University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2004-05-01

An Examination of Teachers' Beliefs about Critical Reading and Academic Writing

Cindi Davis Harris EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Davis Harris, Cindi EdD, "An Examination of Teachers' Beliefs about Critical Reading and Academic Writing" (2004). *Dissertations*. 870.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/870>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**AN EXAMINATION OF TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT
CRITICAL READING AND ACADEMIC WRITING**

by

Cindi Davis Harris

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
San Diego State University and the University of San Diego
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

Nancy Farnan, PhD, SDSU
Bob Donmoyer, PhD, USD
Barbara Moss, PhD, SDSU

May 2004

© Copyright by *Cindi Davis Harris*, 2004
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The ability to compose a well-written research paper is evidence of a student's ability to read critically and write academically. However, evidence suggests that many college-bound high school graduates have not learned these skills. While the research literature overwhelmingly supports the notion that teachers are an important factor in students' academic success, and that in order to be academically successful, students need to have critical reading and writing skills, there has been little research about how teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence instruction with regard to these skills.

This naturalistic case study employed in-depth interviews, observations, and document collection in exploring how six high school teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influenced how they taught students to write research papers. Two research questions guided this investigation: (a) What are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers; and (b) How do teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence how they teach students to write research papers?

The findings suggested that teachers approached research paper instruction with one of two goals in mind—research as an act of inquiry or research as an act of gathering and reporting information. Teachers who used an inquiry model were more likely to hold mimetic or expressive beliefs (Fulkerson, 1979) and were likely to believe that students needed writing knowledge specific to the task of writing a research paper (Smagorinsky & Smith 1998). These teachers held high expectations that students would produce well-written papers, and adapted their instructional practices to improve students' critical

reading and thinking skills. Teachers who approached teaching the research paper as an act of gathering and reporting on information were more likely to hold formalist beliefs and focused their instruction on the form and correctness of the final product. These teachers held negative attitudes about teaching students to write research papers, had low expectations that students would produce well-written papers, and adapted instructional practices in order to improve students skills in formatting the paper following accepted citation guidelines.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Michael, Cori and Charlie

The prophet, Kahlil Gibran tells us that as parents, we are the bows from which our children are set forth. To my children, Cori and Charlie, this work is for you as it has allowed me to be a stronger bow so that you may fly as far as life takes you.

Gibran also reminds us that in marriage "...the pillars of the temple stand apart, And the oak tree and the cypress grow not in each other's shadow." To Michael, this work is for you, for your undying love, support, and encouragement throughout this journey. Thank you for letting there be spaces in our togetherness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people who have given me support and guidance along this doctoral journey. My heartfelt thanks goes to the members of my committee who helped shape this work, who provided feedback and guidance along the way, and who read and responded to multiple drafts of the text. I would like to thank Dr. Nancy Farnan for being an inspiration and mentor to me even before I started this program. Thank you for pushing me, for recognizing my passion for this topic, and for believing in me. I am also grateful to Dr. Robert Donmoyer especially for his suggestions regarding the research focus and methods. My appreciation goes to Dr. Barbara Moss for her encouragement and positive feedback throughout the process. I am also thankful to Dr. Dana Grisham, for getting me interested in examining teachers' beliefs, for her continual support and encouragement along the way, and for always being interested in me as a person, not just a student.

I owe a special debt of thanks to the six teachers who made room for me in their busy teaching lives, and without whom this dissertation study would not have occurred. I am grateful to them for allowing me to visit their classrooms during a time when they were teaching an assignment that so many find challenging. I am indebted to them for their willingness to share their opinions, experiences, and frustrations about teaching high school students to write research papers.

I must also thank and recognize my fellow doctoral students in the SDSU/USD joint doctoral program in Literacy and Learning. Willie, Mark, Leslie Y, Erika, Dina, Jennifer, Kathy, Kris and Cindy—Four years ago, I hardly knew you and today I consider you part of my extended family. My life is so much richer having gotten to know all of

you. A special heartfelt thanks goes to Leslie Hays, who convinced me to apply to this program and who through it has become my most trusted friend. I am indebted to her for pushing me forward, pulling me along, and for being such a great writing partner.

I am blessed to be surrounded by people who love and who believe in me. Among them are: my parents, George and Dora, who instilled in me a love for learning and questioning; my parent-in-laws, Iris and Howard, who have shown me how it really does take a village to raise a family and who have been so willing to be a part of the village that helps me raise mine; and finally my husband Michael and my children, Cori and Charlie, who are my life. Thank you seems such an insufficient expression in response to the sacrifices you have made over the last four years in supporting me as I did this work. I love you and appreciate all you have done more than you will ever know.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD CLEARANCE.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
CHAPTER 1	1
Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose of the Study	8
Research Questions.....	8
Key Constructs and Terminology	9
Theoretical Framework.....	11
Significance of the Study	16
Limitations of the Study.....	17
CHAPTER 2	19
Review of the Literature	19
Conceptualizations of Research.....	19
Student Cognition When Writing From Sources.....	24
Relationship Between Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs, And Instruction	30
Summary and Key Finding of the Research Literature	38
CHAPTER 3	41
Research Method	41

Study Design.....	43
Study Sites	43
Participant Selection	47
Access	49
Data Collection	50
Data Analysis	54
CHAPTER 4	60
Brief Overview of the Research Methods.....	61
Participant Profiles.....	62
Northern High School	62
Valley High School.....	89
Hilltop High School	117
Teacher Portraits: Distinctions and Commonalities	146
Research Question 1: What are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers?	147
Research Question 2: How Do Teachers' Beliefs and Knowledge About Critical Reading and Academic Writing Influence How They Teach Students to Write Research Papers?	149
CHAPTER 5	159
Defining the High School Research Paper: Inquiry or Investigation	162
Information Gathering	164
Critical Reading	164
Conventions	164
Factors Influencing Conceptualizations.....	166
Implications For Instruction and Professional Development.....	168

Treat Research Papers As Acts Of Inquiry That Emerge from the Content	168
Recognize Research Papers as a Discipline-Specific Genre.....	172
Embed Critical Reading and Writing Skills into the Curriculum	175
Provide Teachers With Opportunities to Plan Inquiry-based Research Papers and to Consider the Overarching Questions that Drive their Discipline	178
Directions For Further Research	179
REFERENCES	182
APPENDICES	190
Appendix A. Interview Guide 1	191
Appendix B. Interview Guide 2	193
Appendix C. Focus Group Interview Guide	196
Appendix D. Contact Summary Form	198
Appendix E. Coded Summary Form.....	200
Appendix F. Ellen's Research Paper Assignment.....	202
Appendix G. Janie's Research Paper Assignment	208
Appendix H. Sylvia's and Tracy's Research Paper Assignment	212
Appendix I. Alexandra's and Evan's Research Paper Assignment	221

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Concept map for Ellen.....	75
Figure 2. Concept map for Janie	89
Figure 3. Concept map for Sylvia.....	104
Figure 4. Concept map for Tracy	116
Figure 5. Concept map for Alexandra.....	132
Figure 6. Concept map for Evan.....	145
Figure 7. Causal network of beliefs, knowledge, practices and outcomes	151

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Authentic intellectual achievement rubric	57
Table 2 Research on an American author - Ellen	66
Table 3. Research an incident in American history – Janie	80
Table 4. Research a controversial issue – Sylvia and Tracy	95
Table 5. Research a controversial issue Alexandra and Evan	122
Table 6. Concept matrix.....	148
Table 7. Four aspects of teaching the research paper	164

AN EXAMINATION OF TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CRITICAL READING AND ACADEMIC WRITING

Introduction

"Can you keep a secret?" the veteran teacher slyly smiled, her voice dropping to a whisper. "For years, I didn't teach the research paper, even though it was supposed to be required. I just couldn't. The papers were always so awful, so I just didn't do it."

I'm confident that many high school English teachers have either done just what this veteran teacher did, or have wished they could. Moulton and Holmes (2003) remark that the high school research paper is among the most dreaded of writing assignments given the complexity of tasks required in order to write it. They noted that some advocate that it just be done away with, while others work diligently in trying to improve instruction in it.

In *Reading as Rhetorical Invention*, Brent (1992) argues that research papers are a form of writing without a clear definition and this puts those who are trying to teach it at a clear disadvantage. He laments,

We do not really have an encompassing definition of what it really means to compose discourse based on other people's texts. What does it really mean to search, not only through one's own storehouse of knowledge and values, in search of the answer to a question? What does it mean to interpret large numbers of often conflicting texts, evaluate the opinions expressed, and create from an amalgam of one's own and other people's beliefs, a new answer? (p. 103)

While Brent's primary audience was college composition instructors, his words resonate for high school teachers who teach this genre as well. If students are to achieve some level of proficiency in the academic language and thinking required to write a researched paper, if they are to attain the critical reading and analytical writing skills necessary for academic success, then they must start learning the discourse of the research paper long before they reach college.

I taught high school English and have worked with high school teachers across the disciplines for the past fourteen years, and for all of those years I struggled with teaching students to write research papers. In the last seven years, I helped create and implement school-wide writing programs that focused on using instructional strategies designed to teach students to write using multiple sources. I worked with teachers from across content areas as they tried to teach their students to read, learn, and write source-based papers in their disciplines (e.g. literary analysis essays and research papers in English classes, historical reports and data-based responses in social science classes, and lab reports in science classes). I also worked with students who grew frustrated at the complexity of the task, especially for those students whose discourse was other than mainstream English.

Teacher frustration is hardly surprising given that writing research papers is a complex task. Spivey and King (1994) described the complexity of the composing tasks involved in writing a research paper. They note that when composing from sources, the reader/writer selects content offered by one or perhaps more sources (texts), the writer organizes the content, often having to supply a new organizational structure, and then the writer must connect all aspects by making connections to and among related ideas that

have been drawn from multiple sources. It stands to reason that teachers who assign students research papers make a myriad of instructional decisions regarding these high-level literacy skills in order for students to successfully complete the task of writing such. Their decision-making choices may begin with instruction in everything from formatting note cards and coming up with research questions, to reading for the purpose of writing, analyzing and evaluating texts. Finally, teachers make instructional decisions in how to teach students to compile the information into a well-written document.

The ability to write a well-crafted, multiple-source research paper reveals the ability to read and think critically and write academically. These are necessary skills for high school and college success. Teachers need to teach students to write research papers, as one vehicle through which students can attain the critical reading, thinking, and writing skills necessary for college and academic success. Admittedly, the research paper is a difficult genre to teach. Research is required in order to learn how to do this better.

Problem Statement

Writing research papers incorporates critical reading and analytical writing skills that are essential to students' academic success. These skills are reflected in standards and framework documents such as the California English Language Arts Standards (California Dept. of Education, 1999), and they have also been deemed essential to students' academic success in institutions of higher education. While the critical reading and analytical writing skills required to write a research paper can be taught through many assignments that require students to read and integrate source materials, the research paper differs from other assignments, which are in truth assessments of students' content knowledge, not necessarily showcases for students' critical reading and analytic

writing skills. An example of this might be the literary essay in an English class or an essay test in a history class. In these types of essay assignments, regardless of the content area, the content has typically been “covered” by the teacher through lecture or through class activities. The essay or essay test is used as a means to assess the extent to which students learned the content. The bane of an English teacher’s existence is to hear of the students who boasts that they wrote literary analysis papers without having read the books, yet were able to write effective papers because they just listened to the teacher and took notes. In the case of the research paper, students are entirely responsible for reading texts without the benefit of whole class instruction and discussions. The nature of most high school research paper projects precludes such an opportunity for students in that the student is individually responsible for the reading, and arguably could not write a research paper without having done some reading.

However, there is some evidence that many students have not learned to read critically nor write analytically, especially when reading from non-fiction texts. (Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002; Rooney, 2003; Venezia, Kirst, & Antonio, 2003). In 2002, the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community College system released *Academic Literacy* (Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002), a statement of expectations for college freshmen. This document describes the academic literacy skills needed for success in college and points out that academic writing is usually in response to reading non-fiction texts. In fact, 83% of the faculty interviewed reported, “the lack of analytical reading skills contributes to students’ lack of success in a course” (p. 4). Additionally, they reported that “only 1/3 of entering college students

were sufficiently prepared for the two most frequently assigned writing tasks: analyzing information or arguments and synthesizing information from several sources” (p. 4). In a study of 156 students enrolled in a four-year university, Thomson and Shearer (2002) reported the need for better instruction in the critical thinking and writing skills needed in college. That there is a gap between the skills that students need to be successful in college and the lack of skill that those who enter college have is undeniable.

Of course, the complexities with and the multiple causes of this gap are too numerous to be reviewed here, but one reason for the gap, that is directly related to this study, may be differing conceptualizations and definitions of academic writing between high schools and colleges. Stanford University’s Bridge Project (Venezia et al., 2003) supports this assertion. The Bridge Project gathered data from six states—California, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Oregon and Texas—and reported on the differences between the skills students were expected to master in high school and those expected of students upon entering college. One aspect of the differences was noted in how writing and reading are tested at each level. For example, on high school tests such as the California High School Exit Exam, students are typically expected to write about a concrete event, whereas on college entrance tests such as the SAT II, students are expected to write about an abstract issue and contextualize it. In other words, the SAT II asks students to use the type of writing and reading skills that are most often required when students write using sources—the skills students should be taught when assigned to write a research paper. Similarly, a survey by the ACT indicated that different writing skill emphases by high school and college educators may be one of the reasons for high enrollment in remedial writing courses among college freshman (Rooney, 2003).

Although the researched essay or research paper is widely believed to be a regular part of college curricula, there is some evidence that it is not widely taught in high schools (Gamoran & Carbonaro, 2002; National Writing Project & Nagin, 2003). The reasons for fewer research papers being written are numerous and understandable. For example, in a typical high school, a teacher may teach five classes of 30 students each day. Multiply those 150 students with a 10-page research paper and the teacher has 1500+ pages to read. Also, the research paper is a complex genre for high school teachers to teach because it requires instruction in both critical reading and analytical writing, neither of which high school teachers are especially trained to do (Clifford, 1987).

Another reason for the gap between the critical reading skills students leave high school with and those that are needed in college is related to the type of reading required at each level. When research papers are taught, instruction in how to write them frequently first falls to high school English teachers. However, in high school English classes, where reading comprehension instruction is expected to occur, students typically are taught to read fictional texts most often in the form of novels; whereas the vast majority of reading students are required to do in college is of non-fiction. The one place in the high school English curriculum where students are frequently required to read and synthesize non-fiction texts is when they are assigned to write research papers.

However, research appears to show that students who write about their reading learn more key concepts than students who do not, and that analytic writing about one's reading fosters in-depth learning (Applebee, 1984). Kantz (1989) noted that although the "researched essay" as a topic has been much written about in composition journals, it has been little studied. She further remarked that while most of the articles published describe

classroom methods, few are of a theoretical nature or based on research. Those that are based on research focus on students' cognitive processes (Nelson, 1990), but not on teachers' conceptualizations.

Additionally, while the ways in which teachers make general instructional decisions is a well-researched field (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Nelson, 1992), examinations of how high school teachers make instructional decisions within the context of teaching students how to write research papers are limited in the research literature, even though the research literature supports the contention that teachers are one of the most important factors in determining student success (Corbett & Wilson, 2002; Gallagher, 2002). Haycock (2001) asserted that if we have learned anything over the past ten years, it's how much teachers matter to student learning and success in school.

In short, too many students leave high school without the necessary critical reading and writing skills for post-secondary success. One place in the high school curriculum where these skills may be learned is when students are assigned to write research papers. While the research literature overwhelmingly supports the notion that teachers themselves are an important factor in students' academic success, and that in order to be academically successful, students need to have critical reading and writing skills, there has been little research into how teachers conceptualize instruction with regard to these skills. It is for this reason that in order to increase our understanding of issues related to learning to write research papers, we need to start with learning about and from the teachers who teach it.

Purpose of the Study

The research paper is one high school assignment, which most closely emulates the type of non-fiction, critical reading and academic writing assignment that students will be expected to do once they are in college. What sense high school teachers make of the research paper assignment is a first step in understanding why problems appear to exist between the skills that students leave high school with and those that they are expected to have when they get to College. Because teachers are a determining factor in students' success, research into the beliefs and pedagogical knowledge of teachers who assign research papers would help educators better understand some of the reasons for this gap.

The purpose of this study was to examine how high school teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and analytical writing influenced how they taught students to write research papers. Because we do not know enough about the beliefs and practices behind successful and less-than-successful research writing experiences, gaps exist in how better to teach students to read critically and write analytically.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the broad question: What factors have influenced high school teachers' understanding of teaching students in how to write research papers? Specifically, the following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers?

2. How do teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence how they teach students to write research papers?

Key Constructs and Terminology

Because a study involving teacher instructional practices and student learning is filled with terminology and constructs that are loosely defined and used, it is prudent at this point to define the following terms (in bold type).

1. **Writing from sources** is sometimes referred to as **reading for the purposes of writing**. Both terms refer to those activities in which the student is engaged in reading a text for the purpose of appropriating the ideas contained within that text into his or her own text.

2. **Writing processes** are complex, recursive mental processes that occur when a person is composing text. Bizzell (2000) helped clarify the distinction between writing processes and the writing process when she noted, "Composition scholars began to refer not to the "writing" process but to the "composing" process, as in the pioneering work of Janet Emig. The significance of this shift in terminology has been its emphasis on the cognitive activities involved in writing. "Composing," in other words, is what goes on in the writer's head and is then recorded in writing.

3. **The writing process** is an instructional construct that typically includes structured activities including brainstorming, pre-writing, drafting, revising and editing. It is often taught as a five-day lesson plan. The intent of teaching "the writing process" may be to emulate the writing processes which occur when composing, but are often too linear in approach and have been found to be especially ineffective for students whose primary language is not that of mainstream English.

4. Some researchers, especially those in the field of rhetoric studies, argue that any written product which relies on information gleaned from another source is **a research paper** (Johns, 1997; Larson, 2000). However in this report, I distinguish between **a research paper** and **a researched essay**. A research paper is inquiry based and may be either a headed or non-headed paper. It relies on primary and/or secondary source material for evidence, which is gathered in order to answer a research question or research questions. Both the research question(s) and the central thesis of the paper may be adjusted throughout the research process as evidence is gathered and new understandings are formed. A researched essay typically follows a formulaic essay structure with the goal of supporting or proving the thesis. It too relies upon primary or secondary source-based evidence to support a thesis or central argument. However, unlike the research paper, which is inquiry based, the researched essay is based on gathering and reporting information.

5. Pajares (1992) noted that attention to the **beliefs** of teachers should be a focus of educational research because they have the potential to inform educational practice. He argued that beliefs form early and persevere even against contradictions caused by reason, time, schooling, or experience. Beliefs are instrumental in defining tasks and selecting the cognitive tools with which teachers interpret, plan, and make decisions; therefore, they play a critical role in defining behavior, and organizing knowledge and information.

6. **Knowledge** includes knowledge of content, knowledge of form, and conditional knowledge (Alexander, Schallert, & Hare, 1991; Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). Additionally, this study concerned itself with teachers' beliefs about knowledge and

knowledge transfer as described by Smagorinsky and Smith (1992). It also concerns itself with the role of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge as described by Grossman (1989).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that guides this study lies in the constructivist belief that knowledge seeking is a social behavior (Vygotsky, 1986). This is a significant notion with regard to examining teachers' conceptualizations of student research, since teaching students to write research papers has the potential to cause students to construct new knowledge as a result of examination of other texts. Texts, which themselves are socially constructed and instruction in reading of such texts is also socially mediated. Whether or not teachers conceptualize of these acts as socially mediated is at the core of the research questions. As mentioned earlier, my interest in this topic stems from my experiences working both with students, as they grappled with writing from sources in assignments such as a research papers, and with teachers as we created curriculum and instructional practices designed to teach students to write better from sources. The research questions, as well as the interview protocol, the analysis and subsequent interpretations are influenced by both Flower and Hayes' (1981) model which describes writing as complex processes and especially Hayes' (1996) later model which takes into account how social context and environment influence the writing task, as well as his explanation of how writing from texts interacts with the cognitive model for writing. Equally influential has been Rosenblatt, (1994b), who maintains that external and internal events and pressures affect writers. Rosenblatt writes, "In short, the writer is always transacting with a personal, social and cultural environment" (p. 1072).

Two constructs for examining teacher knowledge and beliefs about writing instruction equally guided this study. First, I use Smagorinsky and Smith's (1992) framework for examining the role of knowledge and knowledge transfer in composition and literacy research. Their thorough review of the research literature with regard to the type of knowledge needed to learn to compose effectively revealed three types of composition knowledge: general knowledge, task-specific knowledge, and community-specific knowledge. Second, I am guided by Fulkerson's (1979) four philosophies about composition: expressionist, mimetic, rhetorical, and formalist. These four philosophies provide an additional way to explain differences in beliefs about the goals of composition instruction. Both constructs are described further below.

Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) identify three positions that emerged in literacy research in the area of composition research—the case for general knowledge, the case for task-specific knowledge, and the case for community specific knowledge. They argue that each position carries with it certain assumptions about learning and knowledge transfer. Those who make the case for general knowledge as it applies to writing instruction tend to adhere to the writing process as an instructional construct model. They cite Murray (1989), Graves (1983), and Elbow (1973) as having posited that writing consists of a very few simple procedures such as freewriting or journaling, brainstorming, drafting, and revising. Students who practice, develop, and learn to use these steps effectively become better writers. General knowledge proponents maintain that regardless of the form of writing—an essay, a research paper, a short story, a memo or a letter to a friend—writers plan, organize, write and revisit. In other words, writing consists of a very few simple procedures that students practice and develop over time.

Advocates of task-specific knowledge argue that composing is particular to different types of tasks. More product- than process-oriented, writing researchers such as Hillocks (1986) and Applebee (1984) contend that there are specific forms of writing, commonly described as narrative, descriptive, persuasive and expository. Task-specific advocates assert that students must be instructed about the particulars of each form, given exemplary models, and instructed in the distinct traits of each form, in order to learn to write them. This notion seems to indicate that writing is a complex process and requires steps to completion but that students need more than to learn the process in order to learn to write; they need to learn how different genres require distinct knowledge tasks.

A third position argues for “community specific knowledge,” in which the writer must be aware of audiences and the rhetorical devices of argument. Community-specific knowledge advocates take the stand that writers from different discourse communities may produce texts that are similar in structure and form but are quite different due to the demands and customs of a particular discourse community. While this position is much more likely to be taken in a university’s departments of writing and rhetoric (Johns, 1997), than in a high school classroom, Luke (2000) argued for this approach to literacy instruction in public school classes in Australia. Luke advocated for instruction that allowed for students to ask, “who could have written or read this text...[as a means to open] up discussions of intention, force, and effects of texts upon particular audiences” (p. 455). In truth, Smagorinsky and Smith see the three stances as being somewhat developmental and remark that it may be appropriate for elementary schools to focus on general knowledge thinking regarding writing instruction, secondary schools on task-

specific knowledge about writing instruction, and colleges and the professions on community specific knowledge about writing instruction.

Smagorinsky and Smith's framework allows for discussion about how teachers conceptualize the type of knowledge that students require in order not only to write, but to think about written texts, (e.g. students' need to know generally the steps to take to write a text or students need to know task-specific steps to take in writing a text). Equally instructive is Fulkerson's (1979) four philosophies of composition, which further allow for discussion about how teachers' beliefs and philosophies regarding the work the writer does in order to achieve a well written text. Fulkerson adapts four philosophies of composition, drawn from literary theory, to explain the four ways composition researchers and teachers conceptualize writing instruction. *Formalists* focus on form and correctness. They tend to focus on numbers of words spelled incorrectly, or number of usage errors in a paper. Fulkerson notes that while most writing instructors may pay attention to these aspects in writing, they tend to not be the main factors the instructors attribute to effective writing. Formalists, however, do. *Expressionists* believe that writing is an act of personal expression. To this end, expressionists argue that teachers should not evaluate or grade student writing and that writers should have choice over the means and the ends of their writing. Teachers who espouse these beliefs hold that if students are allowed opportunities to use writing as a form of personal expression, students will want to be understood and will write well in order to be understood. *Mimetics* hold that there is a connection between clear thinking and clear writing. They believe that students do not write well about certain subjects because they do not know enough. Teachers who hold these beliefs would have students do a great deal of research in the pre-writing stages in

order to learn more about a topic so they could write effectively and clearly about it.

