writing teachers can strategically construct engaging curriculum (not just tasks) that allow for transfer.
Sociocultural/Identity	What experiences encourage participation that leads to writing identities where transfer is enacted?	Writing teachers can create or facilitate formal writing experiences, but they can also acknowledge informal writing experiences where students use writing to explore their identities in relationship to discourses they imagine they might belong to or want to join.

Figure 1: Summary of Views of Transfer and their Essential Questions

Analytic Approach

The current exploration of transfer embedded in the CCSS drew on content analysis techniques. Specifically, content analysis has various applications depending on the data being analyzed and the research questions being explored (Neuendorf). Content

analysis is supposed to bring an interpretation of content of text data through a systematic classification process of coding or identifying of themes or patterns. Using a qualitative design emphasized "concepts rather than simply words" (Fraenkel & Wallen 389) but also conveyed facts in a manner that was coherent and useful (Sandelowski).

The specific strategies for conducting this content analysis included identifying the 6-12 writing standards. These were chosen because they reflected the intent of the researcher to focus on writing and because they had parallel standards for both ELA content and writing in other subjects, which was important to meeting the goal of describing spaces for transfer.

Natural language processing techniques (Kelley) were applied to determine the frequently occurring words in the standards. The most frequently used words as families and phrases were evaluated against the contexts in which they appeared and against the transfer terminology as it had been defined by transfer researchers to produce themes of theoretical spaces where transfer is suggested.

However, looking at the words alone would not be sufficient. It was also, therefore, necessary to apply strategies to examine the context of the words that appeared most frequently. This was done using Kenneth Burke's cluster criticism techniques as explained by Foss (2004). In cluster criticism, a rhetorical critic identifies key terms and then connects the key terms to associated elements from the text. The key terms and associated elements together form clusters. These clusters are then compared against each other to reveal the argument in the text, with particular attention to clusters that are either mutually supporting or in conflict with one another. Cluster criticism is a practical look at the context of the standards because there is an amount of text that is feasible for such an analysis, and because looking at the CCSS document as a work of rhetoric is valid given that it was intended for audiences of teachers, parents, lawmakers, and potentially others to interpret and apply the way that much rhetoric is also designed to do.

Below is a section from the ELA writing standards for sixth grade that will be used to demonstrate cluster criticism. The key terms were selected with the commonly occurring terms in the whole document in mind. The key terms have been bolded. The associated terms have been underlined.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.6.8

(1) Gather **relevant information** from multiple print and digital sources; assess the credibility of each source;
(2) and quote or paraphrase the **data** and **conclusions** of others
(3) while avoiding plagiarism and **providing** basic bibliographic **information** for sources.

This standard has three main clusters, each with its own key terms. The first cluster is about gathering a lot of credible information. The second cluster is about drawing pieces from that credible information to share. The third is about properly citing the sources. The focus in the standard is clearly about locating and sharing information for epistemological purposes since all three clusters map clearly to information in sterile terms that is authoritative and not subject to criticism. A sixth grader, according to the standard, should have enough knowledge and, with teacher support that is undefined in the standards, sufficient skills to make judgments about the inherent worth of knowledge based on objectivity as a standard and then report that information to an undefined audience in an undefined, but non-plagiaristic way. Reading the standard, there is no sense that the credibility of a source shifts according to temporal and spatial contexts. There is no sense that the relevance of quotations and paraphrases might be tied to audiences and purposes that are determined by a variety of factors that might include authorial will or teacher mandate. There is no consideration that what constitutes plagiary or even an appropriate bibliographic reference is also subject to a variety of genre-related factors. From this example, it can be seen how

commonly occurring words, key words, and associative words work together to produce the findings for this analysis.

Findings from the Analysis

Table 1 displays the most commonly used content words in the ELA standards and in the history, science, and technical subjects standards, respectively.

Table 1: Writing Standards Word Frequency Tables

ELA Writing Standards		History, Science, and Technical Subjects Writing Standards	
Word	Frequency	Word	Frequency
Use	64	Claim(s)	31
Claim(s)	54	Inform	28
Information	51	Use	26
Writing	46	Information	21
Relevant	40	Writing	21
Topic(s)	36	Topic(s)	15
Evidence	35	Purpose(s)	14
Develop	32	Audience(s)	14
Reason(s)	32	Evidence	12
Support	30	Appropriate	12
Event(s)	30	Develop	11
Purpose(s)	24	Explanation(s)	9
Idea(s)	22	Technical	9
Audience(s)	21	Idea(s)	9
Analysis(analyze)	19	E.g.	8
Appropriate	18	Relevant	8
Provide	18	Relationship(s)	8
Convey	16	Analysis (analyze)	7
Narrative(s)	14	Introduce	6
Range	12	Range	6
Transition(s)	11	Extend	5
Extend	8	Link(s)	5

Since the phrases in the standards were also important for contextualization, Figure 2 contains examples from the standards using several examples of the most frequently used words.