Teachers who hold a mimetic philosophy may also spend instructional time in examining and analyzing texts for fallacies in logic or for propaganda analysis. *Rhetoricians* assert that good writing is adapted to achieve the desired effect on the desired audience.

Teachers who hold these beliefs may spend a great deal of time examining text structures at a micro-level. For example, an examination of how verbal constructs directed to different audiences achieve different effects and may have to be evaluated differently would be the sign of a rhetorical philosophy toward composition instruction. Fulkerson argues that writing teachers need to be aware of which philosophical assumption they hold, then teach and assess writing according to that philosophy. He asserts that too often writing teachers fail to have a consistent philosophy, and thus they fail to align pedagogy to it.

It is interesting to note both Smagorinsky and Smith and Fulkerson use writing theorist and teacher Peter Elbow as a way to explain each of their constructs. It is useful here to show how both constructs can be used to help to create a rich description of the means and the ends of writing instruction. As noted above, Smagorinsky and Smith remark that Elbow is well known for applying general knowledge rules to writing instruction. Additionally, Elbow, as an advocate for pre-writing and journaling and writing as self-expression, might easily be classified as an expressionist; however, Fulkerson notes that although this may be the case, Elbow's philosophy about the work of writing is based in rhetorical theory. Fulkerson explains,

I had already read his *Writing without Teachers* (1973) and had had some trouble classifying him, but in this article, Elbow explained that his theories of free

writing, collaborative criticism, and audience adaptation are really classical theories masquerading as modern theories...he (Elbow) said that although most teachers judge student writing either on the basis of its truth or its formal correctness, his courses are built on judging student writing by its effect on an audience. Aristotle in modern dress (p. 6)

In short, Elbow's means are based in general knowledge and his ends are based in rhetorical philosophy.

These two constructs can be used to describe ways that writing teachers can conceptualize both critical reading and writing instruction. Constructs such as these are important in that they assert that assessment of writing must follow the theory, belief, or philosophy that the instruction is based upon. Also, they are useful ways to describe disparate situations, such as those encountered whenever interviewing and observing teachers in classroom contexts.

Significance of the Study

I became especially interested in students' reading and writing processes when they were writing from sources as a result of my experiences both working with students as they wrote research papers and working with teachers as they developed curriculum and instructional strategies to teach students to write research papers. Teaching students to write research papers is a complex task. An understanding of teachers' philosophies, beliefs about learning, knowledge, and teaching is important if practitioners are to continue to improve their craft and if researchers are to inform practices that aim to improve craft. Also important is a greater understanding of how teachers do or do not teach according to their beliefs and knowledge. This study is significant in that it seeks to

add to the knowledge base about teachers' beliefs and knowledge, specifically with regard to how teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influences how they teach students to write research papers.

Limitations of the Study

The study was intentionally small (N=6) because the primary concern was to qualitatively investigate the experiences of teachers who were teaching students to write research papers and to examine how they conceptualized the critical reading and analytical writing skills necessary to write a research paper successfully. A qualitative study of this sort can never fully explain the relationship between teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and practice. However a study such as this can, as Donmoyer (1990) argues, suggest possibilities. Although it is not the direct intent, this study's findings could be used to influence teacher practice in regard to teaching the research paper; therefore, the notion of the generalizability and transferability of the case study applies. Donmoyer maintained that in education, the concern is for individuals, not aggregates. We are interested in what single teachers do for the good of individual students. Qualitative research with rich description of people's stories and their outcomes has the potential to influence how teachers teach as well as how curriculum and professional development is designed. Who among us have not been influenced by other people's stories? I, for one, have.

A concern about the truthfulness of this study may include the criticism that I am conducting this study where I work. Some may, correctly, see this issue as influential in both the questions that I pose and the ways that I inevitably interpreted the data. I think about this as I do research on writing. I like to teach writing and always have. Who am I,

someone who enjoys teaching writing, to understand those who do not? Can I understand their struggles? Hayes (1996) argues that students who have had past success with writing are more likely to ask for assistance and help. Those who have not had many successes are more likely to avoid writing. Perhaps the same holds true for teachers; those who have struggled with teaching writing may be unwilling to participate, or may be unwilling to discuss honestly their successes and failures. What do I have to say to those teachers (and my experience tells me that they are many) who do not like or want to teach writing?

I am aware of these subjectivities and made it my goal to adhere to Peshkin's (1988) call for a "systematic awareness of self" (p. 20). I have been largely influenced in my epistemological underpinnings as a researcher by Behar (1996), who asserted that researchers must reveal their epistemological stance and their subjectivity in order to be understood so that their motives are clear. Researchers, regardless of their methodology, cannot merely look at themselves as external observers and at the participants in their research as subjects. In recognizing that these are my subjectivities, I can account for them in reporting my research, although there is no way that I can make them disappear.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

This review of the research literature examines the three notions related to this study and is divided into three sections. First, I examine how research is conceptualized in the disciplines. Second, I review research related to students' composing processes when they are writing using source material. Finally, I review the research literature regarding teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and influences on practice.

Conceptualizations of Research

Writing a research paper requires skill in both critical reading and academic writing. Kantz (1989) noted the research paper may include instruction in many skills, from finding information to critical reading to academic writing, and these all vary with specific disciplines. Part of the difficulty in examining issues related to the teaching of writing research papers may lie in the fact that reading and writing research have separate histories. They come from different research departments at universities and have tended to have different research foci and theory. Scholars with different backgrounds and training historically have shaped research in these two areas. Academic writing instruction is rooted in Aristotelian rhetoric, while reading theory and instruction comes from "British notions of primary instruction (for method), on religion (for content) and on scientific experiments (for theory)" (Clifford, 1987 p. 114). In fact, several researchers lamented that there is a lack of research related to instruction in writing research papers, and that much of what has been published are how-to articles and personal teacher accounts of their experiences with teaching a specific research project (Brent, 1992; Kantz, 1989).

How researchers approach examining instruction in teaching students to write research papers lies in the complexity of learning tasks involved. When students read for the purposes of writing, the acts of critical reading and academic writing overlap. Flower and Hayes (1981) alluded to this complexity in their cognitive model of writing. They theorized that writers perceive the rhetorical problem as part of the task environment. They argued that as writers make decisions about the topic and the audience as they write, they also rely on long-term memory related to their knowledge of the topic, as well as the plan for writing as they write. Included in the plan for writing must be the conventions of writing a research paper. However, missing from this model was a way of conceptualizing and describing how the writer's cognition functions as he or she is writing from source texts. Subsequently, Hayes (1996) described in much greater detail the complexity of reading to evaluate in the writing task. He remarked:

Usually, we think of source texts as providing writers with content, that is, with topic information that any competent reader would infer from the source text.

However, if writers are not competent readers, if they oversimplify or misunderstand the source texts, their own texts that interpret or summarize those texts are likely to suffer (p. 28).

The high-level literacy demands of writing a research paper are clear. In many aspects however, the complexity is compounded when novices are writing a research paper because they are unfamiliar with the discourse of the discipline for which they are writing.

The research literature indicates that the act of doing research is discipline specific as to the nature of the types of questions asked, but researchers have many

commonalities as they go about conducting research. Russell (1991) reviewed the nature of academic writing in the university. He argued that in academia, researchers conduct research and report on it in various publications outside the academy to a community of practitioners who share a discourse. On the other hand, a student research paper is reported only within the academy or, in the case of secondary schools, are reported only to the teacher. Building on this idea, Johns (1997) argued that a lack of understanding on the part of students regarding the requirements of the research paper “genre” leads to their limited ability to write this type of academic paper well. She remarked, “When a faculty member assigns a ‘research paper,’ ...it is difficult for students to determine from the name what is required. The problem with defining and classifying this particular text category is further exacerbated by the teaching of ‘the research paper’ as a specific, fixed text type in many literacy classes” (p. 23).

The function of the research paper as an academic writing task has evolved over the decades. What began as an intimate exercise in inquiry, wherein a student under the tutelage of a faculty member engaged in a course of inquiry related to the faculty member’s interests, has evolved in the secondary school setting into a generic documented paper about a topic in which the teacher may or may not have interest or knowledge (Russell, 1991). Over 20 years ago, in addressing the lament that student research papers were nothing more than a review of information found in secondary sources rather than an argument with sources that expanded the student’s view of a subject, Schwegler and Shamon (1982) described the differing aims and processes of research papers:

Academics view the research paper as analytical and interpretive, an attempt to explore some aspect of the world and to make verifiable statements about it... [while] students view the research paper as a close-ended, informative, skills oriented exercise written for an expert audience by novices pretending to be experts. (p. 820).

Schwegler and Shamon added that while there were indeed differences in the ways students and professors conceptualized the research paper across the disciplines, academics' views of research were remarkably similar.

Academics approaches to conducting research are more similar than different. Academic researchers start with their own extensive personal libraries on topics of interest to them; then they conduct research as an act of inquiry. This commonality shows up across the disciplines. For example, Little (1989) reported on technical and scientific research which share common characteristics. Research in each discipline starts with an idea, theory, or awareness that a need exists. She described a theoretical model of the research and development process that allowed students to develop research strategies based on their understanding of the generation of technical and scientific literature. Hobohm, (1999) when reporting on the state of information and documentation in the social sciences, noted that the information behavior of scholars in the social sciences indicated that their information-seeking always started from their own personal collections of materials, conference papers, research reports, books and general reference materials. In order to study the perspectives and information behaviors of scholars in the humanities, Brockman (2001) examined how humanities scholars thought about, organized, and performed their research. Like social scientists in Hobohm's study,

humanities scholars build their own personal libraries to support their own personal projects, as well as to keep current in their field.

Other issues pertaining to teaching and learning to write research papers stem from differing goals of students and teachers. Valentine (2001) conducted interviews with students writing research papers. Her findings reveal a disparity between college student and faculty expectations regarding the legitimate effort students put into writing research papers. She found students were very pragmatic in their approach to academic work. They focused on the assignment's objective criteria, such as how long the paper had to be, how many sources they had to use, and primarily concentrated on finding out what the professor wanted. Professors, on the other hand, viewed the assignment as a meaningful learning experience and hoped the assignment would provide experience in writing in the discipline. Likewise, McMackin (1994) reported that teachers and students can have different interpretations of assigned research writing tasks if clear criteria regarding the task is not provided by the teacher. She designed a task impression survey to determine how students and teachers perceived a typical research-based writing task. She noted that teachers conceptualized the mere idea of report or research-based writing as an open-ended task involving critical thinking, inquiry, and discovery, whereas students perceived the assignment as a skills oriented, closed-ended exercise of information gathering. Rabinowitz (2000) argued that the pedagogical goals of research assignments should be on critical thinking, not just on information gathering.

In conclusion, writing a research paper requires skill in both critical reading and academic writing, both of which are complex tasks, the teaching of which requires knowledge on the part of the teacher about both reading comprehension instruction as

well as academic writing instruction. Part of the difficulty in examining issues related to the teaching of writing research papers is due to the complexity of learning and teaching tasks involved which are specific to the research paper genre, as well as to the act of conducting research itself. Academics appear to approach the act of conducting research in similar manners. They begin from their own established knowledge base, they pose questions that are of interest to them, and they strive to answer their questions through inquiry. The research literature indicates that it is the types of questions asked which is discipline specific. It also appears that college teachers conceptualize of research in a similar manner. However, for decades it appears that there have been disconnects between the ways in which college teachers conceptualize research, and how students conceptualize the task. What is unknown is the ways that high school teachers conceptualize of the knowledge needed to write research papers, and how their own beliefs about writing research papers have influenced how they teach it.

Student Cognition When Writing From Sources

Three themes emerged from the review of the research literature with regard to student processes when writing from sources. 1) Writing from source materials is a complex process that requires the writer to plan, organize and goal set as they read and write. 2) Student writers who are able to access their own prior knowledge and experiences with both content and text structures read more critically and write more effectively than those who do not. 3) Students who engage in inquiry-based reading to write assignments were more likely to be highly engaged in the task.

Writing From Sources

Having purposes for reading or writing is part of a reader's or writer's process. Rosenblatt (1994a) noted that goal setting (e.g. having a purpose for reading) was part of the transactional process of reading. She distinguished between efferent readings, during which readers take away information from a text, and aesthetic readings, during which readers' attentions are centered on what they are living through during their relationship with the text. In other words, readers assume stances when reading depending upon the text being read and the purposes for reading it. Efferent reading generally occurs when a reader is concerned with taking away information from a text. Such is the case when a reader is reading for the purpose of answering a research question. During an aesthetic reading, the purpose of reading is fulfilled during the reading event. Subsequently, Rosenblatt (1994b) also described the writing transaction as a matter of stance. Similar to reading for either aesthetic or efferent purposes, writers appropriate a stance and must make choices as to how they will present their case. In the case of writing from sources for an assignment such as a research paper, when a writer is writing about a text, he or she typically assumes an efferent stance in which he or she is writing to explain, analyze, and communicate. Greene (1991) noted that in common academic writing tasks, such as writing research papers, teachers expect students to "think critically about what they read, integrate information from sources with their own knowledge..." (p. 1). Spivey and King (1989; 1994) described this act as "discourse synthesis." In a discourse synthesis, they asserted, "readers (writers) select, organize and connect content from source texts as they compose their own new texts" (p. 668). Some researchers have noted that some of the

current problems in American education stem from too narrow a conception of the nature of academic learning (Langer, Confer, & Sawyer, 1993).

Kantz (1989; 1990) described a range of research assignment subtasks when she reported on the difficulties that a fictional student, Shirley, had in writing a persuasive researched essay. She noted that in addition to the obvious problems of citation format and coordination of source materials, the student writer was often overwhelmed by the complexity of subtasks required in research. Kantz developed a heuristic that showed how such a synthesis of subtasks varied with difficulty depending on the number and length of sources, the student's familiarity with the topic, as well as the degree and quality of original thought required in the task. Embedded in her discussion was the inability of the fictional student, Shirley, to read critically the texts she encountered. She argued that like many students, Shirley read source materials as stories and expected them to tell the truth. She did not understand that "facts" are a kind of claim and are often used persuasively in so-called objective writing to create an impression.

Building on Prior Knowledge

Building upon personal experiences and knowledge are important aspects of creating a purpose for writing from source material. Many's (1996) naturalistic case study of 11- and 12-year old students explored the complexity involved in instructing students to write from sources. Students drew information from both literary and informational texts based on either the efferent or aesthetic reading of the texts both for purposes of discussion of the texts in literature circles and when they were going to write about texts. When discussing texts, students tended to verbalize aesthetic responses. Many used the word "tangential" to describe how students talked about topics related to

reading, but did not always accurately refer to the reading. On the other hand, when using source material to create their own written texts, students were cognizant of the public nature and verifiability of the information in supporting their connections. They used appropriate efferent reading skills; however, they did not consider using their personal experiences, even when it would have been appropriate. Students did not draw from personal experience when writing for informational purposes, but they did draw heavily from their personal experiences when discussing texts with classmates.

In the 1980s and 1990s, researchers from the Center for the Study of Writing examined how students made decisions and conceptualized writing using sources. In most instances, these studies examined college students' thought processes during the time when they were writing research papers. Researchers conducted these studies in both laboratory and naturalistic settings using quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches. Nelson (1992) conducted a case study of college students who were assigned to write research papers in a laboratory setting in order to analyze the role that note-taking, planning, goal-setting, and revising played in the quality of student work. She gave all students the same research assignment but gave half the students an additional assignment to fulfill certain process requirements while completing their papers. She reported that those students who received the additional process requirements spent more time on task than those who were given the unstructured assignment. Pearson product moment correlations revealed that time spent on task, including writing extensive notes, planning, and goal-setting positively correlated with writing quality.

Levels of Engagement

Nelson and Hayes (1988) revealed the dichotomy between low- and high-investment strategies used by college students as they approached the task of writing from sources. They found that in five research areas – choosing a topic, getting started, searching for information and taking notes, composing the paper, and evaluating the task—there were significant differences between students who used either low- or high-investment strategies to complete the assignment. High-investment students interpreted the research task as an inquiry into answering an issue based research question that had a personal interest to them, while low-investment students conceptualized the research assignment as a task that required them to write a content-based paper about something that would be easy. High investment students started the paper earlier, visited the library more often, wrote more exploratory drafts of their paper, engaged in more global revision activities, and viewed the process as a more positive learning experience than did the low-investment students. High-investment students felt ownership of the paper and its contents and viewed the assignment as an act of inquiry. Importantly, they typically built upon an issue that they already had an opinion about or an interest in. On the other hand, low investment students tended to start the research assignment two to three days before the paper was due and only visited the library once. They assembled their notes by source by paraphrasing passages that agreed with their already conceived point of view and largely saw the task as a negative experience. These students viewed the research paper as informative in purpose and even complained that their job was to regurgitate information for the teacher in a formal, organizational plan.

Unlike the students in Many's (1996) study, who were admittedly much younger and much less experienced academic writers, effective college readers and writers used both personal interest and efferent reading skills to complete the research paper. In fact, one of Many's questions at the end of the study asked how instruction could be structured so that students used both personal knowledge and informational knowledge in reading to write tasks. Nelson and Hayes (1988b) responded by arguing that the role of the teacher in creating a context for inquiry is great. Teachers need to build into the research assignment steps that require students to pose inquiry questions. They note that this step is essential to improving student's use of sources as a means to support an argument, rather than to report information.

In one of the few studies of middle and high school students, Spivey and King (1989; 1994) used ANOVA and MANOVA to understand and explain how 60 sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students composed reports of information from source material. Their study revealed that there were developmental differences in how students used source material. In short, their work revealed that tenth grade students who were proficient readers used source material in more sophisticated ways, connected content more extensively, and wrote better source-based essays, than sixth or eighth grade students. The study took place over the course of three days, a standard amount of time for a student to work on such a project. In fact, one of the items that Spivey and King measured was the amount of time students worked on the task. In the first two days, there were assignments to be completed. On the third day, task engagement was based on students' independent activities and demonstrated where differences occurred. In this case, the researchers set the context for writing, and the context included writing reports of

information, which ask students to seek and summarize information in order to report it back to teachers.

These studies reveal the complexity of writing from sources. Students with high levels of literacy clearly were able to read critically and integrate source material in more sophisticated ways than were students with lower levels of literacy. These studies set the bar high for examining cognition and conceptualizations of students regarding academic writing tasks including writing from sources, reading to write tasks, and research papers. This body of research pointed out the importance of the role of the teachers in the ways in which they structure the context for writing as a determining factor in the quality of work that students produce. What is missing in this literature, are investigations into the role that teachers' knowledge and beliefs play in setting the context for the writing from sources task.

Relationship Between Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs, And Instruction

This section of the literature review examines notions of teacher knowledge and beliefs and how these relate to instruction. Teachers gain knowledge in often idiosyncratic ways, and often rely heavily on craft knowledge and experience when making instructional decisions, although the role of pedagogical content knowledge (Grossman, 1989; Nelson, 1992; Nelson & Hayes, 1988)—knowledge about how to teach specific to each discipline—is a contributing factor in how teachers conceptualize instruction. Beliefs play a part in how new knowledge is formed because they are the lens through which new experiences are perceived. Almost all research reviewed here advocated for ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers as a way to affect beliefs and knowledge.

Teacher Knowledge

Alexander, Schallert, and Hare (1991) noted ambiguity in the way knowledge constructs are operationally defined and argued that this casts a shadow of doubt on the interpretations of some researchers' findings in the study of teacher knowledge. They reviewed the research literature and reported on 26 selected knowledge constructs. Among these was the notion of teachers' conceptual knowledge—knowledge of ideas, which is made up of content knowledge and discourse knowledge and the conditions under which they are used. Alexander, Schallert, and Hare (1991) make it clear, however, that other types of knowledge interact and influence how teachers teach students:

We found that those interested in the effects of particular knowledge forms on cognition and on literacy could benefit from a broader interactive perspective on knowledge. Discourse knowledge, metacognitive knowledge, text-structure knowledge, or self-knowledge, for instance, do not exist in isolation but operate within a complex and intricate system. (p. 336)

In examining ways that teachers gain knowledge, Kennedy (2002) asserted that teachers gain “craft knowledge” as a result of their own teaching experiences, coupled with systematic knowledge obtained from university and professional development training programs or prescriptive knowledge gained from local and state policies. However, while she discovered teachers often mentioned experience as a source of knowledge, she found little evidence that they referred to it specifically when discussing a change in practice. Conversely, she found that teachers responded more directly and rapidly to curricular guidelines (prescriptive) than other sources of knowledge, but that they tended to interpret these guidelines with remarkable latitude. Most significantly,

Kennedy posited that outside sources such as professional development, which she noted is often deemed ineffective by teachers and districts, actually had great influence on practice. In fact, when systematic knowledge and prescriptive knowledge are combined, they accounted for 2/3 of all teachers' references to new ideas. Kennedy concluded that it is the inconsistency of professional development, due to changing policy, and directives that frustrates teachers.

In attempting to define how secondary English teachers' content knowledge influenced their practice, Grossman (1991) investigated the influence of subject-specific coursework in the development of pedagogical content knowledge of six beginning English teachers, only three of whom graduated from teacher education programs. She found differences between in the ways teachers conceptualized their purposes as English teachers. In this case, Grossman found that teachers who had professional preparation (e.g. had graduated from a program of teacher education) were more student-centered in their pedagogical decision-making; whereas teachers without formal pedagogical preparation tended to rely on their disciplinary knowledge and their own personal experiences in making curricular decisions.

Stodolsky and Grossman (1995) and Grossman (1989) reported on another aspect of teachers' knowledge termed "pedagogical content knowledge." They noted that while teachers' knowledge included subject-matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, teachers also held "more particular knowledge about how to teach specific subject matter" (p. 25). Included in this type of knowledge were conceptions of what it meant to teach a particular subject. These included knowledge of curricular materials, of students' understanding and potential understanding of a subject area, and of instructional

strategies for teaching particular topics. In a study of teachers from five core disciplines including English, social science, science, math, and foreign language, Grossman and Stodolsky explained that English pedagogical content knowledge was most loosely defined of the five disciplines studied. They also found that high school English teachers had less agreement among themselves about curriculum content than teachers of other content areas. Because there was little agreement about what constituted the curriculum of English, there was little agreement about a sequence of skills to be taught.

While there may be little agreement about the content of secondary English curriculum, Langer (1993) conducted a study of high school teachers from four disciplines—biology, physics, American history, and American literature—and reported each had its own disciplinary foci related to how teachers oriented the attention of their students, how they taught them to refine their understandings, and how they wanted students to select and evaluate evidence. Langer noted that reasoning was subject-specific and embedded in the routines of the lessons the teachers taught and had a specific foci. For example, in American history, teachers were oriented toward identifying and contextualizing a particular historical content and in refining an understanding of the content from multiple social and cultural perspectives. In literature classes, English teachers were oriented to identifying personal response or an interpretation to be explored and in refining understanding through developing interpretations by exploring multiple perspectives and considering possible implications. The purposes for evidence also varied with the disciplines. In history, teachers wanted students to select evidence in order to explain interpretations by example and through similarities and contrasts, while in literature classes teachers wanted students to select evidence by using the text, through

previous discussions, personal knowledge, and experiences to explain their interpretations.

However, Langer also noted that the kind of discipline specific reasoning described in her study may or may not be sufficient for meeting the literacy goals of our society. She further noted that certain types of pedagogical approaches may or may not inhibit or support discipline appropriate thinking. One means to explore why certain teachers attempt to set contexts for writing from sources is to explore how their beliefs and knowledge are related to how they interpret writing from source material tasks.

Teacher Beliefs

Pajares' (1992) review of the research literature regarding teachers' beliefs noted the strong relationship between teachers' educational beliefs, their planning, instructional decisions, and classroom practices. He called for educational researchers to continue paying attention to the beliefs of teachers because it held promise for informing educational practice.

One such model for the role of the teacher in teaching students to read as a meaning centered process was developed by Ruddell and Unrau (1994). Their model seems to draw from every conceivable aspect of reading comprehension theory, from activating prior knowledge and motivation in the reader to socio-cognitive theories of comprehension to the practices of teachers necessary to facilitate reading comprehension instruction. In their model, "teachers hold beliefs based on opinions, assumptions and convictions... Teacher beliefs, however, have a direct impact on the affective conditions that influence and shape the teachers' instructional purpose, plan, and strategy construction" (p. 1023-1024). Despite the vastness of their model, two findings stand out

which are salient to this study. First, the teacher is essential to increasing reading comprehension and second, teacher beliefs influence decision-making.

However, there appear to be disconnects between teachers' beliefs and the instructional decisions they make. In one such study of 101 secondary school teachers in Hong Kong, Lee (1998) reported that there was a gap between teachers' beliefs about writing and their practice of teaching writing. The majority of the teachers in this study believed that the most important aspects of writing dealt with coherence and logic, yet they tended to teach and evaluate to low-level features such as grammar, mechanics, and usage. Lee remarked that a limitation of the research was that it relied only upon self-reported data (a survey and some follow-up phone interviews) and called for further research, which should include observational data in order to examine whether or not this gap was accurate. Additionally, the author noted that one important implication of her findings addressed the need for better teacher training and professional development programs for secondary teachers who teach writing instruction.

In another study about teacher decision-making and beliefs, Braithwaite (1999) reported that in the face of increased pressure to improve student literacy through a national test, elementary school teachers in Australia reported a wide variety of beliefs and philosophies about what teaching and learning meant to them. Pressure from national tests was among one of many factors that influenced how teachers conceptualized literacy instruction, and a small one at that. Among those whom Braithwaite interviewed, influential factors included: providing for children a wide variety of literary experiences (17.1%), integration of literacy with other areas (22.9%), student's individual learning styles (8.6%), or current events (11.4%). These research findings were limited to their

participants and, like the Hong Kong study, were based on self-reported data and did not include observations of the practices of those teachers.

Influences on practice

Another factor influencing how teachers' beliefs and knowledge influence practice may be a teacher's cultural background. In a case study of an African-American English teacher, Milner (2003), noting that teacher thinking and knowledge can be considered in terms of pedagogical content knowledge and practical knowledge, argued that in addition to this, a teacher's cultural comprehensive knowledge was central to her thinking and decision making. He asserted that a teacher's life experiences, beliefs, and knowledge, based on her race, culture, and gender, informed her decision-making and self-reflective planning regarding instructional practices.

Other recent case studies have reported that teachers felt increased tension as they tried to negotiate between their personal beliefs about instruction as they worked within a standards-based system that operated on an set of beliefs incongruent with theirs (Smagorinsky, Lakly, & Johnson, 2002). Another factor influencing teacher decision-making may be the teaching environment in which teachers find themselves. Langer (2000) reported that teachers in schools which provided a supportive professional environment had different decision-making processes than teachers who did not teach in a school with a supportive professional environment. Agee (2000) reported that the personal lives of teachers and of their students as well as the larger expectations of the school and community influenced the decisions that the teachers made. Similarly, Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) proposed that activity theory provided a useful way to examine the dynamic of teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and the social and

cultural context of the teaching environment when examining how and why teachers make pedagogical decisions.

More recently, Hamel (2003) reported that teachers drew from their own experiences with reading a text as a measure of student understanding. In other words, teacher assumptions about the meaning of a text, based on their knowledge of their discipline, directed students away from their own responses to texts. He noted the dichotomy between understanding or comprehending a text in an intellectual way and having an affective reaction or response to a text, which has been at the forefront of secondary educational methods classes for the past several decades. In this argument, Hamel claimed that reader-response methods, while having positioned students as meaning-makers when reading texts, may have moved teachers' instructional practices in the wrong direction if the intent was to improve fundamental issues such as reading comprehension. He argued that teachers must re-conceptualize their beliefs about how students interact with texts. Hamel's study examined the relationship between how teachers conceptualized student understanding of literature texts; however, the same finding would seem to apply to how teachers conceptualize student understanding of non-fiction texts—even more so considering the limited amount of training and professional development secondary school teachers have with teaching students how to read informational texts.

In conclusion, the research reviewed in this section describes how teachers use craft knowledge and experience when making instructional decisions. Pedagogical content knowledge is also a contributing factor in how teachers conceptualize instruction. This research reviewed here also highlights that there often appear to be disconnects

between teachers beliefs and their instructional practices and decision-making. Clearly, the research interest into the professional beliefs and instructional practices of teachers, would benefit from further research that includes observations and/or examinations of the ways that teacher knowledge and beliefs manifest themselves in actual practice as well as how they influence the student's experiences as a learner. However, none of the research reviewed here examined how teacher beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing guide their instruction when both acts are required, such as is the case with students writing research papers. Additionally, the notion of how teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, craft knowledge and experiences about teaching students to write research papers is also missing from the research literature.

Summary and Key Finding of the Research Literature

In academia, research reports or papers are reported to a discourse community of interested participants, yet in secondary schools, research is reported to teachers (Johns, 1997; Kantz, 1990; Larson, 2000; Russell, 1991). While disciplines each have different types of research questions that drive their forms of inquiry, and there are some differences in how the research is reported, academic research is driven by inquiry that comes from an already existing knowledge base, from a desire to add to that knowledge base, and from a question that needs to be answered or a problem solved (Russell, 1991). College teachers appear to conceptualize of research in much the same way (Valentine, 2001). Despite the consistency among researchers and teachers in how they conceptualize research, there is some evidence that there are differences between how teachers conceptualize research and how students conceptualize it (Rabinowitz, 2000; Schwegler & Shamoon, 1982; Valentine, 2001). Similarly, in secondary education, there appear to

be discipline specific differences in how teachers orient the attention of their students, how they teach them to refine their understandings and how they want students to select and evaluate evidence (Langer et al., 1993).

Researchers know what academic research is and how it is conducted; at the same time, a great deal of educational research tells us about students' cognitive processes when they are reading for the purposes of writing or when they are writing research papers. Research into students' composing processes reveals that students compose better when they write about a topic in which they have an interest (Nelson, 1990, 1992). They compose better papers when they are better, more critical readers (Spivey & King, 1989). They analyze tasks according to how they perceive the assignment and in meeting the perceived goals of the teacher (Rabinowitz, 2000; Schwegler & Shamon, 1982). However, we know less about the pedagogical processes required to teach students to read critically or write in order to report academic research; nor does the research literature report on how high school teachers' knowledge and beliefs about teaching the research paper influences how they teach it.

The research literature provides a rich research base from which to draw with regard to teachers' conceptual, practical, and tacit knowledge and beliefs about teaching in general. Teachers make instructional decisions based on a complexity of factors that includes their own experiences, whether they be they cultural, learned or lived. However, the gaps between what teachers' espouse to teach and what they actually do, seem to reveal a mismatch between beliefs and knowledge. The research literature also clearly shows the complexity of tasks required of students to write research papers. While much has been written about how teachers of reading and writing need to be readers and writers

themselves (Murray, 1989), many of these reports stem from intuitive notions about the act of writing expressively and reading recreationally.

Completing a research paper requires critical reading and academic writing. What is missing is why some teachers, even within a single discipline, use pedagogical practices that allow for inquiry, and some institute practices that do not. Researchers have not thoroughly examined how high school teachers' pedagogical knowledge and beliefs inform their practices when teaching students to read critically and write academically. One place to examine these phenomena exists during the time when students are engaged in writing research papers.

CHAPTER 3

Research Method

The overarching question of this study was: what factors have influenced high school teachers' understanding of teaching students to write research papers? Two research questions guided the inquiry: 1) What are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers? 2) How do teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence how they teach students to write research papers?

In order to address these questions, I used a naturalistic case study approach. Lincoln and Guba (1986) argued for the use of naturalistic, as opposed to positivist approaches, to examining human behavior. They asserted, "The nature of reality asserts that there is not a single reality on which inquiry may converge, but rather there are multiple realities that are socially constructed" (p. 75). They further argued that these realities could not be studied as isolated pieces, only holistically. The schools, the teachers, and the students in this study could not be studied as isolated players; they interacted with each other and with me. Lincoln and Guba (1986) rejected the notion that an inquirer could maintain an objective distance from the phenomena being studied.

Likewise, according to Merriam (1998), a case study is "a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries" (p. 27). Accordingly, this study constituted both a single case study and a multiple case study. The study could be considered a series of single case studies because the six individual teacher case studies were bounded both by time and by each teacher's individual experiences when he or she was teaching students to write research papers. The study could also be considered a multiple case study in that

all teachers were engaged in the similar experience of teaching the research paper—during the same time period.

Because I wanted to represent the diverse voices of the teachers involved in this study as a means to interpreting how their experiences represented their version of events and what those events meant in the context of their experiences, I subscribed the following methodological constructs in guiding my inquiry. First, this study was constructivist (Patton, 2002) in nature. The foundational questions guiding this study asked teachers to report their perceptions and to characterize their world view with regard to teaching students to write research papers. Second, I used an interpretive approach to both data collection and analysis. Merriam (1998) advised that interpretive approaches are appropriate when the goal is to collect data and develop categories that conceptualize approaches. In this case, my aim was to interpret and conceptualize six teacher's approaches to the task of teaching students to write research papers. Third, I acknowledge that I became a part of the research environment. To this end, following McCarthy and Fishman's (1996) intentions for naturalistic research, I have attempted to reveal my influence as I describe the emerging research design and in the research findings. Finally, I employed Siedman's (1998) three-interview protocol to phenomenological interviewing because my goal was to understand the meaning that the teachers made of their experiences. According to Seidman, the in-depth phenomenological interview allows the researcher to form relationships with participants and affords a context in order to interpret how participant behavior becomes meaningful and understandable.

For this study, I was able to draw upon my own experiences as a high school English teacher as I interviewed participants and became a participant observer in their

classrooms. In this I had both an insider and outsider (emic and etic) view. I was an insider in that I have had experience teaching high school English and was able to relate to and understand English teachers' experiences. A potential negative is that I may have made assumptions about teachers' practices that were not evident based on my observations or interviews. Throughout this study, I have remained mindful of Wolcott's (1990) admonition regarding the qualitative study of educational settings. He noted, "This is especially serious in school research, where we often presume to know what is supposed to be happening and consequently may never ask the kinds of questions we would ordinarily ask in any other research setting" (p. 128). The balance to this possible negative aspect of being an insider is that I was an outsider since I was not teaching at any of the campuses from which my sample pool was drawn, although I had taught at one of them in the past.

Study Design

Study Sites

For this study, I selected six teachers, two from each of three high schools located in a suburban southern California high school district. The three high schools, (pseudonyms are used here) Northern High School, Hilltop High School and Valley High School, all had English departments that were at different stages of developing shared assignments, assessments, and instructional strategies. Also, all three sites were at various stages of working on building a school-wide literacy plan in order to boost student achievement, due mostly to increased accountability measures required by the State of California, although one site, Hilltop, had begun this work several years prior to the latest state accountability movement and appeared not to be working in reaction to it.

The summer prior to this study, each school had been required to write a school plan for academic achievement in order to meet a requirement of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (United States Dept of Education, 2002). Information from this document was used in part to create the brief description of each of the high schools below. For reasons related to keeping the confidentiality of the participants, site plans are not cited or referenced here.

Northern High School

Demographically, Northern High School served a mostly white middle- to lower-middle class population. Because the school had small populations of minority students, they tended not to qualify for additional funding that might be attained through Title I. However, according to their school site plan, test scores had been slipping over the past several years, and staff members generally agreed that Northern's students had many of the same low-literacy skills of minority students or of second language learners. As a result of this finding, and in response to the California English/Language Arts Framework (California Dept. of Education, 1999), Northern had begun examining how it could develop a school-wide literacy program and as a result, a literacy focus group, had been established.

Northern High School was in the beginning stages of developing a school-wide focus on literacy instruction at the time of this study. A committee of teachers met regularly to discuss ways to foster interest and plan professional development activities related to literacy instruction. The previous spring, every teacher, in every department had participated in a school-wide writing assessment, where their students read a non-fiction passage and wrote a summary of it. Then, as a staff, they collegially scored the

summaries. The result of this exercise was an increased awareness of the inability of students to paraphrase and summarize. As a result of this exercise, English teachers, especially, began to use more non-fiction texts into their curriculum and spent considerable time instructing students in paraphrasing and summarizing strategies.

Also, teachers from the site participated in various professional development activities designed to encourage all content area teachers to implement literacy strategies into their instruction. Additionally, the members of their English department agreed to specific portfolio requirements for each grade level. Included in this agreement was the requirement that all eleventh grade students would write a research paper.

Two teachers from the school had been invited to participate in an effort to create a research paper manual that could be used by all teachers in the district to help teach the research paper. This effort was hosted by the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiatives (CAPI) Project. CAPI was part of a California State University (CSU)-wide grant project funded by the Chancellor's Office to establish links between CSU schools and high schools. One of those teachers was asked to participate in this study.

Valley High School

Valley High School was the third oldest school in the district, and like many schools in southern California it was beset by literacy issues stemming from its high-transient, low socio-economic status student population, 35% of whom were English language learners. For three years prior to this study, the school had been named an underperforming school.

According to the school's site plan, the school had established a staff development institute called "Valley University," the purpose of which was to help

teachers engage students in a standards-based curriculum. To oversee this effort, the school hired an English coordinator. She coordinated the effort to develop common assessments based on the standards and to implement research-based teaching strategies to best teach the standards. The first teacher-made assessments developed were multiple-choice tests that looked very much like the state standards tests.

The initial emphasis of this professional development was on the ninth and tenth grade English curriculum. Ninth and tenth grade English teachers met regularly to discuss aligning their curriculum to the standards. It is telling that the site plan notes that one of the goals of the teachers involved in this effort was to develop curriculum notebooks that would be filled with practice materials to teach specific standards.

While there was great focus and energy on ninth and tenth grade English classes, there appeared to be little focus on eleventh and twelfth grade English. As far as research writing assignments go, eleventh grade English teachers were expected to assign a research paper to their students, although there was no school-wide or department wide emphasis on teaching research-based papers at any grade level other than the eleventh.

Hilltop High School

Hilltop High School was the second oldest school in the district and was the only one that required all seniors to complete an 8 to 10 page senior project research paper in order to graduate. Instruction in writing the senior research paper had been at the heart of much of the effort of the English department to standardize assignments, expectations, and outcomes for all of its English classes. Since its inception eight years previous to this study, the English department had changed and adapted its curriculum to teach students the skills they needed to meet this requirement. English classes shared common writing

assignments and assessments. At every grade level, students wrote research reports in their English classes, as well as in many social science and science classes as well. To help facilitate this effort, the school produced a research paper style manual, which outlined for students and teachers steps to the research process, basic documentation procedures. It also provided a model of a finished product. Senior research papers were scored by teachers across curricular areas twice a year, at the end of the winter and spring terms. In the English department, teachers met regularly to score other student writing assignments.

When the State of California published its new framework in 1999, the greater emphasis on teaching students to comprehend non-fiction texts only cemented what teachers at Hilltop already were grappling with: that students did not critically read non-fiction texts very well, as this was becoming more and more evident to the teachers at Hilltop. Students could put together a correctly formatted paper if given enough practice at it. The bigger issue was that students could not read well enough to say anything of substance in the well-formatted paper

Participant Selection

Teachers who participated in this study were selected using both a typical case sampling method as outlined by Glesne (1999) and Patton (2000) and a purposeful case sampling method as described by Patton (2002). I used typical case sampling in order to locate participants who illustrated or highlighted what was considered normal or typical. Purposeful sampling was used in order to locate participants who had rich or important information that would lend insight into the phenomena being studied, participants, in short, who might, in some respects at least, be considered outliers. In this study, I was

looking for teachers who typically taught students to write research papers, but who were not known to be experts at it. I was also looking for teachers who had some expertise or some unusual insight into teaching the research paper.

I initially located teachers by asking the principals and department chairs at each site for their suggestions about which teachers who taught this assignment. In one case, I asked a specific teacher if she would agree to be interviewed for the study due to her participation in the creation of the district's research paper manual.

Since eleventh grade, or junior English is one place where all schools required students to write research papers, teachers who taught eleventh grade were included in the study, although most of the teachers taught other grades as well. Both teachers selected from Northern High School taught eleventh grade English and were required to teach students to write a research paper. One of the teachers included had helped to create the research paper manual for the district. The second teacher selected was the department chair. She was also one of the lead teachers in the school-wide literacy effort. She was selected because she was a typical eleventh grade teacher, but also because her knowledge about the school's literacy efforts lent another aspect to the case that might have otherwise been missed. The teachers from Valley High School also taught eleventh grade English and were required to teach the research paper. Both were named by the department chair as being good English teachers but were not especially noted for their expertise in teaching students to do research. The two teachers from Hilltop High School taught eleventh grade English and were selected because they were typical of teachers who taught research papers at that school, although Hilltop High School was selected as a

site to be in this study due to its school-wide emphasis on teaching students to write research papers.

Access

I must acknowledge that choosing these schools afforded me convenience as far as time, access, and other resources were concerned. Each school was on the “quarter system.” This school calendar system mirrors that of colleges and universities on a semester calendar. In other words, students completed a whole course in 18 weeks. Generally, in high schools, the research paper is taught toward the end of a course, and schools on the quarter system allowed me to collect data in the fall quarter. Additionally, my current position as the school district’s English Curriculum Specialist gave me opportunities to meet teachers across the district, and I either knew or had worked with several teachers who agreed to participate in the study.

Finally, while my current position in the district is not in any way supervisory, I am a resource teacher and curriculum specialist. It is my job to offer curriculum resources to teachers when they ask for them. The role of being participant-observer brings forth various issues regarding the role of the observer and the historical-positivist view that naturalistic observation should not interfere with the people or the activities under observation (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000). This was the case several times during this study, when teachers would ask me for help or for resources as they taught the research paper. These instances were all recorded and reported. They are included in the report as they help to reveal both the complexity of the research paper assignment and of the desire on the part of some of the teachers to seek help and support for their teaching. This is a positive aspect of this research study. I subscribe to the proposition that my

presence did have an effect on both the teacher and perhaps the classroom environment. By merely asking questions of teachers about their practice, most reported that I caused them to reflect more deeply about what they were doing and that, indeed, they made changes as a result of my presence. As is the case with ethnographic research practices, I could not have distanced myself from the place of activity in such a way that I was rendered invisible.

Data Collection

I used four different collection procedures—in-depth individual interviews, observations, and document collection, and a focus group interview. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed for data analysis. Observational data were captured through field notes. Documents were collected, digitally scanned into a computer, and coded. Collection of these different types of data allowed me to both triangulate data and findings. The final individual interview and the focus group interview afforded me the opportunity to conduct member checks with all participants.

Interview Data

Two types of interview data were collected. First was a series of three in-depth individual interviews with each teacher participant. The second type of interview data was collected through a focus group discussion. The reasons for collecting data through interviews has been well established in the research literature (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Seidman (1998) argued that interviewing may be the best form of inquiry if the goal is to “understand the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 3). Seidman recommended a structure for in-depth, phenomenological interviewing that includes three interviews, each with a specific goal in mind—the first

focused on the participant's life history, the second on the details of the experience and the third on reflection on the meaning of the experience as a means toward that understanding.

In the phenomenological interview protocol each interview serves a specific purpose. The first interview was designed to establish rapport and to set a context for how a person's life history influences his or her world view. In the first interview, I used an interview guide that was directed but open-ended (Appendix A). It included questions and problems designed to get each participant to focus on his or her life history, experiences with learning to write research papers, and teaching students to write research papers. This first interview took place either before participants began teaching a formal research paper unit or shortly after beginning. The interview guide incorporated questions which asked each participant to relate stories about his or her own experiences with writing research papers, both as a high school student, in college and as a teacher.

The purpose of the second interview was to delve deeply into the phenomena being studied, in this case, the phenomena of teaching the research paper. Because rapport had been established as a result of the first interview, I was able to ask questions more freely than had the first interview not been done. The second in depth interview took place as near as possible to the mid-point of the research paper unit. For this interview, the interview guide (Appendix B) contained questions that asked the participants to focus on their current experience teaching the research paper. It was also used for a member check as I presented each participant with a copy of his or her transcript from the first interview and asked for clarifications (Seidman, 1998).

The goal of the final interview, which took place after the term had ended, was to ask each participant to reflect upon the meaning of his or her experiences teaching students to write the research paper. In order to facilitate this conversation, I showed each participant a concept map (Figures 1-6) I had created which showed my interpretation of each participant's beliefs about, knowledge of, and practices in teaching the research paper and asked them to respond or react to it. This conceptual map also served as the springboard for the interview questions, in which I asked each participant to reflect upon his or her experience teaching the research paper and what each participant might do differently next time. Again, this also allowed me to test the trustworthiness of my interpretations (Wolcott, 2001). Where there were questions or disagreements about my interpretations, I was able to record those and include them in the later stages of data analysis.

Finally, in order to member check, as well as to triangulate data, I invited all participants to a focus group session, where their thoughts and interpretations about both the experience of teaching the research paper and my interpretation of the events and their interviews were debriefed. This focus group discussion followed a semi-structured informal (Fontana & Frey, 2000) format after the three in-depth interviews and observations were complete (see Appendix C for guide). This group interview gave me the opportunity to tease out, refine, and elaborate on themes from the interviews and observations.

Observational Data

In order to triangulate data received through the interviews by comparing each participant's self-reports regarding beliefs with actual practice, I also observed each

teacher's class at least one time after the first interview. This observational data also helped set a context for the second interview by allowing me to see the relationship between the teachers and the students, as well as to contextualize what were sometimes de-contextualized comments. In each observation, I focused on descriptions of people and places, making the familiar strange and the strange familiar (Glesne, 1999). The field notes I took were both descriptive and analytic.

Document and Record Collection

I also collected teacher documents, such as assignment handouts, writing prompts, directions and student writing in order to further document what was happening in the lessons. Merriam (1998) termed documents such as these as a type of "public record" (p. 113), although Hodder (2000) distinguished between records and documents. He posited, "Documents [are] closer to speech [and] require more contextualized interpretation. Records, on the other hand, may have local uses that become very distant from officially sanctioned meanings" (p. 703). Using this definition, teacher handouts for assignments include both documents and records and some may be a little of both. Some teacher handouts, such as a newly created assignment sheet, are documents in that they are an extension of the teacher's spoken directions of an assignment. These documents may clarify or extend the teacher's conceptualization of the assignment, or, the teacher him or herself is necessary to clarify or extend the intent of the document. On the other hand, some teacher documents may be more along the lines of a record. In this case, I am thinking of the nature of the English teachers to share materials to the point that they become public domain. Such was the case in this study, where I would see teachers, even from different sites, using the same form or handout to assist with student note-taking.

Another teacher record would have been the *Hilltop Style Manual* which was initially a teacher created document but had become a public record of expectations for how the research paper was to be taught. Hodder (2000) noted that documents need careful analysis because “they have to be understood in the context of their conditions of production and reading” (p. 704). As such, these documents were also used to elicit reflection and discussion from the teachers during the second and third interviews and were useful in adding clarity and an additional context for their conceptualizations. Additionally, document analysis allowed me to check further the relationship between teacher beliefs and practices.