Frequently used word	Sample phrases from ELA standards	Sample phrases from WHIST standards
Use	Use words, phrases, and clauses to create cohesion and clarify the relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence (ELA-Literacy 8.1c).	Use words, phrases, and clauses to create cohesion and clarify the relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence. (WHIST 6.1-8.1C).
Claim	Introduce claim(s), acknowledge and distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and organize the reasons and evidence logically (ELA Literacy W 8.1a).	Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among the claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence (WHIST 9.1-10.1a).
Inform	Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to inform about or explain the topic (ELA Literacy W 8.2d).	Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to inform about or explain the topic (WHIST 6-8.2d).
Information	Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented ELA Literacy W 8.2f).	Introduce a topic and organize ideas, concepts, and information to make important connections and distinctions; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension (WHIST 9-10.2a).
Topic	Develop the topic with relevant facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, or	Develop the topic thoroughly by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, extended definitions,

	other information and examples (ELA Literacy W 8.2d).	concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic (WHIST 11-12.2b).
Evidence	Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research (ELA Literacy W.9-10.9).	Draw evidence from informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research (WHIST 11-12.9).
Support	Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented (ELA Literacy W11-12.1e).	Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant, accurate data and evidence that demonstrate an understanding of the topic or text, using credible sources (WHIST 6-8.1b).
Audience(s)	With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on how well purpose and audience have been addressed (ELA Literacy W11-12.1e).	Develop the topic with well-chosen, relevant, and sufficient facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic (WHIST 9-10.2b).

Figure 2: Examples of Phrases from the Most Frequently Used Words

The ELA and WHIST standards conceptually overlap. In many cases, the exact phrase exists in both sets, from different grade levels. In addition, many of the most frequently used words appear in multiple standards.

Not all words that would seem to suggest transfer really did so when the context in which they were used was considered. For instance, the words *analyze* and *analysis* are present in the standards as types of writing rather than processes of writing. Words like *extend* were mostly referring to writing a lot or writing, instead of extending ideas, identifying unique contributions, or meeting personal goals for learning. In another example, the word *transition(s)* did not refer to transfer of writing, but rather to types of words used to suggest relationships between ideas. Analytic writing is held up not only as the most important type of writing, but there is a formula for doing it well. Given the stated goal of the CCSS of college and career readiness, analytic writing in a particular way is also propounded as a skill that will be valuable to many, in not all, post-secondary writing.

Views of Transfer Embedded in CCSS Terminology

The terminology in the CCSS that suggests transfer of writing knowledge relies heavily on the cognitive paradigms. These words include *use*, *analyze*, and *link*. They all suggest that knowledge is in discrete pieces that can be directly applied, taken apart (or conversely put back together) and connected to other things. In the text of the standards, the word *link* is an injunction to connect ideas within a writing assignment together rather than to link between assignments. Certainly it is important to learn to write coherent text, but the emphasis on *linking* when viewed in the context of the standards as a whole propounds the idea that there is one way to write well.

The prevalence of words like *claim* and *evidence* also suggest that argument is the dominant type of college and workplace writing and further that writing an argument is an epistemic exercise rather than a practical one. This view is validated in the phrases in which the words are used (see Figure 2) as well as in CCSS explanatory material about the writing standards. This material states: *"An argument is a reasoned, logical way of demonstrating that the*

writer's position, belief, or conclusion is valid" (23). This position is clearly epistemic, which validates the findings of other researchers in the transfer of writing (Dias, Freedman, Medway, and Paré). Considering this information, one cannot help but question whether the standards are really optimal for preparing students for college and work since few writing tasks outside of schoolwork are epistemic in nature.

Rhetorical Situations and Purposes

Unfortunately, the other views on transfer find far less representation. Motivation as a quantitative construct or disposition as a qualitative is entirely absent from the standards. Curricular and sociocultural activity and identity views are poorly represented as well, with two exceptions that are tied specifically to genre studies: *purpose* and *audience*. This was a curious finding considering the generally epistemic premise dominating the standards. If writers are truly considering purpose and audience, a list of knowledge or an analytic argument will not help them compose messages that resonate in most communities.