I also collected school records that included demographic and profile data about each school. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, prior to the beginning of this study each school had been required by the district and by regulations pertaining to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to create a Single School Plan for Student Achievement. In the document, schools were required to state the school’s plan of action to raise the academic performance of students and improve the school’s educational program. Included in the school’s plan were the school’s Vision and Mission statements, additional demographic and testing information, analysis of the current educational practices, and goals for improvement. I was specifically interested in those sections of the reports that included a plan for increasing academic literacy.

Data Analysis

Individual Case Analysis

In order to answer each of my research questions, I began data analysis early in the study. I used two data analysis forms recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994)–

a Contact Summary Form and a Coded Summary Form (see Appendices D and E) for the first level of analysis and coding. Additionally, I used Microsoft Word, word processing software to capture and refine the emerging codes emerging themes and then used a qualitative research software package ("HyperRESEARCH," 2003) to assist with categorization, organization, and analysis.

In the first level of inductive analysis, I used Miles and Huberman's (1994) Contact Summary Form to summarize the key points and my initial reactions to each interview. Miles and Huberman recommend using a contact summary form in the early stages of data analysis in order to capture the "main concepts, themes, issues, and questions" (p. 51) that arose during the contact. Thus, after each interview, I summarized each participant's answers to each of the interview questions, captured my own initial reactions, reflections, and thoughts as to what concepts, themes and issues were emerging, and also captured any of my questions left unanswered. The Contact Summary Form allowed me to summarize my reaction and response with the participant. This form was used for each of the first two interviews and for the observations. This step allowed me to synthesize the data from each interview as well as to capture any data that I missed in a subsequent interview.

Once the first interview and each observation were captured using the contact summary form, I employed a next level analysis by using the Coded Summary Form. In this phase, I went back to each interview transcript and pulled out salient points made by each participant. Then I began to categorize and code each point according to emerging themes. At this point I also began looking for data that would confirm or disconfirm

theories and models that emerged from the research literature. Each of the emerging themes, coded salient points, models, and theories were entered into a code list.

Once the first six interviews and were coded using the coded summary form, each interview and observation was re-coded using the entire complement of codes using the qualitative research software program, HyperResearch. In this step, I entered the codes from the code list function of HyperResearch, Then I re-read and recoded each first interview transcript using the full complement of codes. I then used the software program for coding the second, third, and focus group rounds of interviews. Following the recommendations of Strauss and Corbin (1998), I used both theoretical and descriptive coding as I conceptualized, classified and compared the data.

I also scanned each teacher document into HyperResearch. Each document was coded using the entire complement of codes. I also created a rubric based on a scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson, Manning, Knepler, & Jolliffe, 2002) (See Table 1). This rubric allowed me to examine how the assignment allowed students to construct their own knowledge, whether it asked students to draw conclusions or make generalizations or arguments and whether or not the assignments asked students to connect the topic to experiences significant to their lives.

Documents that included demographic data and the site plan were summarized and used to help in building a site profile, which was reported earlier in this chapter.

Table 1 Authentic intellectual achievement rubric

Aspects of	High	Medium	Low
AIA			
Construction of Knowledge	The assignment asks students to interpret, analyze, synthesize or evaluate information in writing about a topic rather than merely to reproduce information.	Some aspects of the assignment ask students to interpret, analyze, synthesize or evaluate information in writing about a topic rather than merely to reproduce information.	The assignment asks students to reproduce information.
Value Beyond School	The assignment asks students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.	Some aspects of the assignment ask students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.	The assignment does not ask students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.
Disciplined Inquiry	The assignment asks students to draw conclusions or make generalizations or arguments and support them through writing.	Some aspects of the assignment ask students to draw conclusions or make generalizations or arguments and support them through writing.	The assignment asks students to write, but is designed to have students re-tell information.

Note: Based on the scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson et al., 2002).

Once patterns and themes had been established using this inductive analysis (Patton, 2002), I created a Code Map for each participant, using the Code Map function of HyperResearch. The Code Map function allowed me to create a conceptual map of my interpretation of how the codes were related to one another. In this step, I used only the codes that most frequently appeared for each participant to build the conceptual map. These maps illustrated the interplay between each participant's beliefs, knowledge, concerns and practices. By arranging these codes, I further refined and uncovered the various relationships among the codes, looking for evidence of conflict, and contradictions (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Because the Code Map function of HyperResearch 2.6 only allows for rudimentary schematic maps, I recreated each participant's map using Inspiration Software ("Inspiration," 2002), through which I was able to examine more closely and illustrate more clearly how each participant's words, actions, and documents confirmed or disconfirmed the existing themes.

Cross-case Analysis

In the cross-case analysis, I established a Conceptually Clustered Matrix (Miles & Huberman, 1994) in order to build a model which established the trends among the teachers' knowledge, beliefs and practice (See Table 5, Chapter 3). The model was designed so as to capture each participant's conceptualizations regarding themes that emerged both from the literature review, the theoretical constructs that guided this study and the study itself. As a second level of analysis, I created a relational network based on Miles and Huberman (1994) cross case causal network model. Miles and Huberman explain a cross-case causal network allows for a comparative analysis, which uses the variables estimated to be most influential in accounting for an outcome. In this case, I

traced the relationship among variables regarding participant's beliefs, knowledge, instructional goals and outcomes related to teaching the research paper.

Credibility and Transferability of Findings

Lincoln and Guba (1986) devised criteria for naturalistic (e.g. qualitative) inquiry that paralleled the conventional positivistic paradigm with regard to internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity. They suggested credibility and transferability as parallel criteria of trustworthiness. For credibility, they recommended triangulation, which could occur in several ways. One way to triangulate data is to collect data from multiple points in order to create verisimilitude or robustness. Toward that end, I collected data through multiple data points including: observation, individual and group interview, and document collection. I also aimed to establish the credibility of the data through triangulation of data analysis procedures. Similarly, Lincoln and Guba also recommended member checks and peer debriefing.

In this effort, I initially coded the data as soon as it was received, then I recoded it a week later looking for agreement in coding and emerging themes. Efforts to conduct member checks have been described earlier in this chapter. Additionally, I employed the use of a peer debriefing throughout the study and especially after the focus group interviews with doctoral student colleague, who as a disinterested peer engaged in confirming emerging themes and hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 1986).

CHAPTER 4

This chapter reports the findings of the research study described in the previous chapter. The chapter is broken into two sections. Section I contains a number of components including brief profiles of each school site (schools are profiled in depth in Chapter 3). Included in the site profile is an overview of salient features regarding each school's focus on literacy instruction and each English department's policy regarding research papers, if such foci or policies existed. These site profiles are presented in order to establish a context for how the site may or may not have influenced each participant's approach to teaching the research paper (Grossman et al., 1999).

Following each site profile are profiles of the two participants from that site. Each participant's profile begins with a vignette drawn from a classroom observation. This is done to illustrate the nature of the individual's beliefs and knowledge in practice. Other information included in the participant profiles are findings regarding each teacher's beliefs and knowledge about teaching the research paper as well as how beliefs, knowledge and other factors that appeared to have influenced how each participant taught students to write research papers. The discussion of beliefs includes an examination of the research paper assignment using a rubric for Authentic Intellectual Achievement and an explanation for how the assignment is either an act of inquiry or an act of reporting on information gathered. The discussion of beliefs also includes an interpretation of each participant's philosophical beliefs using Fulkerson's (1979) four philosophies of composition instruction. The discussion of how each teacher conceptualized the type of procedural knowledge students needed to accomplish the writing research paper includes an interpretation using Smagorinsky and Smith's (1992) argument for examining

composition instruction as transfers of general, task-specific, and community-specific knowledge. Additionally, with some participants I examine how they seemed to conceptualize the research paper as a research essay. Description of the differences between the two ideas is contained within the chapter. Finally, I examine the findings with regard to how each teacher's beliefs, knowledge, and experiences teaching the research paper influenced his or her practice. Each participant's profile concludes with a conceptual map that illustrates the interplay of all factors.

The second section of this chapter presents a cross-case analysis of the data that explores distinctions and commonalities across the six cases. A causal network (Miles & Huberman, 1994) is presented as a means to explain the associations among teachers' beliefs, knowledge, practice, and the assignment itself. Additionally, the causal network seeks to illustrate how those constructs influenced teachers' conceptualizations about the experience of teaching students to write research papers, the perceived problems in student research papers, as well as the teachers' beliefs about their abilities to teach students to overcome the problems. The second section is organized around the two research questions: (a) what are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers; and (b) how do teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence how they teach students to write research papers?

Brief Overview of the Research Methods

For this study, data in the form of interviews, observations, documents and reports were collected between November 2003 and February 2004. Each of the six teacher-participants was interviewed three times for a total of 18 interviews. Interviewing each

teacher three times allowed me not only to get to know the teachers, but also gave me time to hear their stories, successes, and frustrations with teaching students to write research papers. The three-interview protocol and the subsequent focus group interview afforded opportunities to conduct multiple member checks, which increased the truthfulness and credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1986) of this report. Additionally, in order to set a context for what each teacher was reporting in his or her interviews, I visited each teacher's classroom at least one time and in some cases twice. Throughout this reporting on teachers' thinking about their beliefs, knowledge and experiences, I let the teachers speak for themselves as much as possible, using their voices and thoughts to demonstrate their perspective.

Participant Profiles

Northern High School

The teachers at Northern High School taught approximately 1800 students who came from a predominantly middle-class suburb of a large urban city. Both Ellen and Janie, the teachers from Northern who participated in this study, were leaders in the school's efforts to increase student literacy. Ellen was the teacher-leader in charge of a literacy focus group, which had been established as a part of the Western Association of School Accreditation (WASC) process, when teachers at Northern decided to make literacy across the curriculum one of their goals. (This decision had been prompted by a number of factors including a change in emphasis in the English/Language Arts Framework (California Dept. of Education, 1999) from a literature-based curriculum, to one that includes instruction in both fiction and non-fiction texts.) Janie was also considered a leader in the school's literacy effort. As described in Chapter 3, she had

participated in several professional development activities focused on increasing students' skills in reading non-fiction texts and writing research papers.

The change in emphasis, from teaching solely fiction through novels, to teaching critical reading of non-fiction texts, was at the forefront of both Ellen's and Jane's minds as they talked about teaching students to write research papers, an assignment that was required of all eleventh grade English students. Although the English department had agreed upon a minimum page length requirement of five to seven pages for the eleventh grade research paper, each teacher taught it as he or she saw fit. Additionally, the eleventh grade research paper was the only time in the English writing curriculum a research paper was required. Thus, for most eleventh grade students at Northern, this was their first experience writing a research paper.

Ellen – A Focus on Form, Correctness, and Product

Vignette. The lights were dimmed as Ellen turned on the overhead projector in order to review citation procedures with her class. She asked students to get out their "Get It Write" research materials, which contain forms, advice, pointers, and a guide for using MLA citation procedures. The class of college prep juniors had completed their library research for an author project—in which they had investigated the life and times of an American author—and were getting ready to begin writing the paper. "How many have heard of parenthetical citations before?" Ellen queried. When nobody responded, she scolded, "I know some of you have heard of them. We've been talking about it for weeks." A female student raised her hand and offered, "Isn't that when you put the author and the page number after a quote?" Ellen responded with a slightly exasperated, "Yes! But that's not the only time," and then using the overhead, she listed the four times when

they should use a parenthetical citation. She instructed them to write down the four times they should use a parenthetical citation as: (a) after a direct quote, (b) when citing a date, (c) after a paraphrase, and (d) when using a number or statistic.

She reminded the students of the importance of citations. She remarked, “If you don’t cite, you are plagiarizing.” As she showed the class a model paper from a previous year’s class, she said, “The goal of the research paper is to gather information from a number of sources. It’s not a report, so pick and cite from several sources.”

Mimetic beliefs and formalist procedures. The goal of the research assignment Ellen taught to her eleventh grade college prep juniors was to gather information about an American author and report on it in a formal paper. Ellen described the assignment as

...very, very structured because it's the first time a lot of them [the students] have gone through [writing] the research paper. Our topic is researching an American author and anything connected with the time period when the author wrote, and the author’s life, and some literary criticism. Then they have to read a selection by the author and tell what similarities they find from what they researched and see if they can make connections to what they've read. I break it [the instruction] down and they have a piece due each week.

Fulkerson (1979) noted that one of the tenets of a mimetic philosophy is teaching students how to think or help them learn enough about a topic to have something worth saying. Ellen conceptualized her research assignment as a means to help her students think more clearly about how the life and times that an American author lived influenced how and what he or she wrote about. Her hope was that students would come to some conclusion that the author was influenced by his or her life experience and by the era that

he or she lived and that those experiences were reflected in the novel. (see Appendix F for assignment).

Using the rubric based on Sisserson's (2002) scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (see Table 2), this assignment has medium and low intellectual achievement aspects to it.

The following sections will show how, although Ellen did not see the assignment as being "all that difficult," she was repeatedly disappointed that students did not engage in this assignment, much less make the connections that she hoped they would make. Additionally, a review of Ellen's self-reported perceptions about, and experiences with, writing and teaching the research paper illustrated that while Ellen held mimetic beliefs about the role of writing, she approached instruction for this assignment from a formalist perspective. Although Ellen would express frustration at the inability of students or their lack of willingness to make connections, when discussing what she did to prepare them to write the paper, clearly her main emphasis was on form and correctness. Equally, instructional strategies designed to help students think about the topic were either implied or absent. Instead, Ellen's instructional strategies were intended to teach students the process of locating information, of organizing their papers and of learning how to cite properly. This could be seen in every aspect of her instruction, from how she talked about it, to the assignment sheet itself, to how she was observed teaching it

Table 2 Research on an American author - Ellen

Elements of AIA	Tasks in assignment	Evaluation
Construction of Knowledge	The assignment asks the student to find information about the author's life, find what occurred in the United States when the author was alive, and trace the author's literary career.	Low- Some aspects of the assignment ask students to interpret, analyze, synthesize or evaluate information in writing about a topic rather than merely to reproduce information.
Value Beyond School	The assignment asks the student to read a work by the author, write a review of the book and compare his or her opinion with the literary criticism	Medium - The assignment minimally asks students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.
Disciplined Inquiry	The assignment asks student to summarize what he or she learned as a result of doing the research project	Medium - Some aspects of the assignment ask students to draw conclusions or make generalizations or arguments and support them through writing.

Note: Based on the scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson et al., 2002).

In her own experiences with writing research papers, Ellen's earliest memories were of writing researched reports in elementary and in high school. She described those experiences as somewhat typical. She recalled,

I think the first report I really did was in fifth or sixth grade, and I remember we made a book on Ancient Greece and Rome, did research, and we put different pages in the book about what we found out about the different gods and different aspects of the culture.

From high school, she remembered,

It was my junior year, English, and I remember our teacher torturing us with note cards, and I thought it was just a waste of time, and I couldn't figure out why we had to do it. But I remember the whole process was very easy, because you had it all broken down, and I think a lot of the way I teach it now is the way she taught it, and it was very easy to put it together.

On the other hand, she had many of the same problems that she saw in her students when she was learning to organize ideas for a research paper.

I remember I was very fascinated with the research, and then confused about how to organize it. And my teacher would give us guidelines...but looking back on it, it was very rudimentary in organization...although to me it didn't seem like it had any focus, or organization.

These experiences from high school seemed to form the basis for both her beliefs that there was a relationship between clear thinking and clear writing and her instructional focus on form and correctness even when she went to college. There was also a notable connection between how Ellen learned to write research papers in high

school, how she conceptualized teaching students to write a research paper and how she went about doing research herself as she worked on her Master's thesis. She recalled her way of organizing and synthesizing information as, "I would just kind of summarize what I put on the card, after I wrote the card, and then I put the topic on it. And then I would group them and I ended up seeing some themes." She reported that throughout college these skills she learned proved to be useful. For Ellen, the note cards helped her think more clearly about the topic or subject she was researching. When asked why she thought the note card approach worked for her, she noted, "I think because I could separate them out and put them in categories. To me, I think it's the visual thing; I can see the organization in the card, sort of separating them out."

As a high school English teacher, she used a similar strategy when she taught her students to use note cards as a means to organize and synthesize the information they'd been gathering. She explained,

They bring all their note cards in, and we separate out the note cards into stacks. And then they look for subcategories within those, ...and then from that I do a sample outline on the overhead, and we talk about how you look at the topics on your cards, and that's how you can get the different headings—I try to help them make the connection to the outline from that. That's the first step. And then I look over their outline to make sure they have a thesis statement, and I look at their thesis statement to make sure that they're on track. And they usually are. I mean it's not that hard.

She also gave students detailed plans for how they should organize their papers. Although she did not want students to write a headed paper, she gave them the subject

headings for the paper, which followed the five sections of the paper—biography, history, literary criticism, book summary, conclusion. In fact, Ellen asserted that it was in the organization of the paper that her students showed the strongest skills. She said,

I think the organization of it [is what students do best], because it's so easy to organize this paper; it's kind of just laid out with them. I think they do the best on being able to transfer from their outline into a research paper.

Task-knowledge as mediator. Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) suggested that high school teachers ought to appropriate a task-specific knowledge stance for composition instruction. They argue that those who follow a task-specific stance are likely to identify the particular writing skills needed to complete a genre specific writing task and design activities that teach students the appropriate set of strategies. While Ellen noted that the research paper was similar to other writing assignments in her class, “in that I do at other times make them gather information from different sources and try to synthesize it,” she clearly considered that writing required knowledge would be characterized as task-specific (Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). This was most evident when she discussed the emphasis she had been placing on teaching students to paraphrase and summarize in other places in the curriculum. She described how she had students do a weekly current event. She reported,

I work on the whole paraphrasing skill that way... I'll model what paraphrasing is... We've been working on their reading along with their writing and [their] being able to articulate what they've read and summarize it. We do it in baby steps along the way. Hopefully it transfers over when they do the research paper.

Ellen also talked about the research paper as being a different type of writing task than the literary essays, which were the majority of the writing tasks in her class. She noted,

If they are responding to the literature and to the theme. I don't think they gather as much from different sources or cite sources. In that [literary] paper, [the information] is more just taken directly from the text itself, one text. They can bring in information they've read in other things, but if I can even get them to reference the text that they're dealing with, I'm happy.

Although there seem to be some similarity to the assignments, the reason for that may be a result of the school's increased emphasis on teaching critical reading skills of all texts, but especially of non-fiction texts. For Ellen, this meant that she had begun to integrate more non-fiction, reading-comprehension instruction into her curriculum. This gave her students more opportunities to learn and practice the skills they'd be using when they did the research paper into the rest of her curriculum. Thus far, she seemed to be focusing primarily on paraphrasing and citation skills. She noted,

We've been reading a lot of newspaper articles and stuff, just so they get familiar with that type of writing, and it's different from a novel, you know...I've had them doing lots of paraphrasing exercises so they get used to putting things into their own words.

Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) also argued that those who hold a task-specific stance may also have students read with this goal in mind, noting that different texts are read differently for different purposes. When Ellen discussed what she thought students needed to do in order to read texts critically, she said she wanted them

looking at how the language is used, and the propaganda that could be involved—looking at the purpose behind it. What is this person intending? I think it's important that kids can see if someone's trying to influence them, and be able to discern what's real and what's not.

However, she admitted that she had not done enough of this yet. She noted, I don't think that we do enough of that before they get to the paper, to make it easier for them. I think that we need to do more of that throughout the three years we have leading up to the research paper. I think we're trying to do that, the critical reading, reading nonfiction, put information into your own words and that they're paraphrasing.

Influence on student engagement and motivation. Ellen reported that students had a difficult time figuring out how, what, and whether to cite in their papers. This aspect of their research papers caused her the greatest amount of frustration and concern. Ellen remarked that she thought students' lack of ability to cite correctly was a matter of low motivation. She lamented that she spent a great deal of time and effort in teaching or explaining to students how to cite, how to set up a parenthetical citation according to the guidelines of MLA. The school had invested in both a writing handbook series (*Writer's Inc.*) and had borrowed another school's (Hilltop High School's, it turned out) citation Style Manual, in an effort to give students models for how to cite, and yet, in many cases, she felt that students just did not do the citations correctly, if at all, because they didn't want to. She told the story of one student who decided that, in order to satisfy the citation requirements, he would cite himself.

He did a paper on Ayn Rand and he pretty much wrote an essay. And he wasn't into research. And so my comment on his draft was, 'You need to include some sources and give credit to your sources.' And he says, 'I studied her all my life. I know everything there is to know about her.' And I said to him, 'Well no matter what you think, you really aren't the authority. You're not a published author. So you really need to cite some credible sources.' So he credited himself - did a personal interview. And he did it through the whole paper; he cited himself.

Ellen was also disappointed that many of her students had turned to SparkNotes.com, the electronic version of Cliff's Notes, instead of reading the novel written by an author, which was a portion of the research paper assignment. Again, she suggested that this was either due to an inability or unwillingness to be academically honest. She noted,

I really want them to read a selection and then make the connections. What I find students doing is going to SparkNotes.com and they will literally cut out the plot summary and paste it into their research paper. They don't read the book, then any connections that are made are made on SparkNotes.com. I feel like the whole point of the assignment is lost when they do that. I find it very frustrating.

In recent years, she had started to use, or tell her students she was going to use, an online anti-plagiarism product such as Plagiarism.com or Turn-it-in.com in an effort to stem the SparksNotes abuse. She related this story:

I had to tell my juniors when they turn in their papers that they had to put it on a disk and I was going to submit it to Turn-It-In.Com. I did a test of it, and when there was silent reading they saw me. I was putting them in and scanning them,

and doing all that and they asked me what I was doing. And I said, “I’m submitting it to Turn It In Dot Com.” So the word got out that I do that. So when the kids came into the class this term, they asked me, “do we have to put it on a disk?” I’d say, “Uh Huh.” And I think it made them pay more attention.

In order to increase student motivation, Ellen reported that she was starting to think about changing the topic of the research paper to something that might connect with student’s lives more. She claimed,

And so I try to make it relevant—maybe I should let go of the topic thing, and so they can pick something that they’re more interested in. But since it’s [the research paper the students write for her class] their first one, I try to make it so it’s very clear-cut versus what you’re doing... it is so broken down into little parts...

In the second interview, Ellen remarked that she did not look forward to reading her students’ rough drafts because she anticipated they would be poorly done. I suggested that she collect the first three paragraphs of the paper instead, something I had done when I was teaching. I also mentioned that I had individual conferences with students when I returned their first paragraphs. As a result, she also started doing individual conferences with students in order to discuss their writing before the final draft. She was especially pleased about the effect of individual conferences on student writing. She described,

I marked all over it [the rough draft] to show them how to do a parenthetical citation, when to do it, I talked to them about their verb usage because I’ve been drilling it into their heads about using passive voice and that kind of stuff...It was really good, having the time to do that.

She mentioned on more than one occasion that meeting with students one-on-one to facilitate their learning was a positive notion to introduce to her teaching. In the final focus group interview she indicated,

After the positive results I saw from conferencing with them, I think I need to do more of that one-on-one, sitting down with them and saying, “What did you mean here? Why didn't you change this, or do what I told you to!”

When presented with the concept map (see Figure 1) that illustrated the associations between her beliefs, knowledge and practice, Ellen commented that she felt relieved that there were “actual concepts” that described what she thought about teaching the research paper assignment. She felt that the concept map accurately represented how she thought about the research paper assignment. She commented, “You must think I’m a control freak!” as we discussed my interpretations of her beliefs, knowledge and practice.

Figure 1. Concept map for Ellen

She questioned my interpretation that she had low expectations for her students.

She explained,

It might even be they don't have the motivation. I try to tell them this is the real world. They're going to have to synthesize the information and then try to improve stuff, but ... I try to make it relevant. Maybe I should let go of the topic, so they could pick something that they're more interested in. But, since it's their

first one, I try to make it so it's very clear-cut. It is so broken down into little parts. So, that's where I have to think about what the goal is.

Janie –The Lifelong Learner

Vignette. Most of Janie's students were busy working on wireless laptop computers. Typically, computer glitches had caused several computers to be unusable but neither Janie nor her students seemed seriously affected by this. She circulated among the students, getting computers set up and giving students advice about how and where to find information. There was the buzz of excitement and uncertainty in the air. Janie had decided to try a completely different research paper assignment this term. After a period of assigning the same "dry old paper about an author," in a leap of faith she had decided to try out a new research paper assignment. In this assignment, students were to choose one incident in American history in order to discover how the event had been reported and how differing versions of history become "truth." In order to do this, students needed to locate at least three different primary source reports about the event.

The newness of this assignment was evident, as Janie seemed somewhat unsure of what she was doing or expecting. Just finding information that day was a challenge both for her and for her students. She had spent hours on the computer the previous few days, searching the Internet for primary source and historical web sites and had been able to provide her students with several sites she had discovered, which might be helpful. Janie was also thrilled that the district's curriculum specialist was visiting her class, had brought along another list of web sites for her students, and was even willing to work with them. At one point she told the students, "Hey, I'm out on a limb with you here, too!"

I'm doing something I've never done, and that's why in some places I'm going to give you some slack.” She paused and added, “I'm not going to be a pushover, but I'm learning, too.”

Janie stopped to help one female student who was having difficulty finding information on the Chicago Fire of 1908. She directed her to look through a web site run by the Chicago Historical Society that offered a section devoted to the fire. When the student complained that she already had looked at the site and there was “nothing there,” Janie shook her head in disbelief, reached over to the computer mouse, and clicked on a link. “Did you look here?” she asked. The student, slumped in her chair and grumbled, “Well, no.” And then with one more click of the mouse by Janie, the female student became more excited and animated: “But wow! There’s lots of stuff here! I didn’t think to look around.” Janie looked at her and gently reminded, “You need to make sure you click around these websites. The information is often there, but you have to look to see all that it offers.” The student smiled, nodded her head, and started reading the materials, as Janie headed off to help another student.

Expressionist beliefs and personal connections in inquiry. When I approached Janie to ask her to participate in the study, she was initially hesitant. She told me that she hadn’t really taught a research paper for the last several years because she found it so frustrating. She added that as a result of participating in helping to create a research paper manual with the help of some instructors from a local university, she was going to teach an entirely different type of research paper, but that she was nervous about it. She called the experience of helping to create the research paper manual her “epiphany.” She claimed she’d become more interested and motivated to teach students to “answer a research question” rather than “write a research paper.”

During the previous summer, Janie also had attended a California Reading and Literature Project summer reading institute. The purpose of the reading institute was to give junior and senior high school English teachers training on types of critical reading skills the college was expecting of incoming freshman, as well as to give them some strategies to teach students to read critically. When I assured Janie that her experiences with these two professional development opportunities, and especially her renewed interest in teaching the research paper, were stories worth telling, she agreed to participate in this study.

Janie was enthusiastic and animated. It was easy to see why Janie was so widely respected across the district. She was in her twenty-sixth year of teaching high school English, and was still enthusiastic and nervous about trying a new project. In both her teaching and in her interviews, she tended to make her point by telling stories, creating metaphors for situations, and often by finishing her sentences with facial expressions and hand gestures. She was concerned about what her students were learning in her class and whether or not she was doing the right thing by them. These were among the reasons she had stopped teaching the research paper, "...it took too long and students didn't get enough out of it," she remarked. These were also among the reasons that she decided to start teaching students to write a research paper again. She claimed:

That's one reason why I say to my fellow literature teachers... I mean, we're not preparing a lot of English majors here, but maybe if they [the students] could just look at something that's happening in their culture, the people they've talked about a lot, and see how there's not always just one side of the story...then maybe... [and she nodded her head in the affirmative].

Using the AIA rubric, Janie's research paper assignment would get medium and high marks for the intellectual rigor of the assignment, despite the fact that there are places in the assignment where students could choose to merely report information. The research paper assignment Janie borrowed from another teacher asked students to seek multiple perspectives about a single incident in American history in order to understand how history has been reported and interpreted (Table 3). The assignment sheet, which directed students to select a single incident from American history for study, included a list from which students could choose, or they could choose their own (Appendix G). Students needed to locate three perspectives about the incident. For example, a student who chose to research the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima was required to locate three perspectives about the event. She directed students to develop their own research questions about the nature of the event and then to come to some conclusions about how and why the perspectives differed.

Table 3. Research an incident in American history – Janie

Elements of AIA	Tasks in assignment	Evaluation
Construction of Knowledge	The assignment asks students to gather information from three perspectives. The students have an opportunity to discern their own perspectives, to interpret and evaluate the perspective being offered, and to make decisions about the validity or truthfulness of each perspective.	Medium - Some aspects of the assignment ask students to interpret, analyze, synthesize or evaluate information in writing about a topic rather than merely to reproducing information
Value Beyond School	Because students are given choice, they have the opportunity to choose an incident in history that is of personal interest or significance to them. Some students may not have enough historical content knowledge to do this	Medium - Some aspects of the assignment ask students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.
Disciplined Inquiry	Students must draw conclusions about why or how the perspectives are different from one another, in a cited researched paper	High - The assignment asks students to draw conclusions or make generalizations or arguments and support them through extended writing.

Note: Based on the scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson et al., 2002).

The lesson was inquiry based. Janie noted that students tended to select incidents they already knew something about. This proved to be a double-edged sword. In some cases, students chose an event such as, “dropping the A-Bomb on Hiroshima” because it was the most obvious, not because they were very interested in it. She felt that this didn’t really push students to think critically about the incident. Also, she wanted them to learn something new. She was able to convince a few students to research an event that they had little familiarity with, but that she felt they’d be interested in because of other factors. For example, she wanted one female student who was interested in civil rights to research the events (including Eleanor Roosevelt’s resignation from the Daughters of the American Revolution) that led to Marian Anderson’s singing at the Lincoln Memorial in 1939:

She [the student] went in and found the exact letter that Mrs. Roosevelt wrote to the president of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the letter that the president of the DAR wrote back to her. We looked at those. It was amazing, because she [Eleanor Roosevelt] had typed her letter to the DAR president and we looked at some of the language that she used. And I said to [the student], so what’s between the lines here? What strikes you here? And she’s going, “Oh, God, this is dripping with sarcasm!” And they think they’re humanitarian but they’re telling someone they can’t sing because they’re black. It’s so wrong. So I said, ‘can you do the research about where this outfit [the Daughters of the American Revolution] came from and what was their agenda?’ So that’s the kind of excitement and she’s excited and I’m excited. I told her [the student] ‘I’ve never seen this, It’s just amazing to me. I didn’t even know much about this

incident until you went into it. See all this politeness, dripping with politeness and underneath is power clashing and huge implications here. Then, the fact that almost a million people came to Lincoln Memorial to hear her sing... so she orchestrated that.' To me, that was the sign of excitement itself and discovery that I wish that all my students could have. Maybe part of the thing was the topics themselves. Maybe they didn't know enough about enough of them to pick one that would have been more suitable to their interests, or whatever. But this one really clicked.

In fact, Janie reported that the students who chose a topic that "spoke to them," were more successful than those who chose a topic because they thought it would be easy. She remarked,

One student who did Jesse James—I found a book for him, and he read about a hold-up. His first one [primary source] is from the standpoint of the person who was held up. How they perceived this guy [James], what it was like from their point of view. You saw him [the student], he says he's related to Jesse James [nods her head and gives a thumbs up gesture]. He [the student] did a nice piece....That's where it's working out nicely is where kids are going "oh, [and she does a thumbs up]."

On the other hand, Janie claimed that far too many students chose topics like The Bombing of Hiroshima because they thought it would be easy to find enough information on the topic. As she reflected about aspects of the assignment she would consider changing in the future, she noted that she would continue to think of ways to make sure that students chose a topic that would be meaningful to them. She related how she'd

changed her mind about letting students do more current events after she saw how researching the shooting death of a hip-hop rapper had taught some valuable critical thinking skills to one student.

This is Tupak Shakur's fan club. That was one of the sources used and the student started to ask, 'Well, how objective are these people? They're not going to be that objective. Consider the fact that they love him dearly and he can do no wrong, then go from there. He also looked at the police report. Part of what I hope he's learned in this process is that there are such things as primary sources that haven't been adulterated, filtered by whomever. But people in the media do put their spin on and then what can you trust? If anything, maybe if we could impress upon them that, "Okay, maybe you won't be doing a research paper [in your future], but there will be times, we would hope, where you will have to sift information, and you have to be able to make something out of it. You have to synthesize it or act on it and also you will have to look at who said it.

Janie's belief that her students needed an assignment that they had a personal connection to was also related to her belief that writing was a form of expression for them. Fulkerson (1979) noted that expressionist teachers cover a wide range, "from totally accepting and non-directive...to much more directive, experiential teachers who design classroom activities to maximize student discovery" (p. 344) . Janie clearly fell into the latter group.

Janie's inquiry-based assignment also grew from her belief that she needed to focus on critical thinking skills. She noted the relationship between the ability of students to make connections among texts to their ability to make personal connections. As she

talked about the assignment and what she was going to be looking for in their initial drafts she said,

I have been beating them over the head about having three different points of view—three different takes, three different biases, three different personal reactions to something. I'm going to be really looking for some fullness in that part of it, not just a one-liner and "oh well, that's what he said" but where they've actually have some, excuse my expression, meta-cognitive experiences.

At another time she mentioned the female student who was investigating the Chicago Fire of 1908; she described a conversation she had with her where she asked her to think critically about the information she was gathering about a firefighter during the Chicago Fire who had been told to let the fire burn and reported he wasn't allowed to help.

What must that have been like?" she said she asked the student, "What must that have done to the person down the line? Think of the times, thousands of people? What might it do to a culture at the time? You're having to watch people you could help and you're being forbidden to do so. What did you have at stake if you did help? That kind of thing. Do we see any parallels now of people who feel they can't step in and help others; either there are laws or there are attitudes of society that hold you back?

Analysis of task-specific knowledge. As students moved through the research project, it became evident that Janie had conceptualized that students needed task-specific knowledge about writing. Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) explained that the task specific knowledge position is divided by whether one should concern oneself with form or

procedures. In this view, Janie taught students to write the research papers using task-specific procedures. For example, her walls were covered with poster-size Post-it-Notes that guided students through the different procedures involved in not only gathering the information, but also in organizing it and writing about it. Additionally, she provided each student with a sample outline, which she had written herself (Appendix G).

Like Ellen, Janie had been teaching students paraphrasing and summarizing skills as part of Northern High School's school literacy plan. She also reported that after having participated in the summer reading institute, she had spent more time teaching students to read non-fiction texts. As students were working through gathering information, she noted that she had laid the groundwork:

I would think that we got those huge [points to a stack of books] books this year, these nonfiction collections, because we're trying to work more of that kind of thing in. In the first part of the term I was doing that and I was pulling in things from the newspapers and we were analyzing how the rhetorical voices are skewing our heads... and then, I haven't looked at those for weeks, and I haven't done much from the newspapers for a couple of weeks. And I thought, well, you know why—because what they're doing now is not as directed, but what they're doing is looking at nonfiction information.

Janie also recognized students lacked the task-specific knowledge to carry over what they had learned about effective writing to the new task of writing a research paper. She noted,

It is like when we get into a different kind of writing they relapse into, every sentence starts the same... blah, blah, blah... Their spelling goes to hell-in-a-hand-

basket, and it's like we just spent a month on sentence beginnings, paragraph structure, how to get more zing for your buck, and now we're back to [frowns and shakes head].

Influences on student engagement and motivation. Like Ellen, Janie was frustrated by students' inability to cite work correctly and their propensity to plagiarize. At a focus group interview, she remarked,

Then there was that fight about citations. Oh my goodness, I would say a good third of them still cannot figure out what a footnote is for. All the time we spent... and then I put in their first drafts—[pointing at an imaginary draft] right here you need to cite this here [pointing at the “draft”].

On the other hand, she was reflective about the causes of student plagiarism. She remarked,

I think part of it is inexperience on the part of the kids, and they're really not trying to be evil, but they really don't know how to play the game...then there's always the business of, well, what does one cite and what doesn't one...I'm doing this paper on this subject that's totally foreign to me, so then everything?

She also interpreted plagiarism as part of the modern youth culture and its lack of respect for intellectual property. She said, "If they have no qualms about taking people's music online and not paying for it, or downloading movies or whatever they're doing. [Students must be thinking] ‘If I have the wit to get it online and I don't have to pay for it, then why not get away with it?’” She noted, however, that student plagiarism probably all boiled down to not understanding the issue of intellectual property and the rationale for wanting authority in academic writing.

As a teacher who had shied away from teaching students to write research papers, to one who had become enthusiastic about it, Janie wasn't shy about asking for advice, assistance and feedback on what she was doing throughout the process. In our interviews, she often would pepper her stories and remarks with questions about how I would have done it, or she would ask me for resources, rubrics, contacts, or even ask me to come in and work with her students. Her concern for her students learning and her own desire to continue growing as a teacher was evident. At one point, after she had collected, graded and returned the papers, she asked me:

You know what I want to do? I'd love to connect with somebody over at [Hilltop]. Is there anybody who'd be doing anything even close to this? I'd love to get that person's number, and I would love to see what a student turned in over there that they consider to be a mediocre paper and a high paper. I'm wondering, are their kids really that much better than the population we have here, or is it that we're just not doing the job of preparing them for what they need to do on this level.

When presented with her concept map (Figure 2), Janie agreed that she believed strongly in the idea of teaching writing as a form of personal expression and hypothesized that this belief would help explain why she shied away from teaching students to write research papers for so long. She recalled working with a professor from the local university's writing department, who suggested that research papers didn't have to be dry and uninspired. She recalled:

When we were having our conversations where [the professor from the university] would talk about the potential for research papers and she would get

so rhapsodic about what the research paper can be. It doesn't have to be this dry, uninteresting, so and so piece of writing, but it could be where there's some interesting moments where you see that the writer is having some illumination or is shifting or there's something that's happening with the writer that's really growth, or the writer is having a new realization...

It was that experience that inspired Janie to take up teaching students to write research papers again. She noted that she had learned a great deal about the topics that she had chosen to have her students do research and write about, and that she intended to continue teaching students to write research papers from then on.

Figure 2. Concept map for Janie

Valley High School

Valley High School sits in the middle of an older suburb located within the a large southern California school district where this study took place. The campus sprawls over acres of land in an economically depressed area and is made up of a combination of buildings erected in the early 1960's and an abundance of portable classrooms and trailers. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the school had been listed as underperforming, but during the time of this study, the most recent state test scores had been reported and due

to increased test scores, Valley High School had been removed from the state's Program Improvement List. Still, although the school had improved student test scores, the high-transient, low socio-economic demographics meant that the staff members certainly could not rest on their laurels. One of the struggles of the school was to overcome the excuse that their students just couldn't do the work due to these demographic factors.

Valley High School grouped students by perceived ability into one of several levels of English classes. Applied Arts classes were offered to low-skilled, non-college bound students. Advanced Placement English classes were offered to high-skilled, college bound students; sheltered English classes were offered to English learners; college prep English classes were offered to everyone else. Eleventh grade college prep and Advanced Placement students were required to write a research paper. Three teachers taught eleventh grade college prep English. Both Sylvia and Tracy taught part-time and the third teacher was retiring and was reported to be using up sick days for the remainder of the year. Sylvia, the first participant in the study, taught the Advanced Placement Language course, which was offered to juniors, and eleventh grade college prep English. Tracy, the second participant, taught both college prep junior and senior English classes.

Sylvia – I'm the One Doing All the Work

Vignette. The Valley Library was small and cramped and poorly lit. It smelled musty and of old books. Students from Sylvia's third period English class were in the library to begin finding information for their research papers. Some were seated around tables and chatting quietly; others were milling around the library, looking for books. Several students were waiting to ask Sylvia for help finding a book or for validation that the book they had in their hands was a "good one." At the moment, Sylvia was up on

stepladder in the reference section of the library reaching for a thick book on a top shelf. As she stepped down, she handed the thick book to a student. "There," she said, "that should help you out." The student blanched at the size of the book and made a grunting sound as Sylvia handed it to him.

The student stopped at the first table where others were seated. There, he dropped the book on the desk where it landed with a loud, thump. He frowned and leaned toward a female student and complained loudly, "Do I have to read all of that?" Sylvia, who was still near enough to overhear him, broke in with an exasperated tone, "No, you look at the back, in the index, and find the place in the book that deals with your author. Then you read just that part." Looking a little relieved, the male student wandered back to his table.

Two female students approached Sylvia and asked if the books they had chosen were "OK?" She looked at the books, thumbed through them and either approved the student's selections--or not. One student approached her with a book by Ursula McGuinn, Sylvia made a face and said, "That isn't a good one for you; you'll have a hard time finding information about her." The student seemed dismayed, but acquiesced and asked for help in finding another book. Sylvia led her off to the fiction section of the library. Upon her return to the reference section, the second student approached her with a book by Alice Walker. Sylvia shook her head and told the girl that another student had already chosen the author, so she'd have to choose a different author to research. Sylvia gave the student a few options and walked with her over to a computer terminal that was the online card catalog and typed in some search information for her.

After 45 minutes of library time Sylvia was exhausted, and frustrated. She muttered as the bell rang and the students filed out of the library, “These kids, they just don’t know how to do library research. I feel like I’m the one doing all the work.”

Formalist beliefs and control of assignment. Sylvia taught both Advanced Placement English classes which met on alternating days all year and a single eleventh grade College Prep English class, which met every day for 18 weeks—or one term. The preceding vignette was drawn from a day in the library with her Advanced Placement juniors who wrote an American author research paper much like Ellen’s assignment. For the most part, in our interviews and discussions about teaching the research paper, we discussed her college prep students, who were writing a controversial issue research paper.

Sylvia was in her fourteenth year of teaching English at Valley High School. She had been working part-time since the birth of her son almost two years earlier. We did all interviews at her house as her 20-month old son played in the background. Sylvia’s part time schedule made it difficult for her to feel a part of what was going on at Valley High School. She noted during the interviews she thought there were teachers in her department who had been discussing making changes to the eleventh grade research paper requirement, but she didn’t always have all of the information because she had to miss a meeting or leave one early due to child-care issues.

Fulkerson (1979) argued that in many cases writing teachers fail to have a consistent theory or philosophy which drives pedagogy, and this leads to disconnects between what the teacher assigns and what the teacher expects. This could be said of Sylvia. She expressed a great deal of frustration regarding teaching students to write

research papers. She reported that many of her college prep students turned in poorly written, incorrectly cited and formatted research papers. In most aspects, she had a formalist philosophy in that she was primarily concerned, for the research paper assignment at least, with the form and correctness of the final product. However, other aspects of her thinking revealed both mimetic and rhetorical philosophies. For example, she expressed, “You know you can't argue about something about which you know nothing. If you don't know anything about it, you can't really form a position just because it's not an argument.” This intersection of all three philosophies was evident when she noted how one of her goals was

trying to get them to understand the structure and the format of how to present the argument and how important it is to provide the facts and the research that you need to understand the topic before you can write about it.

In this statement, she appropriated the vocabulary of a rhetorical stance when she said she wanted her students to understand how to present their argument. Also, she acknowledged that her students needed to understand the topic in order to present their argument, which implies mimetic beliefs. However, both of these aspects were superseded by her belief that it was important for students to understand the structure and format of presenting the information as the means by which to get to the ends.

Sylvia's formalist philosophy was most evident in the research paper assignment handout itself (Appendix H). The assignment document, which called for a controversial issue research paper, was distributed to students when she introduced the assignment. It included six pages of directions and instructions. The first two pages outlined all of the format requirements of the paper, and the last two pages gave additional information

about works cited forms. The directions for the assignment, which began on the third page read:

Argue for (pro) or against (con) on any of the following issues. If you have another issue you would like to research, please see me first so we can make sure it's arguable and that information is available in our library.

This was followed by a list of 27 potential issues, most of which were drawn from past issues of *CQ Researcher*, a periodical to which many high school and college libraries subscribe. Each issue investigates the latest legislation, opinion, and research about a single news event about which legislation is looming. Professionals such as journalists, legislative analysts, or others who are charged with researching social or political issues are the target audience for *CQ Researcher*. Additionally, while it contains thorough coverage of an event, it is also written at a post-high school/college reading level.

Using the rubric for Authentic Intellectual Achievement, this assignment had low intellectual achievement aspects to it because it asked students to reproduce information. It gave few opportunities for students to connect their learning to their own lives in meaningful ways (Table 4).

Table 4. Research a controversial issue – Sylvia and Tracy

Elements of AIA	Tasks in Assignment	Evaluation
Construction of Knowledge	Although the assignment asks students to take a stance on a controversial issue, which implies an evaluation would take place, the outline suggests that students should report information both for and against the issue they have chosen.	Medium/Low - The assignment asks students to reproduce information.
Value Beyond School	In the final paragraph, based on the sample outline, students are instructed to include a strong personal opinion or belief about their topic	Medium/Low – Only one aspect of the assignment ask students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.
Disciplined Inquiry	The sample thesis statement which is supplied, suggests that students will be required to report back three types of information, and there is little that indicates that students will be asked to synthesize information in order to make an informed evaluation.	Low - The assignment asks students to write, but is designed to have students re-tell information

Note: Based on the scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson et al., 2002)

For the most part, although the assignment asked students to write extensively about the information they had located, for the most part students were asked merely to retell or report information. It is also evident that Sylvia's research assignment asked students to write a researched essay, rather than a research paper. I distinguish between these two tasks in the following way: A research paper begins with a research question, whereas a researched essay asks students to substantiate a pre-existing opinion or thesis with outside sources. There appear to be few avenues for students to construct their own knowledge about a topic, and they are most likely to take a stance on an issue about which they already feel strongly.

General knowledge and control of product. Sylvia had decided to use the controversial issue essay as her research assignment because, she said,

I thought it [would be] easy for kids to form a thesis. They [the students] are going to have to be informed on the topic because in order to form an opinion you need to have the facts and you need to see a little bit of both sides.

She also had hoped that a controversial issue research assignment would be more interesting to her college prep students than writing about an author, which is the paper she had her Advanced Placement Students write.

Due to her perception that her students were low-skilled, Sylvia wanted to maintain tight control over the topics they chose, the sources they used, the process by which they wrote, all in order to have a final product that was correct. She noted that she felt that she could help students do better research if she knew about the topics they were researching. One way that she controlled the assignment was through limiting the topics they chose. In the case of her AP students, she would guide students toward authors that

she felt she could help them with. In the case of the college prep students, she limited the “controversial issues” they could investigate. Another way she controlled the assignment was by limiting the types and number of sources they could use. Overall, she preferred they use books. She described her reasons for limiting the number of Internet sources they could use:

I tell them five sources for them and we suggest areas they can go to, and then they can have up to three Internet sources. The reason I did that is because sometimes they get topics that are too new to find information on. That makes it kind of tricky.

Sylvia taught her students to write essays following a five-paragraph essay format, and she taught students to write the research paper in much the same way. In other words, she believed that a general set of procedures was sufficient for her students to be able to write either an essay or a research paper. (Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). When she did see that there were specific aspects of each writing assignment that students needed to understand in order to write the research paper, these tasks attended to the format of the paper (e.g. using correct MLA conventions), the content of the paper (e.g. the topic), or the length of the paper. While the content of the papers may have changed with each assignment, the type of knowledge that students needed to accomplish these writing assignments did not.