Words such as *appropriate* and *develop* further instantiate the exigency of writing as epistemic rather than practical. Specifically, the knowledge display goal appears to be one of synthesis. Bringing together ideas is consistent with the transfer concepts like remixing and assembling. The difference is that in composition research, synthesis is accomplished in service of a variety of specific writing settings, whereas the CCSS say they want students to do a range of writing, but then focus on epistemic writing in the standards. In order to support the synthesis of writing for practical purposes, more attention will need to be given to specific writing purposes rather than vague ones such as "to inform," or even "to debate social policy on homelessness." A specific practical purpose might be "to depict the travel needs of various community members as the city council considers proposals for improvements to public transportation networks."

Discussion

This study used content analysis techniques to examine the CCSS writing standards in the ELA and WHIST subject areas for grades 6-12. The purpose of this examination was to identify space for transfer as a learning goal in the standards. The analysis revealed that the language of the standards, as they are currently articulated, reflects some research on transfer, but in highly limited ways. While there is space for transfer of writing in the CCSS, that space is mostly derived from writing to reorganize facts rather than writing to increase knowledge or contribute to personal, practical or social knowledge domains. Writing in this frame reflects the behavioral (Cormier and Hagman) and cognitive (Perkins and Salomon) orientations but does not address the need to direct student motivation and develop dispositions by writing for self-selected purposes. Recall from earlier discussion that such epistemic writing tasks are problematic since the teacher, who already knows the information, is the primary audience (Dias, Freedman, Medway, and Paré). Writing in a workplace is about communicating information to people that do not already know the information. In other words, it is not enough to write to prove that one has done required reading. Writing is about doing something.

Although there are injunctions in the standards to write for multiple audiences, no well-developed theory of audience can be discerned from the standards. This must be the case when students are only expected to receive limited support from peers and teachers. Words that suggest collaboration are largely absent in the standards. The tension embodied in the standards is one of writing for the immediate audience of the teacher and the secondary audience of gatekeepers who will rate the writing, rather than authentic audiences of neighbors, community members, colleagues, and friends.

Cognitive views of transfer were better represented in the standards than the other views. Teachers of writing required to use the CCSS standards can leverage the space provided in the standards through returning to the question: What supports

transfer of cognitive understandings about writing to new writing tasks? Asking the students what they expect to transfer at the beginning of the writing assignment and/or asking them what they did transfer are both easy strategies for facilitating transfer of writing knowledge. Attending to the standards between ELA and other content areas is also greatly facilitated cognitively by making writing tasks in ELA and WHIST subjects highly similar or by assigning writing tasks in these classes that build on one another. In these ways, attending to transfer could also help meet other goals, and disposition/motivation may also be a by-product as students are able to use skills such as evidence collecting and argument building in multiple classes.

In other words, there is nothing wrong with engaging with the cognitivist views that dominate the current standards, but teachers could be empowered by realizing that there are other perspectives on writing that will enrich their teaching. It may also be fruitful for teachers to use their professional judgment in interpreting the language of the standards in ways that offer them the most flexibility in their instruction. For example, even though the standards say "avoid plagiarism," a teacher who wanted to have real conversations with students about assemblage and remixing would use writing tasks to interrogate the concept of plagiarism in different communities and contexts (citing its presence in the CCSS standards as justification if necessary) rather than pretending there is universal agreement about what plagiarism is and that everyone considers it wrong.

Writing teachers might also consider the standards' limited attention to purpose and audience. Recent research in transfer suggests that the most promise for writing transfer requires considerations of the genre and/or activity-based social nuances. It is in these views that writers realize that what counts as evidence and what is considered a viable argument varies by the writing task, both between subject areas and within them. This study, then, adds to the growing calls for a revision of the standards. An example of a standard that takes these ideas into account might look like this:

(1) Plan to approach multiple print and digital sources for the purpose of determining whether and how the information will aid the production of an intended text or genre;
(2) Make decisions about how to quote, paraphrase, and interpret the ideas of others
(3) While engaging with issues of representing and repurposing work according to the standards of the intended text or genre

These revisions use language to embrace more fully the author's agency in looking at text production as a series of authorial decisions. These decisions are not made in one moment and then forgotten, but are constantly negotiated in social contexts as social action (Devitt).