Sylvia reported that when she had the time, she collected students’ drafts in order to give them some feedback and to make sure they were on the right track. When Sylvia described what she looked for, she noted she looked for these three aspects—conventions, content, and length. She claimed,

I look at format, I look for mechanics, certainly. I do look at format because I mean part of this is I'm trying to teach the main format for writing a research paper. Also, I look for whether they have all the parts. That's part of the format, and then of course I look at the content, whether they have enough facts to support their position, whether they analyze those facts or explain them at all, I mean they can't just throw me a list and a bunch of facts.

Similarly, when she described how the research paper was similar to or different from other papers she had students write, she noted that the essays she assigned were different because “typically they're using one source.”

Another example of how Sylvia conceptualized the general knowledge students needed in order to write a research paper is evident in the fourth page of Sylvia's assignment handout, which included a sample outline (Appendix H). The sample outline illustrated how the paper should be divided into four parts and followed a similar outline to a five-paragraph essay model. The introduction was to begin with lead-in sentence, which included a statistic and ended with a thesis statement. The sample thesis statement read,

Though millions of abortions are obtained by American women every year, they should not be allowed because they are (1) **unsafe and unnecessary**, and they jeopardize the (2) **mental** and (3) **physical health** of confused (sic) frightened pregnant women” (bold type in assignment). The second section of the sample outline illustrated three counter arguments. The third section, titled the argument section, contained three sub-sections, one for each of the part of the thesis

statement. The fourth section contained the conclusion, which invited students to restate the thesis and to close with a “strong personal opinion and belief.

The outline she provided to students evidenced that Sylvia felt it was necessary to control the final product. This aspect of control was also evident in how she managed instruction when students wrote the research paper. She noted that

Well, they do the outline first so I can tell them they have the facts. I tried note cards before but they'd lose them or it was just too tedious. [Instead] I have them do different colors for different arguments when they're taking notes..., but that gets kind of out of control, too. So basically what I do is have them give me the outline first and then what I do is I go through it and I look at the facts and see if they are useful in supporting their arguments and see if they support them. and if they include their opinion too much and they've only got one fact here, then they need to go back and do some research and find something else that's going to support that.

In another instance, she described how she tested students on the required conventions of a research paper in order to hold them accountable for learning them, a task she admitted they seemed unlikely to do. She felt that by testing them, she was providing guidance and support so that the final product would be correct,

Like for instance, today I gave them this whole kind of packet thing I do and I'm going to give them a quiz on it tomorrow because I went over it and what I find is I get kids who come back to me and say, 'But I didn't know you had to have a typed outline, I didn't know it had to be 15 [pages].' I mean they don't read this

[pointing to the assignment sheet] and even though we go over and over and over the requirements. I don't know what it is.

Sylvia's desire to deal with her students' perceived low skill and motivation levels led her to attempting to control all aspects of the process. She felt that she was working harder than most of her students were and this also led to a great deal of frustration and anger toward her students and about teaching students to write research papers. She wondered how necessary it was for her to teach students to write research papers or even if high school students were sufficiently capable of writing research papers. Being at an underperforming school, she noted that she felt pressured to teach all the standards, and noted that there just wasn't enough time to do it all. She had concluded,

I'd rather just have them write some literary type analysis paper since we're in a literature class. That way I might be able to teach the standards and have the kids do independent reading and some other things and let the issues type paper be dealt with in another class.

A lack of positive experiences and influences. Sylvia noted almost immediately in the first interview that she found teaching students to write a research paper to be a very frustrating experience. Her frustration appears to have stemmed from her assessment that students from Valley High School were very low skilled and lacked motivation to do the work assigned to them. She explained that the students at Valley didn't "have the best reading skills, and they don't have the best homework skills and the best work habits." It became evident as we talked that her perception that students were unmotivated and unskilled was a great source of frustration to her as she assigned students to write research papers. After she read her students' first drafts, she complained,

I'm just frustrated because, you know, we have so much to teach them and if they're not willing to do the bulk of the work. These kids are not willing to do anything outside of class. They just don't do it.

She continued to describe her reasons for her dismay,

I gave them their papers back and I gave them four days to revise them. I wrote a lot of comments, questions about okay 'where's the facts to support this' and 'how did this fact support your position' and then I ended up getting probably five kids that took advantage of revising their papers.

The effort that Sylvia felt she was putting into correcting and giving feedback on student work clearly wore on her. As she collected drafts, and as the final draft due date neared, Sylvia became more and more vocal about her frustration with low skills of weak work ethic of her students. In the second interview, which occurred after students had finished doing most of their research and had started writing their papers, she noted, "And then I think it's just like spoon feeding them everything. I mean I'm correcting everything along the way..." When asked what she hoped students would do with her feedback about revising their papers, she explained,

Revising means you need to answer the questions that are on those papers and you need to probably add some more information because you know the two and a half pages means it wasn't complete. No one came to ask me questions about it and I told them several times when I gave them class time, 'What questions do you have on your paper?' and "What you need to do to make it better?" And I just, I'm just frustrated with it.

Sylvia reported that students also had difficulty reading the source material they found in their research, however, even though Sylvia recognized that the critical thinking and reading skills of her students were below grade level, she did not believe it as her responsibility to teach reading. She stated,

I'm not a reading teacher, obviously. They [students] just gotta do it...I mean a lot of it [improving critical reading] just comes with practice and getting better at being able to decipher text. I mean I know that sounds simplistic but really I mean the more you read, the better you get at it... I mean there are strategies that are used to help kids trying to understand the main topic... I don't know. I don't do enough non-fiction [instruction].

Finally, Sylvia worked in relative isolation at Valley High School. Part of this was due to her part-time contract. She arrived after the school day had begun and left before it ended. This schedule often interfered with her ability to attend department meetings and she often felt out of the loop, although she had regular lunchtime conversations with her colleagues. She had some idea that teachers in her department were discussing the junior research paper requirement, but she was not fully part of those conversations. She noted:

We had our meeting a couple of weeks ago and one of the things that they were talking about was [research papers]. At the sophomore level they're doing a five-paragraph research paper without parenthetical citations and then suddenly they're thrown into the junior class and they're asked to do something hugely more significant and the parenthetical citations. But I just I don't know what they decided.... I'm not sure what they discussed after I left as far as the junior [paper goes], I think it's kind of open ended.

When shown her concept map (Figure 3), Sylvia immediately noted the word frustration in the middle of the page. She asked, "I'm not the only one who's frustrated, am I?" She frowned as she reviewed the conceptual map that illustrated the disconnect between what she wanted in her students papers, as a result of her mimetic philosophies not being consistent with the formalist procedures she used as she taught students to write research papers. As she reviewed the synthesis of the problems she had reported and encountered along the way, she remarked that her frustration might have been a result of the timing of our second interview, which caused her to sound more frustrated than she really was. She also noted that her level of frustration might also have been a result of "[the students'] low abilities and just, frankly, no motivation, just not really buying into it or really frankly caring about the process or the product." She also acknowledge that she felt somewhat powerless to do anything about the problems with motivation that her students were having. She commented,

I don't know. I really I just don't know. I can't tell you that's going solve the problem but you know my thinking [is] that some kids you know no matter what you do its not going to motivate them to do it. No matter what the topic is or what the assignment is. I don't know.

Figure 3. Concept map for Sylvia

As she projected into the future, she noted that she was thinking she was going to change her research paper topic for the next term to one that was more "literature based." In essence, she wanted to teach students to write a research paper in which they investigated an American author, much like Ellen's assignment at Northern High School. She explained:

I've just kind of been toying with this idea of doing an abbreviated version of what I do with my AP kids, the author paper, where they have to read a story and they have to do some biographical research on a writer and or it could be a poet and then have them, you know, have them make connections between the subject matter and themes or other lifetime experiences. How they relate to the author's life, and then examine their philosophical values and stuff and then have them maybe take one example of style that they can support through the story. I'm just thinking, well I might as well use this vehicle to teach what we're supposed to be teaching anyway which is, you know, independent reading and a little bit of thinking and research of knowledge. What I don't want is just a bunch of facts spit out.

Tracy – In Search of Answers

Vignette. At our first interview. Tracy asked me for help in getting her students to get started with writing their papers. "Will you teach my class? They have trouble starting their papers and I just don't know how to help them," she stated. In truth, all her interviews will be peppered with as many questions about how I would teach students to write research papers as she had answers to my questions. As a researcher, I was reluctant to participate in her class so directly, but as the district curriculum specialist, I also felt obliged to help when asked. With some trepidation, I agreed to model an instructional strategy I had used even though I had mixed feelings about teaching her class as I recognized that I'd moved from observer to participant observer. We agreed that the next time I visited her classroom, I'd also present her students with some ideas for how to get started writing their research papers.

On the day I taught Tracy's class, she had assigned students to finish a paraphrasing-outlining worksheet. As class started, students were working on finishing the notes they'd taken on a photocopied note-taking form Tracy had provided. Some students were writing directly from newspapers that were available at the back of the class. Tracy circulated around the room, checking off that they had completed the outline form. As she checked, she had anywhere from a 15 to 30 second conversation with each student.

After checking with each student, she introduced me to the class as the district English curriculum specialist who was going to help them get started writing their research papers. My plan was to have students summarize what they already knew about their research topic, as my experience has taught me that often students don't realize how much they already know (Fearn & Farnan, 2001). I began my instruction by directing them to look through their notes. "What is the most important idea you have?" I asked. "Write it down in a sentence or two." As I moved around the class, I could see that most students had simple sentences written down. I returned to the front of the room and on the whiteboard I wrote down four words and phrases: "because, so that, in order to, since." I asked for a volunteer, and showed students how to re-write their sentences so that they included one of these cueing words. Then I asked for another student to volunteer his or her first sentence. Together, on the whiteboard, we crafted the first sentence of his summary. I then directed students to re-write their first sentences, then to do the same with next important idea they had about their research. Both Tracy and I circulated throughout the class, prompting students and answering questions. As students were writing, Tracy moved to the front of the room and reminded them that they needed to

include parenthetical citations when they used information from their research. As class ended Tracy noted that she was pleased that students had gotten so much writing done.

Mimetic beliefs, inquiry goals and formalist practices. Tracy was in her tenth year of teaching English at Valley High School. Like Sylvia, she taught on a part-time contract. She was in the process of adopting a child from overseas; thus she admitted that she had limited time to participate in this study. However once she agreed to participate, she enthusiastically shared samples of students' work that she had kept from past classes. She also began expressing her hopes that she would be able to learn something about her own teaching as a result of participating in the study. In the first interview, she suggested, "I would love to just set up a day and discuss just the research paper and how we can make it better, because to me it just seems it lacks focus. It lacks clarity to me. I know that I'm teaching the kids the process, but am I really teaching them the critical thinking skills?"

Her dissatisfaction with the way she taught the research paper assignment itself became more evident as she talked about and shared examples of past research paper projects. It is notable that she showed an array of the research papers she had assigned over the years. One paper she assigned was an historical paper. She showed an example of a paper a student had written about medieval warfare. In another paper she revealed that she had students choose their own topics, and one student had chosen to do research into the restaurant industry. That same year, another student had researched Pablo Picasso. It seemed that she had changed paper assignments several times in an attempt to find a project that would elicit better student products, but she hadn't found the perfect assignment yet.

Tracy used the same research paper assignment as Sylvia had (Appendix H). More accurately, she used all the same forms and handouts that Sylvia had created. As described in Sylvia's report, using a rubric for describing an assignment's Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Table 3), the research paper assignment itself had medium and low rigor to it. In most aspects the directions to the assignment focused on product and the procedures and forms required for students to produce a correctly formatted and cited research paper.

Perhaps for this reason, like Sylvia, Tracy used an approach based on formalist philosophy to teaching students to write research papers, especially during the information gathering stages where she focused her instructional goals primarily on the steps and procedures. She commented that she had broken the process into about eight steps, so that students would correctly and accurately cite material. She claimed that, "It [citing work accurately] drives the paper." Even though she described the steps and procedures as "tedious and boring," she noted she thought they helped students because they "neatly laid out a plan for getting the work done."

Interestingly, although she used the same research paper materials and the same writing directions as Sylvia, she rarely referred to these or discussed the assignment itself other than to mention that she used the same forms that Sylvia did when we would discuss teaching the research paper. Instead, as she discussed what she did, she focused almost exclusively on the steps and procedures she followed to get students to write the paper correctly. She described how she tried to keep students accountable for all of the steps. She noted that if students missed one of the steps, they had the opportunity to do it for reduced credit. The steps had to do with locating information, filling out note-taking

forms, completing a correct works cited page, completing a correct outline, completing a draft of the paper, participating in a peer review and completing a final draft. If students did not do all of the steps, then they failed the paper.

She also claimed she didn't think that the ninth or tenth grade teachers had done a sufficient job of teaching students the rudimentary skills of how to cite work correctly. She remarked, "I don't even feel that the kids are being as well trained as they should be and so when I get them, they look at me like, 'what's the works cited page?' I still get that."

Tracy held mimetic beliefs about writing the research paper. This stance was most evident when she discussed how she wanted to teach students to read and understand texts in other aspects of her instruction that led up to the research paper assignment. She described, "I love reading essays and I love critiquing essays. I [help students] look at them for choice of [rhetorical] devices and that type of thing. This type of thinking leads into the research paper. I copy editorials constantly. I'm always thinking, 'what could I do to have the kids reading essays or nonfiction and weaving this somehow into a research paper?'"

Unlike other participants in this study who held mimetic philosophies, yet who conceptualized the research paper as an act of investigating and reporting about information, Tracy conceptualized the research paper as an act of inquiry. She wanted her students to answer a research question, although she seemed unsure about how to structure her instruction to elicit this type of thinking in her students. She noted that she focused much of her instruction on what she called "the process," and to her the process

was all about the steps required to have the form of the research paper done correctly.

She explained,

I teach it in steps (about eight). Each step must be verified by me as being complete. If a step is not taken, the student has the opportunity to do it at reduced credit. If they do not fulfill all the steps then they fail the paper.

She also reported that when she read student work, she looked for both the critical analysis and reading, in addition to correct form and citation. However, she found herself frustrated that while students seemed to understand how and when to do parenthetical citations, the critical analysis part of the paper was missing. She noted that her instructional practices were “process driven.” But she also lamented, “I know the process is huge but to me I think the research paper should be driven by critical analysis and by critical thinking also.” In order to find an assignment that elicited a higher level of critical thinking from her students, she changed assignments frequently, thinking it was the assignment itself that was the mitigating factor.

General knowledge—concrete detail and commentary. To Tracy, the research paper was much like other essays they wrote in class, especially since students wrote several other research-based essays in her class. She pointed out, “I have both the classes, actually the juniors and the seniors, do research based essays, such as historic aspects of Puritanism. So they have done mini-research briefs of two or three pages before they even get to this one.” She described one difference between the research paper and other research-based essays students wrote in class, and that had to do with the issue of thesis. She reasoned,

If you have this amount of research that you've done on these topics, and you have these questions that you formed about what you want to find—sometimes what happens with these papers is you have to manipulate your thesis from your research, you know, so that means you may have to change some of those questions around that you're asking?

When describing what students would do with a thesis statement in a regular essay, she noted,

Normally, when we have the kids write essays, one of the things you have to have first is the thesis...Sometimes it's okay to write your body paragraphs and you know, have an idea of a thesis, but then go back and re-word your thesis. You have an idea of what you want to prove in the paper, right? Well, you're answering a question or you're responding to a prompt.

In a researched essay, she noted students start with a thesis and the goal is to support the thesis with examples from the text, whereas in the research paper, the thesis was a more flexible statement that might change as a result of the research. The implication was that in an essay the thesis may need to be reworded, but is constrained by the writing task or the prompt. To Tracy, an essay thesis statement had less flexibility than a research paper thesis. The research paper thesis was constrained only by the research; this is an interesting distinction.

One place where the general knowledge approach caused Tracy to question how she was teaching was in considering how she taught students to write analysis. Tracy taught at one of many schools in the district that had adopted the Jane Shaffer model for essay writing instruction. This model is named for a teacher who had gained both local

and regional notoriety for developing writing curriculum that follows a formulaic and prescriptive approach to writing. In this formulaic approach to writing instruction, each paragraph starts with a topic sentence that is followed by a concrete detail (CD), then two sentences of commentary (Comm), then another concrete detail, two sentences of commentary, and ends with a transitional sentence that sets up the next paragraph. Concrete details are described as facts and details that can be seen (I've heard teachers use the explanation that they can be "filmed.") Commentary refers to the writer's opinion about the concrete detail. Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) noted that knowledge of form is one of the tenets of the assumption that general knowledge is sufficient for most composing needs, and that this assumption has driven the practice of writing instruction for many years. In the case of the "Shaffer essay," form is CD, Comm, Comm. Yet, for Tracy, using the specific Shaffer constructs of concrete detail, which are the "facts" and commentary, which is what one says about the "facts," was confounding. She described one way she taught students to present their analysis as:

Well, like I said before, there's no real critical thinking going on until the synthesis of information is done. I think with the analysis and the research paper, it's more clearly delineated to me after that last PC [parenthetical citation], as opposed to the regular essay from the textbook, where it [the analysis] is more integrated throughout... I would love help with that area, with that area of research plus, you know, the commentary. How do we weave that? Because like I said, I've just been having them chunk it at the end, in the intro, conclusion and then at the end of each body paragraph. So to me that's not sophisticated by any means but it is what it is.

To illustrate this, she showed me a student paper which she described as having done a good job of synthesizing information. In this paper, the first two-thirds of a paragraph had sentences that included a parenthetical citation after them. The last two sentences of the paragraph, which she also called commentary, were designated as the analysis. She noted that she wasn't sure if this was an accurate way to teach students about what to cite or how to analyze their research. She elaborated,

If there's something they want to paraphrase, then they have to have the parenthetical citation after it. I say, well, anything (e.g. the analysis) that's going to come after the parenthetical ideally should be woven in. But I tell the kids for purposes of organization, their commentary or their analysis can come after that last parenthetical citation which I don't even know if that's correct.

Influences on practice—what do students' cite and how do I know it's their words? Tracy had many questions about what to cite, how to cite sentences that were “part concrete detail and part commentary,” and how to distinguish between the research about a topic that she may or may not have knowledge of, and the student's own thinking. She felt that she could distinguish between a student's original thoughts (or analysis) when they were writing an essay about a novel that she had also read, but with the research paper she hadn't read the student's sources material and this made distinguishing between the student's synthesis of ideas and potentially plagiarized text a problem. One way she worked to deal with this problem was through approving the topics that they researched so that she had some knowledge of that topic. Although this was less of an issue with the controversial issue research paper than when she let them choose any topic, she still limited them. She also was concerned about the amount of online research

students wanted to use. She noted, "So, it's getting to the point where you say, okay, three [sources] can be on line, one can be text; where it used to be the opposite, you know three text, one online [source]." She felt that students using online sources allowed her less control. It made it a bigger job to check their source material, which she did.

Despite this, she had great confidence that her curriculum and instructional planning was meeting the learning needs of her students, even though she felt occasional frustration regarding her students' preparation in their freshman and sophomore year. However, Tracy operated for the most part in autonomy and isolation and could only make guesses about what her students were and were not assigned to do in earlier grades. She indicated that, "from what I understand, what I've seen, and this is, I'm not trying to disparage anyone, but I'm just not seeing that it [teaching students to write research papers] is being taken as seriously at the ninth and tenth grade levels."

The Valley High School Site Plan reported that over the past several years, teachers, especially ninth and tenth grade English teachers, had worked to increase student literacy. When asked if she was seeing any effect from this effort, she seemed utterly unaware that such an effort had been made and equated a school literacy program to after school tutorials and special programs. She seemed unaware that an effort was being made by classroom teachers to improve students critical reading or writing skills. She professed, "Well, I guess I'm not sure what the question is, because, am I actually, well, I wouldn't be seeing it directly. There might be a residual from what's being taught in the ninth and tenth grade, but I'm not quite sure what you're asking..." When I tried to clarify that I was wondering if she'd seen any increased ability in her student's critical

reading and/or writing skills that she might attribute to the school's increased effort on literacy, she replied:

I know what I do in my classroom, and hopefully everything I do will transition nicely into this end product, which is a research paper. I don't know how else to answer that unless we're talking about after school programs, tutoring programs, that type of thing. It's kind of an ambiguous question, because I guess I wouldn't know if a kid were being tutored, or if he were going to an after school program. Of course, if it's helping him improve his literacy skills, it's essentially going to help him here.

Finally, when I showed Tracy the conceptual map that I created for her (see Figure 4), she indicated that she liked the complexity of the illustration and felt that it represented all of the aspects with regard to her teaching of this one assignment. However, she was concerned that it showed only one small aspect of her as a teacher. In an email she explained,

I think that what you've seen of me and of the other teachers is just a glimpse into what are very dedicated and complex human beings. Every teacher has a certain philosophy as to why they teach. This is integral to understand why we do what we do. This one assignment is just a part of what I do.

In addition to making the above comments, she expressed that her concept map should also reflect how she cared for and regarded all of her students. She stressed, "Yes, I work them hard but I try to be compassionate to each situation even when it's a lot of extra work for me." She worried about those students whom she characterized as "intent

and they want to graduate,” but she was concerned that perhaps they would never have the ability to do high level work. She remarked,

It's just the quality isn't there the critical thinking skills aren't there. And so if it's a kid who has been trying all year long and handing in all their homework and they're at the sixty-six percent what I've been doing, is I've been—and I don't even know if I should do this—but [the English facilitator] said I could... I passed them with an A level [Applied Arts] instead of a College Prep.

Figure 4. Concept map for Tracy

Tracy's instructional focus on the form and correctness of the research paper seemed to conflict with her mimetic beliefs and her stated goal, which was for students to think critically about the topic they were researching. This disconnect caused other conflicts for Tracy in regard to how she viewed herself as a teacher who genuinely cared for her students, and how she sometimes had to compromise her high expectations for some of her lower skilled students. However, because her assignment was inquiry based and many of the research skills were embedded into her curriculum, she had more questions than answers about how to improve student critical thinking skills.

Hilltop High School

Hilltop High School's English department had been the first department at the school that had instituted course performance standards for all English classes. The performance standards fell into three categories: essays, timed writings, and speeches. Research papers fell into the essay category and were required at all grade levels. All essays were scored using a six-point rubric. Research papers were scored using a 100-point scoring guide. Students were required to earn a passing score on all essays and the research papers in order to be finished both with the essay or research paper and with the course. In order to establish common criteria for passing essays, the department frequently collegially scored both samples of writing or met to collegially score whole sets of research papers. Both Evan and Alexandra used the same research assignment, which was a performance standard that students had to pass in order to pass the class.

Based on the notion that not all students mastered skills at the same rate, and that all needed multiple opportunities to pass classes, students who did not earn a passing score on an essay were given multiple opportunities to revise the essay or the research

paper. This requirement was known at the campus as the “Revision Policy.” It also led to a rethinking of the entire remediation system. First, it changed the structure of summer school and other remediation courses so that students were not required to repeat entire classes. They needed to complete the performance standards. Second, since the next level of course was based on the assumption that students had completed or mastered the performance standards, students were not able to enroll in the next level course until the lower level course had been passed. In other words, students could not take sophomore English, until they had passed freshman English.

Both Evan and Alexandra, teachers at Hilltop High School, were conscious that in their eleventh grade English classes they were preparing students to meet a Senior Research Paper requirement in their senior year. Evan taught an after-school junior English class of students who had already taken and not passed their junior year English class. Generally speaking, remediation courses, where students had to pass performance standards were offered either during summer school, or during intersession breaks. It wasn’t the nature of the school to offer entire remediation courses during the school year; however, the school did make one exception to this rule, and that was for junior English. They offered one last opportunity in the fall of each year for students who were seniors and who would otherwise graduate in June, but who had to pass their junior year English the class in order to enroll in Senior English in the spring.

Alexandra’s English class was part of a film and media career path. While there was very little cross disciplinary work that went on in the film and media career path, the two core classes of English, US History, and a number of elective classes a student could take focused their instruction from a film and media studies perspective. For this reason,

Alexandra had moved her instructional focus away from the more traditional American Literature curriculum, to one where students studied argument and rhetorical analysis in the media.

Alexandra – A Focus on Critical Thinking

Vignette. Soft music played in the background as students worked on the class assignment. Directions for the assignment were on an overhead projector and were titled “Journal #8 – Brainstorming and connecting to evidence.” The directions read:

- Write your thesis statement in the center of your paper
- Highlight key ideas in your thesis
- Begin sorting through your note cards for related ideas
- Cluster or list around the thesis, connecting smaller related ideas to larger ones

Alexandra, in her seventh year of teaching, and looking not much older than some of her students, circulated around the room. She was distributing rubber bands so that each student could keep his or her 3 by 5 note-cards organized and together. Occasionally a student would whisper to another, pointing to note-cards or outlines, apparently discussing quietly some aspect of their research. At one point Alexandra asked the class, “How many need a few more minutes to cluster?” About 2/3 of the class raised their hands,” so she said, “OK, you’ll have more time. If you think you’re finished, go back and ask yourself, “Have I used good evidence? Be picky about your evidence.”

She continued to circulate and answer student questions. After five minutes she directed the class, “You should start sorting your note cards into stacks now. Your goal is to have small stacks.” Prompting them to think about their notes, she reminded, “Are you going to have 30 note cards worth of evidence in a paragraph? Look at your note cards,

look at your categories; how are you going to find smaller categories? You need to ask yourself, ‘How does this evidence support smaller ideas? If you have a stack of note cards that is thick, how can you break it into smaller stacks?’”

At the back of the room, two students began whispering to one another. One was explaining to the other how she was planning to organize her evidence to support her argument. She mentioned to the other student that she had one idea that she wants to add to her paper, but “I don’t have enough note cards to support that yet.” Another female student raised her hand and complained that she was “confused.” As Alexandra questioned her, the student struggled, but began to describe the types of information she had gathered and how she was going to organize it. Alexandra noted this and smiled at her. She reminded the student that confusion is part of doing research and as she moved on to the next student she said, “Just trust the process.”

Mimetic beliefs and rhetorical practices. Alexandra, the first of two teachers from Hilltop High School, taught both eleventh grade “junior” and twelfth grade “senior” English. Alexandra had taught upperclassmen during her entire time teaching at Hilltop and had taught nowhere else; she even did her student teacher at Hilltop in the upper grades. She was quite articulate about what she hoped her students would accomplish in writing a research paper, what steps she took as a teacher in preparing and guiding them through the process and why she took the steps that she had. She defined a research paper as follows:

It’s an expository essay with a clear argument, structured much like any other essay that you would write in class would be except it’s not focused just on a piece of literature. You’re not just using one source and analyzing that source. A

research paper shows that you can take a stance, make a claim, and prove your argument utilizing evidence that you have researched, that you have found from different sources....

Alexandra used the framework of the “controversial issue” as the research paper assignment. Students were given a list of “controversial issues” that were quite general. They were allowed to choose an issue from a list or to come up with one of their own. Typical of the broad issues to be researched were topics such as: affirmative action, capitol punishment, or racial profiling. As she explained how she taught students to write this paper, she described a process that was recursive and inquiry based. She asserted that she wanted her students to “construct their own argument” and to provide “evidence” that supported their thesis and their argument.

The research paper assignment revealed Alexandra’s conceptualization of research as an inquiry based, recursive project, which was guided by her belief that there is a relationship between clear thinking and writing (mimetics). Alexandra’s assignment, used language such as “Your argument should include convincing evidence.” She encouraged students to start their research using both outside sources and their own knowledge before they began an investigation.” Fulkerson (1979) noted that teachers who hold a mimetic philosophy have students spend a great deal of time in prewriting and gathering information. While this would be the nature of any research project, Alexandra had conceptualized her entire class not only around students learning about their topic, but primarily around teaching students to read critically in order to learn about their topic. In short, critical reading and thinking were the cornerstones to Alexandra’s instructional plans.

Table 5 shows how Alexandra's research paper assignment required high levels of rigor and intellectual achievement on the part of the students. This assignment would score high using the AIA rubric to assess its rigor, not only because of the assignment itself, but also for how it grew out of the overarching goals of the class.

Table 5. Research a controversial issue Alexandra and Evan

Elements of AIA	Tasks in Assignment	Evaluation
Construction of Knowledge	The assignment asks students to inform, explain, argue, and analyze a noteworthy issue. It asks students to assume a position or stance on the issue and to argue their position in a logical and persuasive way.	High - The assignment ask students to interpret, analyze, synthesize or evaluate information in writing about a topic rather than merely reproduce information
Value Beyond School	The assignment asks them to think of a current development in the news, in culture, from their experiences as a starting point for deciding upon an issue to research	High - The assignment ask students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings or situations significant to their lives.
Disciplined Inquiry	Students have learned Aristotle's persuasive appeals and are expected to use and evaluate their use in this paper.	High - The assignment asks students to draw conclusions, make generalizations or arguments and support them through extended writing.

Note: Based on the scale for Authentic Intellectual Achievement (Sisserson et al., 2002)

Alexandra's interviews, practices, and class handouts revealed strong philosophical beliefs about composition instruction in what Fulkerson (1979) would label mimetics, the belief that there is a strong relationship between clear thinking and clear writing. She had also held philosophical beliefs influenced by rhetoric, which is the belief that the author's purpose and context drives the written work. Interestingly, this notion was most evident when Alexandra talked about how she taught students to read non-fiction texts, not necessarily how she taught students to write them.

Alexandra described how instruction in teaching students to write from sources began on day one in her curriculum. In her interviews, she noted how she and a fellow teacher re-envisioned their classes in order to teach students to read critically. They had decided two years ago to focus "more on teaching non-fiction text early on, really teaching how to understand argument, evidence, what evidence is and how different authors prove their opinions, their claims." She also maintained that starting class with instruction in reading non-fiction essays taught her students how to "dissect the text, how to look at paragraph ideas and what that author's argument is and what kind of evidence they used to support that argument." She noted how this change in her instructional emphasis enabled her students to use the skills they had learned through direct instruction, on their own, when they wrote the research paper:

Well, now since I've shifted from literary base to nonfiction essays, instead of [students] finding all of the sources, for the first few paper's they write, they use multiple sources that I provide. It may be two or three essays [sources] by the same author that we read together. Then they write an essay that links the ideas that are found in all three or four of his essays, depending on how many there

are...so if I kind of hold their hand through the first process and then when we get to the research process, they understand what is required; it's just that they're finding their own sources now. And they need to figure out the main ideas and evidence on their own and use the skills that we did together as a class and apply them individually for their mutual research.

In another interview she noted,

Starting the class with non-fiction essays and really teaching them how to read closely, how to dissect the text, how to look at paragraph ideas and what that author's argument is and what kind of evidence they used to support that argument helps that carry over so that when they're reading their own sources for their research paper, they're continually thinking about their argument.

One might think that with Alex's emphasis on argument, claims, warrants, and evidence, her beliefs would be based in rhetorical philosophy, and there is no doubt that she had been influenced by her relationships with faculty at the local university who reportedly held those beliefs, as well as by the professional development opportunities she'd participated in at the school that were facilitated by university faculty; however, it became evident that she used the devices of argument and persuasion as a means to help students understand the nature of texts so that they would think more clearly about the topic they were researching. In other words, she held a mimetic philosophy. For example, in describing what students did in a research paper, she said,

And I make sure they read the entire source before they do their note cards. You have to read it, you have to understand what the argument is, you have to understand how the author used their evidence, what authorities did they cite, you

know how did they, did they present an opposition? How did they develop it?

Do you feel that their argument's valid? Then decide if what they have to say can help support your stance.

While critical reading and writing with a rhetorical stance requires students to take audience and purpose into account, and while that may have been an underlying factor in how she taught students to read texts analytically, her reasons for having students do this was so that they would understand the issue better in order to use the texts as evidence more convincingly.

In another example of how she described how her instruction guided students to understand their topic better she said,

So I really focus a lot on that point where they're starting to break up their quotes and their evidence into smaller ideas, I told them that you know how do these quotes—what are the connections between these quotes that you have here?

What's the evidence they have in common? What are the main ideas that you see?

And then just break them up based on that, read through them again then start to ask yourself, okay how does this link to what I want to prove? Do I have enough evidence that's going to lend itself to that? And if I have to change anything about my thesis, about my argument, is it going to be based on the evidence that I have?

Again, her intent was to question students so that they made connections among their ideas, the evidence they had collected, and the points they wanted to make.

Task specific ways of teaching writing, community specific ways of teaching reading. In considering the knowledge students needed in order to write a research paper,

Alexandra conceptualized writing instruction from a task-specific approach, although there were elements of her thinking, which implied she may be approaching a community specific approach, which acknowledges that texts are written for specific discourse communities. A writer would have to consider the nature of the discourse community when composing for that community (Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). When I asked her about this, she noted that she agreed that writing required task-specific knowledge, however, she admitted that she didn't have students write a for variety of communities, so that made community-specific writing difficult in a high school environment. She noted, however, that she wanted her students to understand that texts were written for various purposes and audiences as part of teaching them to read critically. However, she remarked that the writing that students did in her class was expository and argumentative in nature, but that it was all done for her, the teacher.

The goal of her instruction was to identify clearly the sub-tasks involved in writing a research paper, which were similar to other writing tasks in her class. However, she also noted that she didn't teach many other genres or types of writing, nor did she subscribe to the idea that there were really rhetorical types of writing, such as description, explication, narration, cause and effect, compare and contrast: those that are usually seen in college readers. Instead she noted that students could use any of those strategies if it suited their purpose. This idea comes very close to the type of thinking that guides those who hold that community specific knowledge is necessary in writing instruction. Additionally, in the focus group interview, Alexandra pondered the place of the research paper in the school's curricula. She noted,

I think there should also be a research paper in other disciplines—to reinforce skills. They're not just learning how to cite information and write sentences; they're learning how to formulate a question and know where to find the information and be able to organize it and explain it in a logical fashion....plus that would force students to access different kinds of sources because if you're writing a paper about science you're talking about primary sources, different types of sources, you know it's expanding their literacy. The same in social studies—there are different kinds of sources and they'd probably learn a lot more about differences in factual evidence.

That she hadn't moved toward adopting a community specific approach to writing instruction in her classroom is not surprising. Smagorinsky and Smith were not optimistic that individual teachers could effectively adopt a community-specific instructional stance. They argued, "Teachers who adopt a community-specific knowledge position are faced with a daunting instructional problem. They must either instruct students to differentiate their writing in seemingly unlimited ways, or be content with having limited influence on student writing." Alexandra had not seemed to have adopted that stance yet.

However, when discussing the skills that she wanted to teach her students, Alexandra repeatedly mentioned community-specific ways of reading for the argument of the text. Her goal was for students to know enough about the topic to formulate their own argument. In fact, she had re-conceptualized her entire curriculum around the notion of reading and understanding argument in text. She commented on the change in her instructional goals:

As far as the skills that I teach, I've moved away from locating theme and symbolism and being able to write a literary based essay, to looking at non-fiction essays and argument and evidence, in different forms of the media. Basically being able to interpret and understand all messages from all different types of text...and especially working with [Aristotle's] persuasive appeals.

Influences of the school environment and colleagues .As mentioned in Chapter 3, Hilltop High School was eight years into developing and implementing a school-wide literacy plan, the heart of which was the senior paper requirement. Over the years, the English Department had developed a shared set of curriculum expectations and practices. Alexandra noted how helpful this was:

I like the fact that we're all following the same structure, because I have to teach seniors too. [For my juniors] I need to prepare them for the next year. But I know they're coming into my class with this set of skills.

She also felt supported by a literacy coach and by the collegiality of the department:

Within our department, it's been wonderful. I mean just the days when she [the literacy coach] comes in with a couple of sample essays and we just go over how to approach teaching the students who wrote these essays. I know we all appreciate that. We don't feel like we're being forced to teach in a different way, but hey here's a strategy. And it helps and it makes your job easier. And our department is willing to do that. We share ideas and share their [student] essays that we found and I think that works well. When she [the literacy coach] started introducing teaching non-fiction texts... I don't want to call them trainings, but

just going through the process. Sharing the process. I know just about everyone does it now.

Whatever belief and knowledge constructs Alexandra operated from, it was clear she was reflective about her practice. She reported that she expected that students would master the skills they had been taught, and she expected them to use them, even if they weren't being graded for it. One example of this was her instruction in *précis* writing [summary writing]. She claimed that she had students write *précis* at the very beginning of her instruction in reading non-fiction texts, but by the time it came to writing the research paper, she stopped collecting them. She reasoned, "So at that point if they don't have that skill, being able to understand argument and summarize argument then and look at how it's broken down then it's not going to matter now at this point."

In truth, Alexandra reported that she had few problems with plagiarism, although that may be because she believed plagiarism was the a result of students' low-literacy skills. She noted, "Students plagiarize, I think, when they feel like they can't say it themselves. They just can't. They don't know how. I think that's the most common form. And so they kind of re-word what they read in their research to make it look like it's their analysis." At another time she mentioned,

I think many times they understand what they're doing [when they plagiarize].

They understand they're copying, and that they should not be doing that. But they're copying these words and by not planning it, they're saying that they're their own words because they don't know what to say about it... Even if they understand how the example links to their thesis idea or they can see how it connects, they don't know what to say about it.

Alexandra added that she had garnered many positive comments from her students about teaching them to read critically non-fiction texts. She described how a formerly reticent student agreed that the instruction was helpful:

I had this student who said to me: “You taught me how to annotate; you taught me that highlighting doesn't do anything. You're just kind of putting color on paper. You have to interact with the text. You have to write in the margins. You have to question what you're reading and that if I'm just naturally writing on the source if I when I go back and look again I realize okay that's where I remember that one quote. Oh there it is because I wrote on it there.”

Interview data, documents and observations all revealed that Alexandra used facilitation rather than a teacher-centered approach to instruction. One class handout that she used titled “Generating Text Ideas” guided students in how to ask research questions about their topic and included the following comment, “This is your first crucial step in the research process. This will also allow me to help guide you in the right direction...” When discussing how she helped students through the initial process of narrowing their topic, she described how she met with each student individually:

They show me what their initial idea is. I sit down with each one of them individually make sure they can verbally explain to me what it is they want to prove. I ask them questions then we, together, refocus their thesis.

In fact, throughout her interviews, when she described how she would teach students a skill, she would pose her directions as a series of questions, in the manner of asking questions of students rather than telling them what to do. For example, in

explaining how she would lead them to examine their research in order to see how it supports their own argument, she broke into a litany of questions that she'd ask students:

I ask them, "What are the connections between these quotes that you have here?"

What's the evidence have in common? What are the main ideas that you see?

Read through them again then start to ask yourself, okay how does this link to what I want to prove? Do I have enough evidence that's going to lend itself to that? And if I have to change anything about my thesis, about my argument, how's it going be based on the evidence that I have?"

This facilitation model did not let students off the hook for skills they were expected to have learned and mastered. She emphasized how her guidance led to her students' self-reflection about their learning. She commented, "I'm here as kind of a guide to just kind of help you [the students] get there but you are responsible for learning these skills, it's up to you. And you need to be aware of what those skills are and then be able to evaluate yourself. And they get that."

Overall, Alexandra believed that she was working toward meeting students' need to learn to read critically and write analytically. When she saw her concept map (Figure 5), she said she was "flattered." As we talked about it, she agreed that she had undergone a paradigm shift several years earlier as she went to some workshops offered by the university and learned more about how to teach students to analyze texts for argument.

Figure 5. Concept map for Alexandra

Evan – Writing as personal expression at a performance based school

Vignette. I walked with Evan and his students as they headed back to class after having spent an hour in Hilltop’s library. While we were there, Evan had reminded me

that this was a “remedial” class, filled with students who had already failed their regular eleventh grade English classes and were taking it over. Rather than have students repeat a class they’d already failed, Hilltop scheduled them into a special class which met after the regular school day had ended. In short, these are not the most enthusiastic English students, yet 20 of them were in class that day and most of them seemed to have been engaged in conducting research when they were in the library.

As students sauntered into the classroom in no particular hurry, Evan rested against a stool at the front of the classroom making small talk and jokes. Once most of them seem to have returned, Evan asked for their attention and announced, “OK. Now get out a piece of paper. You need to write four sentences describing your research process in the library today.” Several students protested and tried to remind Evan that it was a Friday afternoon. Evan was friendly, but consistent, and after a few minutes of writing time he began calling on students to report out how many sources they were able to locate when they were in the library.

One student reported that he found no sources. Evan asked why and the student just shrugged his shoulders. Evan responded with encouragement and a reminder that perhaps the student needed to focus more when he went to the library the next time. The next student, Julio (a pseudonym) reported that he had located 10 sources. When Evan suggested that finding 10 sources in one class period might be a few too many, Julio described why he had so many sources, how each was necessary, and how each was different from the others. Evan smiled, congratulated the student, and noted to the rest of the class that Julio had chosen some quality sources. He reminded the students, “Always

choose quality sources. Quality sources are important. Don't just pick anything," he added, "You need to have good quality sources."

Since it was a Friday afternoon, once he had heard from all the students about their research progress, he had planned to "let students kick back and relax" for the last 10 minutes of class, but due to my presence (he later told me), he made a quick change of plans and announced, "OK! Now imagine that you and this research paper are in a room together." He grinned a little and paused dramatically, "Now think. What type of *animal* is the research paper?" Several students burst out laughing. One student shook his head and muttered, "This is impossible." But overall, the atmosphere was jovial as students cracked jokes about what type of animal their research paper might be. Evan also laughed at their jokes and gently nudged students write about their research paper-animal.

When the students reported out, their metaphors were revealing. One student compared the research paper to the fable of the rabbit and the turtle. She said, "If I rush through this, I will lose. I need to take my time." Another student responded, "This paper reminds me of Wiley Coyote. I'm trying to get away from it, but in the end, it's going to crash down on me." Another student's metaphor mirrored this one. He claimed, "It's an elephant. It's huge." Another student called out, "It's a parrot. It keeps squawking and I can't get away from it." A female student remarked, "It's a hippo. It's an obstacle in my way. I have to do it if I want to graduate." The last student to speak stated emphatically, "It's a skunk. It stinks." All students laughed as did Evan who retorted, "Does that mean you can't get the stink off you?"

As the class wound down, Evan said he agreed with the students. He remarked that yes, the research paper is a big project. He also assured them that he would help them through the process by breaking it into parts so they would be successful.

Expressionist beliefs in a standards based – high accountability school. Like Alexandra, Evan had spent his entire teaching career at Hilltop high school. He too did his student teaching there and was in his sixth year at the time of this study. In those six years, he'd primarily taught freshman English and English Language Learner classes. Evan had also made quite a reputation for himself as a workhorse at the school, often taking on extra teaching assignments. If there ever was an opportunity to teach an extra English class, Evan never hesitated to volunteer to teach it. Teaching the fifth block "remedials," as he called them, was an example of that. A teacher with a full teaching load on the quarter system taught three classes. With a fifth hour class, Evan taught four. It also meant that he was at the school, from 7:50 in the morning, until 5:00 everyday, ending his days with the most reluctant of learners. Given the intense writing demands of Hilltop High School, this was quite an undertaking.

Evan was partially blind in one eye as a result of a childhood accident. He reflected on his partial blindness as fueling his intense desire to prove himself. He also credited it with his discovery of writing as a form of personal expression. He related,

I had this traumatic childhood incident, lost vision in my left eye...at 12 years old I found myself without vision, not being able to connect in a lot of ways, and so I actually struggled for many years to find my own expression, my own way of just understanding things that happen.

Evan described how he discovered writing as a form of expression as a teenager:

A lot of my observations and readings have shown that a lot of trauma creates dramatic art, creates moments inside people who have their lives changed for whatever reason that causes them to grow and to develop. So when I was 12, that happened to me. I had some dark years for a while, so that forced me to look to the more to literature and writing, and mostly poetry. I didn't actually find the expository voice until, I would say, the college years. But in high school, definitely, I was very poetic. That was very important for me.

Since Evan used writing as a way to express himself, he related that he found it difficult to teach writing as a directed activity. He remarked,

I'm teaching kids to write in a way that I feel uncomfortable myself which is by steps, organized. I mean you do this, then you do this, then you do this, when I feel my writing is more free flowing and procrastinating and everything comes together the last minute.

Since the research paper required a great deal of direct instruction in reading, writing, and synthesizing information, Evan struggled to reconcile his own beliefs that writing is a form of expression with the demands of learning to write an academic paper, such as the research paper.

Fulkerson (1979) noted that expressionists not only value writing that is about personal expression; they also desire that writing have an, "interesting, credible, honest and personal voice" (p. 345). Likewise, Evan conceptualized the writing demands of the research paper by comparing them to what he believed were more authentic, personal writing tasks. He reasoned,

[The] academic voice is definitely a formal proper voice. It has more to do with the etiquette of language as opposed to the usage. I mean, what would seem proper as opposed to what would seem dysfunctional. It's not about pure expression; it's more about formal expression.

Because Hilltop High School required a great deal of academic writing of its students, and instruction in academic writing by its teachers, Evan often felt torn between what he felt was expected of him, how he wanted to prove himself as an effective teacher, and what he believed.

He saw himself as being on a journey with his students as they did their research papers. He remarked, "A lot of the students that I've had, they never connected to what their teacher's vision for what this is. I believe that a research paper can be a very subjective thing, depending on who's leading the journey." That students would find a personal connection to the topics they had chosen to examine was of the utmost importance to Evan. In noting how a personal connection to the topic was an important motivating factor, he remarked, "But the hope is that they're actually researching something that they have a moderate interest in so they're satisfying their curiosity, they're fulfilling some intellectual need." Similarly, at another point in the second interview he noted,

But definitely I want them to be affected and be impacted by what they're researching. They have to just get into whatever it is. Hopefully the connection will happen easily but if it doesn't, I mean, I sort of push that connection and the idea that how I express the research process through daily activities, personal example, all these different types of things will help them hook into that. But

definitely if they're not involved in their research topic, I mean, it's going to be a very difficult activity.

Evan tried to reconcile his beliefs about writing being an act of personal expression by compartmentalizing the research paper assignment into two parts. One part of the research process was to make a personal connection with the topic and the other part of the process was taking an opportunity to learn or feed an intellectual curiosity. Still, coming to a clear definition of a research paper was difficult for Evan. He recalled a research assignment he did when he was in high school.

It was a sophomore paper for honors English, honors world history. The teacher, she made us watch this documentary called, "In Search of the Trojan War." So we watched this video. It must have been at least six hours, and we looked at evidence supporting that the Trojan War, the Iliad happened, occurred, and that it didn't happen. And so we had to take all this evidence from that series of videos, and basically construct an argument one way or another.

Similarly, for his students, he noted, "They need to be able to find something, bring it back, then lay it out, and internalize it enough to take a stance on it." He mused,

I think that's a critical skill. But then also I think [this] opens research to many different definitions of what a research paper is. I ask myself, "Is when I watched it, a 6-part video series and took notes, found facts, looked at different points of view, and then brought that together for a persuasive essay, was that a research paper?"

Evan, because he was relatively new to teaching eleventh grade English, had decided to use Alexandra's research paper assignment. Although he had taught students

to write research papers and he shared other research assignments that asked his freshman classes do in the past, most of these assignments he characterized as essays, rather than research assignments because he provided all of the texts students would read for evidence. So to Evan, part of the definition of the research paper, was that students would find their own resources.