Addressing the lack of motivation/disposition in the standards, for instance, might involve more targeted language where planning writing tasks are agentful (there is already language that says students should learn to plan a text) and planning for writing as a habit or way of being in everyday life. To be sure, a disposition requires cognitive skills to keep track of ideas, articles, and citations that might serve future purposes, but it also requires writers to develop long-term interests in topics, ideas, and communities to write to.

Attending to argument as a generic focus will probably require more substantial revisions to the standards that reflect writing as an activity that is more than agonistic or argumentative. There seems to be an assumption that writing that is not epistemic is reflective and/or creative when that is not the case. Professional writing, for example, performs a variety of functions besides convincing or converting someone to the utility of a particular plan or view. In addition, there are multiple genres of argumentative writing, not all of which require a writer to take only one position and stick with it through an entire text. Revisions might also include incorporation of visual text along with linguistic text. But without revision, writing teachers could

help their students by interrogating their position as a primary reader with their students and encouraging them to think about and plan for other readers of their work.

Conclusion

As teachers determine how to implement the writing standards, researchers determine how to study the writing standards, and policy makers determine whether those writing standards meet their original goals, transfer of writing research could be leveraged to help the CCSS meet all of its own goals. If college and career readiness are really the focus of the CCSS, then writing cannot remain an epistemic exercise where the students reproduce stipulated content information or repeat stipulated patterns or genres of writing; it has to transform into recurrent social action (Miller) that can meet a host of contextual exigencies.

In order to improve in writing for non-school purposes, students will have to be oriented to perform workplace writing for workplace purposes using strategies from a range of workplaces for writing. To be sure, the epistemic orientation to writing is a valid one in some instances and a classroom is not a workplace, but a set of standards that aims to prepare students for multiple scenes of writing give teachers more guidance for instructing with a greater variety of forms. In addition, any assessment of the standards should be adaptable to writing beyond the conveyance of information from a few approved academically oriented databases and argument for argument's sake.

It also might be too much to hope for too soon, but such far-reaching standards as the CCSS might eventually consider writing that is neither for school nor for the workplace. The current standards may say that students should do multiple types of writing, but the creators cannot but expect that with such little guidance on "multiple types" and such specific advice on formal, yet generic knowledge sharing with a hint of argumentation, that teachers will mostly take up an epistemic argument in their curriculum. This will be particularly true if an epistemic argument

is the focus of assessment. If students and teachers are going to actively participate as see-ers, sellers (Nowacek), remixers, and assemblers (Robertson, Taczak, and Yancey) who can engage in the work of boundary crossing and guarding (Reiff and Bawarshi) to achieve consequential uptake and transitions (Beach; Rounsaville), the language of the standards will need to reflect a more inclusive view of transfer, rather than relying so heavily on the cognitive aspects. When more complex views of genre are incorporated to flesh out the current attention to audience and purpose, students will finally have the opportunity to be truly prepared for college and career in public school classrooms.

Works Cited

Abrevaya, Sandra. "Statement on National Governor's Association and State Education Chiefs Common Core Standards." *United States Department of Education*, 2010. Web.

Beaufort, Anne. *Writing in the Real World: Making the Transition from School to Work*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis S. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2003. Print.

Beach, Richard. W. "Issues in Analyzing Alignment of Language Arts Common Core Standards with State Standards." *Educational Researcher* 40.4 (2011): 179-182. Print.

Bunch, George C. "Pedagogical Language Knowledge: Preparing Mainstream Teachers for English Learners in the New Standards Era." *Review of Research in Education* 37.1 (2013): 298-341. Print.

Connors, Robert J. *Composition-rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997. Print.

Cormier, Stephen M., and Joseph D. Hagman, eds. *Transfer of Learning: Contemporary Research and Applications*. Alexandria, VA: Academic Press, 2014. Print.

Devitt, A. J. "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." *College Composition and Communication* 44.4 (1993): 573-586. Print.

Dias, Patrick, Aviva Freedman, Peter Medway, and Anthony Paré. *Worlds Apart: Acting and Writing in Academic and Workplace Contexts*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Driscoll, Dana Lynn, and Jennifer Wells. "Beyond Knowledge and Skills: Writing Transfer and the Role of Student Dispositions." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 26. Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition, 2012. Print.

Ertmer, Peggy A., and Timothy J. Newby. "Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism: Comparing Critical Features from an Instructional Design Perspective." *Performance Improvement Quarterly* 26.2 (2013): 43-71. Print.

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice.* Longrove, IL: Waveland Press, 2004. Print.

Fraenkel, Jack R., Norman E. Wallen, and Helen H. Hyun. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Vol. 7. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993. Print.

Freadman, Anne. "Anyone for Tennis." *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway. New York: Taylor and Francis, 1994. 43-66. Print.

Jackson, Robert J. "Genre Process Writing and Testing." *Journal of Education and Practice* 2.3 (2011): 12-18. Print.

Kelley, John F. "An Iterative Design Methodology for User-Friendly Natural Language Office Information Applications." *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 2.1 (1984): 26-41. Print.

Kellogg, Ronald T., and Bascom A. Raulerson. "Improving the Writing Skills of College Students." *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 14.2 (2007): 237-242.Print.

Lobato, Joanne. "Alternative Perspectives on the Transfer of Learning: History, Issues, and Challenges for Future Research." *The Journal of the Learning Sciences* 15.4 (2006): 431-449. Print.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70.2 (1984): 151-167. Print.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. *Common Core State Standards* (Writing Standards, ELA 6-12/WHIST). Washington D.C., 2010. Web.

Nelms, Gerald, and Ronda Leathers Dively. "Perceived Roadblocks to Transferring Knowledge from First-Year Composition to Writing-Intensive Major Courses: A Pilot Study." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 31.1-2 (2007): 214-240. Print.

Noddings, Nel. *Education and Democracy in the 21st Century*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2013. Print.

Nowacek, Rebecca. *Agents of Integration: Understanding Transfer as a Rhetorical Act.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011. Print.

Neuendorf, Kimberly A. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.Print.

Papola-Ellis, Aimee L. "Text Complexity: The Importance of Building the Right Staircase." *Reading Horizons* 53.2 (2014): 21-39. Print.

Park, Gloria. "'Writing Is a Way of Knowing': Writing and Identity." *ELT Journal* 67.3 (2013): 336-345.Print.

Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. "Teaching for Transfer." *Educational Leadership* 46.1 (1988): 22-32. Print.

---. "Are Cognitive Skills Context-Bound?" *Educational Researcher* 18.1 (1989): 16-25. Print.

---. "Knowledge to Go: A Motivational and Dispositional View of Transfer." *Educational Psychologist* 47.3 (2012): 248-258. Print.

Phillips, Vicki, and Carina Wong. "Tying Together the Common Core of Standards, Instruction, and Assessments." *Phi Delta Kappan* 91.5 (2010): 37-42. Print.

Pintrich, Paul R., and Elisabeth V. De Groot. "Motivational and Self-Regulated Learning Components of Classroom Academic Performance." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 82.1 (1990): 33. Print.

Porter, Andrew, Jennifer McMaken, Jun Hwang, and Rui Yang. "Assessing the Common Core Standards Opportunities for Improving Measures of Instruction." *Educational Researcher* 40.4 (2011): 186-188. Print.

Reiff, Mary Jo, and Anis Bawarshi. "Tracing Discursive Resources: How Students Use Prior Genre Knowledge to Negotiate New Writing Contexts in First-Year Composition." *Written Communication* 28.3 (2011) 312-337.Print.

Robertson, Liane, Kara Taczak, and Kathleen Blake Yancey. "Notes Toward a Theory of Prior Knowledge and Its Role in College Composers' Transfer of Knowledge and Practice." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 26. Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition, 2012. Web.

Rounsaville, Angela. "Selecting Genres for Transfer: The Role of Uptake in Students' Antecedent Genre Knowledge." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 26. Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition, 2012.

Russell, David. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction.* Ed. David Petraglia. New York: Routeledge, 1995. 51-77. Print.

Sandelowski, Margarete. "Focus on Research Methods-Whatever Happened to Qualitative Description?" *Research in Nursing and Health* 23.4 (2000): 334-340. Print.

Scardamalia, Marlene, and Carl Bereiter. "Assimilative Processes in Composition Planning." *Educational Psychologist* 17.3 (1982): 165-171. Print.

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

Thorndike, Edward L. "Animal Intelligence: An Experimental Study of the Associative Processes in Animals." *The Psychological Review: Monograph Supplements* 2.4 (1898): i-109. Print.

Watcharapunyawong, Somchai, and Siriluck Usaha. "Thai EFL Students' Writing Errors in Different Text Types: The Interference of the First Language." *English Language Teaching* 6.1 (2012): 67-78. Print.