Evan clearly viewed research as a form of inquiry. Our final interview took place just as the spring term was beginning and Evan was excited about his first opportunity to teach seniors as they wrote the senior research paper. In this interview, Evan most clearly stated how inquiry and finding the answer to a research question was at the core of what was happening when his senior students wrote a research paper:

for the senior papers, we started the process but the students haven't actually come to the point where they have found that defining question which obviously leads them to the answer to their thesis. What they don't know yet is that they're finding out different things. I was expressing this to my students. The exploration, the discovery is important. In the same way, there's an excitement about learning something you just don't know, that you want to know, which is the answer to a question.

Knowledge for writing. Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) noted that those who argue that task-specific knowledge is necessary in writing instruction hold that “teachers should conduct a task analysis to identify the skills needed for successful performance in a particular writing task and design activities that teach students the appropriate set of strategies” (p. 287). Evan repeatedly referred to the task-analysis strategies he used to teach students to write research papers. The first was breaking the process into steps. For

example, Evan described a research assignment he taught his to his freshman English classes. In this assignment he provided the source texts. He called this assignment a precursor to a larger research paper in which they located their own source material. He reasoned that at first, he provided the source material so that he could break down the whole task into sub-tasks that students could learn. He remarked that he thought it was important to break the research process into a series of developmental steps. Likewise, he also described a strategy he used to teach students to appropriate an academic voice:

Sometimes I will actually have them copy it [a passage] word for word. I use the metaphor of looking out at something from the inside. I want them to feel what an academic sentence feels like, to write it down. If they've never written one for themselves, they don't know what it feels like. If they just took an academic paragraph and they had to copy it word for word, the words, the sentences, the punctuation...then they can sort of enter that world of what does an academic paragraph feel like, and then, the hope is, that eventually one day through other activities, they're going to actually get to the point where they can write their own academic paragraph.

While one might agree or disagree with the efficacy of this strategy, it is clearly a strategy that exemplifies how Evan conducted a type of task analysis. He recognized that one aspect of academic writing students needed to learn was academic paragraphing. He designed a strategy to address that need.

In other ways Evan analyzed the tasks that were required for students to write research papers and devised instructional strategies designed to address those tasks. Many of those tasks were related to the process of writing the research paper. Some of those

processes were related to teaching students how to read and think about the research. He noted how he focused on the following:

the idea that before that they would be exposed to annotating work, hi-lighting, breaking it down...Even if they haven't presented the source material, they need various methods of actually scanning, I'm very big into scanning to where, forcing them to scan something before they actually sit down to read it to where they have a sense of it, and then definitely stressing that research and the world of information that's so large, that they can't possibly know everything, and so looking for specifics on what's related to their topic as opposed to looking...

The task-specific approach to writing instruction allowed Evan to compartmentalize writing tasks thus making it easier to negotiate between his beliefs that writing was a form of personal expression (Figure 6) with the task-specific demands of academic writing. After I showed him his conceptual map, which reflected his expressionist philosophy and the differing expectations of the school focus on academic writing, he noted,

I would say that I have this conflict or disagreement between the two styles, I mean, is it about formalistic writing or is it about personal expression? By compartmentalizing tasks of writing, there's almost the idea that this compartmental writing activity is about personal expression and this compartmental one is about formalized writing and that removes the conflict...I might say this is the creative writing activity and this is what we're accomplishing here, but this is a formal assignment and this is what you're expected to do here. But, you know that this may be the best formal writing you could do, but you

could throw a little bit of creativity in your timed writings too. So by compartmentalizing, it allows me to achieve both my goals and the underlying school writing goals.

Concerns and influences on practice. Evan focused his instruction on the process of finding information, including teaching students to think critically about what they were reading. He remarked, “[Students] have to understand why are you doing this? Why does this process have to be the way it is? Once you have a better understanding of why you're doing it, then there's the how...”

However, while he thought that his students did a good job of finding source material that could support their research, he was concerned that his students didn't read critically enough to use the information well. He noted,

I would say it's one of the more difficult aspects of teaching it [students to read critically] is to get them to make that self judgment. They have the sources by themselves; they're researching and making that judgment on what to do with this information; they've got this book; they've got this section; it's right in front of them; what do they do with it?

He also talked about how he wanted to teach students to address this issue. “[I have students do a] resource review and the article review,” he noted,

I want kids to be able to understand when they're looking at research, what they're looking at. When they find an idea they like, or it's significant, They [should have the] idea of, is this something that I should directly quote? Is this idea something I should paraphrase? Is this something I should write a summary of?

These are, again, clearly instructional aspects that address task-specific needs.

Another example of this in practice can be seen in a simple worksheet he created. (Appendix I.) In this exercise, students read the Hilltop Style Manual, which included a research paper about how to write a research paper. Evan had pulled several quotes from the document and had directed students to place the quotes into a context and explain why or how the quote was significant. This activity served two purposes. First, it gave students an opportunity to work with quote integration and paraphrasing. It also gave them an opportunity to read critically about how to write a research paper.

Reflecting upon his students' struggles caused Evan to constantly refine his curriculum. He noted how he looked at each student as an individual and the act of learning how to write a research paper as a process.

I'm trying to look at the students holistically. I mean, I'm looking at them every single day as they go through this process because just my educational experiences have shown that one single benchmark does not lead to anything. I mean, so what they can write a timed writing essay...it doesn't mean anything else except that they can do that, so I'm trying to look at the process. And so, I mean, I put more into instruction into the process than I do the final product.

He even joked about his inability to find the "perfect curriculum:

I'm looking for that perfect curriculum, but I realize that every time I change it, so there, what is the perfect curriculum? There is no perfect curriculum because I keep changing it. But that's part of the interesting aspect of teaching because you're looking for perfection, but in looking for perfection you're always changing...it's a journey.

Evan reported that one of the biggest influences on his own thinking about how and why to teach students to write research papers were the relationships he had with other teachers on campus. He credited especially other junior English teachers, especially Alexandra, the other teacher-participant from Hilltop, for making him want to be a better teacher.

I have so much respect for what Alexandra accomplishes and what she brings as an educator. It's almost like I'm always measuring what I'm doing in reference to her because of the respect I have for her. So, when I'm thinking about my curriculum and what my curriculum is supposed to accomplish I'm always referencing what she does.

He noted that he was keenly aware of what other teachers at the school did in their classes, and he told how he checked with them regularly. He remarked, "I try semester by semester, year by year, to try and reacquaint myself where I am versus where they are." Since both senior and junior research papers were graded by groups of teachers, he was quite aware of how other teachers taught and what they expected of their students.

He also felt very supported as a teacher and appreciated teaching at a school where there was such a keen emphasis on writing and research instruction. He commented,

I don't have to justify that fact that we do so much writing in my classroom, I mean, it's just understood we do a lot of writing. Some of the successes I've had this term are bringing in things that allow that personal expression and that creativity, but you still maintain the framework here which is the complete support of writing.

Figure 6. Concept map for Evan

Evan's concept map (Figure 6) is presented as a circle in an attempt to represent how he had been influenced by those with whom he taught. A circle also allows for to expression of the potential for conflicts between his beliefs and those of his work environment. The notion that students would have to meet writing performance standards would appear to stand at odds with his beliefs about writing being a form of personal expression. However his conceptualization that writing is task specific seems to mediate

those two philosophies, as he described, sometimes students write for one purpose, sometimes for another. If they write for different purposes, they require different task-knowledge.

When presented with the concept map, Evan agreed that he had, at some points felt conflicts between how he taught students to write and what the school and his peers expected of him. However, he noted that had come to terms with the conflict, as described earlier, by compartmentalizing writing tasks between those tasks that aimed for personal expression, and those that aimed for academic ends. He explained,

Towards the beginning [of my career, there was] much more of a conflict. Now I've come more to terms with it. I created for myself a platform from which I can achieve my individual teacher goals of personal expression, while still having tasks that are the formal writing... There's almost the idea that this (points to one side of the desk) compartmental writing activity is about personal expression and this (point to the other side of the desk) compartmental one is formal and therefore that removes the conflict. Like I'll say [to students] this is the creative writing activity and this is what we're accomplishing here, but this is a formal assignment and this is what you're expected to do here... By compartmentalizing—[I can] achieve both my goals and the underlying school academic writing goals.

Teacher Portraits: Distinctions and Commonalities

The previous section elucidates the individual teacher's conceptualizations, beliefs, and knowledge related to teaching students to write research papers. This section contains a cross case examination related to the two research questions: What are the

beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers? And how do teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influence how they teach students to write research papers?

In this study, I use Fulkerson's four philosophies of composition to explain the beliefs that these teachers had about the nature of writing, whereas I use Smagorinsky and Smith's explanation of the types of knowledge needed to compose texts in order to describe the type of conceptual and procedural knowledge each teacher used to conceptualize their instructional practices.

Research Question 1: What are the beliefs and knowledge of high school English teachers regarding critical reading and writing research papers?

Figure 7 provides a matrix view of all six teachers' self-reported results with regard to the instructional goals of teaching students to write research papers, their beliefs, and their knowledge about writing instruction. It also shows what each teacher reported students as a whole did successfully when writing research papers, as well as what problems their students had when writing research papers.

Teachers who approached teaching research papers as an act of inquiry were more likely to hold mimetic or expressionist beliefs about composition (Fulkerson, 1979). They were also more likely to believe that in order to write well, students needed task-specific knowledge about writing processes (Smagorinsky & Smith 1998), whereas teachers who approached teaching the research paper as an act of gathering and reporting on information were more likely to hold formalist beliefs. They were also likely to believe that students required general knowledge about writing processes.

Table 6. Concept matrix

	Goal of research paper instruction	Beliefs	Knowledge	Successes	Student Problems
Ellen	Investigate and report on information	Mimetic Formalist procedures	Task- Specific Knowledge	Organization	Plagiarism
Janie	Inquire, Investigate and report	Expressionist	Task- Specific Knowledge	Finding information	Making connections
Sylvia	Report Information	Mimetic Formalist procedures	General Knowledge	Making general- izations	Motivation, Following the format
Tracy	Inquiry	Mimetic Formalistic procedures	General Knowledge	Doing parenthetical citations	Critical Analysis
Alexandra	Inquiry Build an argument	Mimetic Rhetorical	Task Specific Knowledge	Understanding argument	Critical Reading
Evan	Inquiry Answer a question	Expressionist	Task Specific Knowledge	Finding good sources	Making Connections

Teachers with mimetic and expressionist beliefs, and who held either general knowledge or task specific knowledge about how to teach students to write, had a more positive attitude toward teaching students to write research papers. They perceived that students' problems with writing well-written papers stemmed from a lack of critical reading and thinking skills. These teachers reported that they had changed or adapted instructional practices to improve these skills. They also had higher expectations that students would produce well-written papers. In other words, they held high levels of self-efficacy about their ability to teach students to write research papers, whereas, teachers who held formalistic beliefs were largely frustrated about teaching students to write research papers and held negative attitudes about teaching students to write researched papers. They had lower expectations that students would produce well written papers and perceived inability to follow the formatting procedures or follow directions were the reasons for poorly written papers. They reported they made changes in their instructional practices in order to improve student skill in formatting the paper following accepted citation guidelines

Research Question 2: How Do Teachers' Beliefs and Knowledge About Critical Reading and Academic Writing Influence How They Teach Students to Write Research Papers?

These teachers' stories revealed that they approached teaching students to write research papers with one of two goals in mind—research as an act of inquiry or research as an act of gathering and reporting information. These teachers' beliefs fell into three categories. Those who held mimetic beliefs yet followed formalistic procedures, those who held expressionist beliefs, and one who held mimetic beliefs influenced by rhetorical beliefs, especially when teaching students to read critically. Additionally, teachers taught

students how to write either following general knowledge procedures or task-specific knowledge procedures.

Figure 7 explores the relationships among teachers' beliefs, knowledge, instructional focus, and goals of the research paper assignment. It also describes how the various belief systems interacted with teachers' perceptions of what their students' problems were when writing research papers, as well as their own ability to teach students to overcome these problems.

Figure 7. Causal network of beliefs, knowledge, practices and outcomes

Mimetic Beliefs—The Relationship Between Clear Thinking and Clear Writing

Four teachers held mimetic beliefs but they differed in important ways. Three of the teachers, Ellen, Sylvia, and Tracy, held mimetic/formalist beliefs and one, Alexandra, held mimetic beliefs, but was influenced by rhetoric. These teachers' belief systems formed the basis for how they instructed, and in some cases caused the reasons why they were dissatisfied with the results of student research papers.

Ellen, Sylvia, and Tracy reported that they thought it was important that students understand why each step of the research process was important. They reported that they believed that if students knew more about their topics, they would write better papers, and they reported that they had students spend a great deal of time gathering information to these ends; yet they approached teaching the research paper from a formalistic perspective. They relied heavily on forms that outlined and gave direction about how to cite information correctly. They gave students outline models to follow and they grew increasingly frustrated that students were not engaged in the process, despite their pushing them, encouraging them, and even threatening them if they did not do the work.

Two of the teachers, Ellen and Sylvia, who held mimetic/formalist beliefs, taught students to write research papers where the goal was to gather information and report on it. Ellen called it "investigative" but the goal was clear. Students were to report on the information they gathered. Both Ellen and Sylvia expressed the most frustration at their students' lack of engagement in the process, and both felt somewhat powerless to do anything more than they were doing to improve matters. Sylvia repeatedly used the line, "I don't know" as she finished explaining some aspect of her instruction making it

appears that she didn't know if what she was doing would have any effect. She also tended to focus on her students' low-literacy skills as a factor that she couldn't overcome.

Tracy, who also held mimetic/formalist beliefs, conceptualized the research paper assignment as an act of inquiry. Like Ellen and Sylvia, she appeared to hold the belief that there was a relationship between clear thinking and clear writing, a main tenet of mimetic beliefs, and had her students spend a great deal of time and effort in the data gathering stages, yet she too used a series of forms and procedures that could only be interpreted as formalistic due to their emphasis on form and correctness. Unlike Ellen and Sylvia, Tracy reported that she had few problems with students following correct citation procedures, although she also reported that she taught citation procedures throughout her class. There appears to be a disconnect between Tracy's instructional practices based both on beliefs and knowledge and her desired goal, for students to inquire and answer a research question.

Sylvia and Tracy approached teaching students to write research papers much like any other essay they would have students write. Essentially following Smagorinsky and Smith's (1992) description of general knowledge approaches, when it came time to write the research paper, they had students pre-write, which in the case of the research paper included sorting and organizing note-cards or note-taking handouts. Then each had students draft an outline. When they went drafted the research paper, they were to follow the outline. Additionally, the outlines themselves tended to follow a popular format for general writing, the five-paragraph essay. Students were given precise instructions that guided the topic of each paragraph in the paper. In fact, the teachers who followed a general knowledge approach assigned a researched essay, as opposed to a research paper.

As described in Sylvia's profile, I distinguish between these two tasks in the following way. A research paper begins with a research question, whereas a researched essay asks students to substantiate a pre-existing opinion or thesis with outside sources. Ellen's, Tracy's and Sylvia's information based papers seem to follow that model. This distinction may also help to explain why Tracy could not get her students to write papers with the type of analysis that she hoped for. Perhaps it was the writing assignment that did not clearly ask them to.

Ellen and Sylvia reported that students seemed unmotivated to do the work required to write the research paper. They also noted that they faced great reluctance on the part of their students to follow the conventions and form of the research paper. Ellen complained that students "just wrote essays. There was no citation." Sylvia noted that her students just didn't seem to want to follow the formatting directions, no matter what she did. Tracy reported that her students had more success with this aspect of the paper, but it's noteworthy that she had students cite work in every paper they wrote. In short, she treated almost every paper as a research paper. Both Sylvia and Ellen reported they felt defeated by the end of the research paper assignment. Ellen laughed or joked about it and hoped that her students would do better next time. Sylvia reacted with anger and frustration. She noted that she thought her department was going to "do something" about what she termed "the research paper mess," but she wasn't sure what the "something" was.

Alexandra seemed to teach from the other end of the spectrum. She too held mimetic beliefs, but had been influenced by recent professional development that taught her about the nature of rhetoric and argument in texts. As reported in the individual

profiles, she had reconceptualized her instruction around teaching students the nature of argument. She began with teaching students about argument in advertising and expected them to use Aristotle's persuasive appeals in their efforts to read texts critically.

At the same time, she believed that there was a relationship between clear thinking and clear writing. Fulkerson, in fact, notes that one aspect of a logical-mimetic approach would be on propaganda analysis, "the detecting of hidden assumptions, emotional appeals, and fallacies in reasoning." Another aspect of a mimetic approach would be having students spend a great deal of time during the pre-writing stages in doing research. While it may seem self-evident that in assigning a research paper, time would be spent in doing research, the nature of the time Alexandra spent in teaching students how to think about their research is especially noteworthy.

The Influence of Knowledge Approaches

Four teachers, Alexandra, Janie, Ellen and Evan, approached writing instruction from a task-specific approach. In practice, that meant that these teachers had either conducted analysis of the types of writing that students had to do in their class or in the case of Evan, talked about the rhetorical strategies that students would use in different papers, such as in a compare and contrast essay. Both Janie and Evan both held expressionist philosophies about the nature of composition. They looked for voice and authenticity in their students' work. As they recognized that students needed to use their voice, they constructed activities, strategies, or practices to meet those needs. In Janie's case, she conceptualized an entire research paper project to fill the desire to allow students to express themselves. Evan described repeatedly how he analyzed different aspects of what students needed to learn in order to write the research paper. He then

developed strategies to address those needs. These strategies typically were descriptive rather than prescriptive in nature. Two examples of this were given in Evan's profile, one in which he had students re-write academic paragraphs so they could get the "feel" of academic language. In another activity, Evan used the Hilltop style manual's sample research paper both as a model of an academic paper, and as a means to teach students how to use quoted material in context.

Although Ellen's formalistic beliefs caused her to focus on form and conventions, she also conceptualized writing from a task-specific stance. This was especially evident when she talked about what students needed to think about when they read. It may also be part of the reason she became willing to change the topic of her research paper to something that students would be more interested in, but she seemed unlikely to sway far from focusing on the form and correct citation in her instruction.

Alexandra seemed to have the clearest vision of what she was doing when she taught students to write research papers and why she did what she did. As reported in the individual teacher's profiles, she was articulate and confident about her teaching. Alexandra held a mimetic philosophy about composition and approached teaching students to write from a task-specific approach. Like Evan and Janie, she had analyzed the tasks involved in students writing research papers, but unlike Evan and Janie, she had come to the conclusion that students needed to read more critically and analytically in order to write more clearly. It's also interesting to note that Alexandra also described task-specific knowledge approaches to teaching students to read. Smagorinsky and Smith (1992) indicated that merely being able to generally read and comprehend texts does not guarantee that one will have a meaningful transaction with a text. Instead, the genre of

the text determines how it ought to be taught. This also holds for community-specific approaches to writing texts which argue that in understanding the nature of a rhetorical argument, one must understand the context in which the argument exists. Interestingly, although Alexandra had given a great deal of thought to how students ought to be taught to critically read texts, this did not extend to how she taught them to write texts. For the most part, although she encouraged them to construct an argument, and to support that argument with evidence, she taught them to write a relatively standard paper, with an introduction that ended in a thesis sentence, body paragraphs which started with topic sentences and which supported the thesis, and a conclusion, which summarized the argument and restated the thesis.

Summary of the Findings

It seemed clear that, at least for the limited number of participants in this study, there was a relationship between formalist beliefs and a general knowledge approach to writing instruction. Teachers who taught from both formalist and generalist stances were least satisfied with their practice and reported the most frustration with their students' inability to follow formatting directions. Those who taught from a task-specific stance felt greater satisfaction with their practice, but still had concerns and questions about how to teach students to read critically for the purpose of answering a research question. Finally, Alexandra, who taught from a mimetic and task-specific approach, seemed to have the greatest satisfaction with teaching students to write research papers. She also exhibited the most confidence that she was teaching students the skills they needed in order to write good research papers.

Finally, one factor seems to have had a great influence on teachers' instructional practices, and that factor is the school site itself. Both Alexandra and Evan taught at a school site that had a shared set of conventions practices, epitomized in the Hilltop Style Manual, and which emphasized research across grade levels and disciplines. Alexandra and Evan did not have to spend as much time teaching basic formatting and research paper conventions in their eleventh grade classes because students had started learning them in their freshman year, not only in their English classes, but in some of their other content area classes as well. Although both admitted that students would cite incorrectly occasionally, it wasn't their primary concern. Not having to teach formatting conventions allowed them to focus on critical reading and academic writing skills.

CHAPTER 5

Alverman (2001) held that effective adolescent literacy instruction must address issues of self-efficacy and engagement such as developing students' abilities to comprehend, discuss, study and write about multiple forms of text. Alverman also asserted that effective literacy instruction for adolescents must be embedded in the curriculum and address differences in students' abilities. Also, effective adolescent literacy instruction must teach students to read through a critical literacy lens and must involve them in higher level thinking about what they read and write. It follows that inquiry-based research paper assignments, which involve students in critically reading all types of texts, would be central to any effort to improve adolescent literacy.

Much has been similarly written about improving secondary students' academic literacy (Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002). The Intersegmental Council in the report *Academic Literacy* noted, "Once college-bound students reach the last two years of high school, their teachers should engage them in writing tasks that demand analysis, synthesis, research, and critical thinking skills to extend students' writing abilities" (p. 47). For high school students, the work involved in writing a research paper is arguably the pinnacle of academic writing. While some may argue that not all students go to college, it seems evident that given the current literacy demands that society places on all individuals, that the critical reading and academic writing skills embedded in writing of research papers would benefit all students if they are to read critically, analyze and synthesize information in a democratic society.

A student's ability to compose a well-written research paper is evidence of his or her independent ability to read critically and write academically. For these reasons,

research papers were chosen as a context within which critical reading and academic writing skills were examined in order to more fully understand the complexities of why instruction in this type of assignment does not always achieve the desired effect, (e.g. students being critical readers, thinkers, and writers of texts).

Therefore, the fundamental purpose of this study was to investigate factors that influenced how high school teachers taught students to write research papers. Among those factors investigated were teachers' philosophical beliefs about the purpose of composition, as described by Fulkerson (1979), and teachers' beliefs about the type of composition knowledge, as described by Smagorinsky and Smith (1992), needed for students to compose a research paper. The findings of this study revealed that the teachers who participated in this study conceptualized research in one of two ways—as an act of inquiry or as an act of investigating and reporting about information. Additionally, teachers who embedded critical reading of non-fiction instruction into their curriculum were more likely to report that they were satisfied with the papers their students wrote than were the teachers who either did not teach students to read critically non-fiction texts or who offered instruction in critical reading only when they were teaching students to write research papers. Other factors played into teachers' conceptualizations, and those included their own experiences with writing and teaching students to write research papers, as well as the school community's emphasis, or lack of emphasis, on the importance of writing research papers.

In addition, most of the teachers who participated in this study held philosophical beliefs that could be described as mimetic, which means that they believed that there was a relationship between how much students knew about a topic and how well they wrote

about it. In some cases, the mimetic philosophy influenced instructional practices. Such was the case of Alexandra who planned lessons so that her students would have ample opportunity not only to learn more about a topic that they had chosen based on their interest, but to pose and repose research questions throughout the process as they integrated new learning into existing knowledge. However, several teachers, while holding mimetic philosophies, operated according to a formalist philosophy, which meant that their instructional practices, including how they evaluated papers, centered on the form and correctness of the piece. This aspect of the study seems to support Lee's (1998) study of teachers in Hong Kong, who professed that they wanted clear thinking in their students' writing, yet graded papers mostly according to form and correctness. Additionally, teachers who held expressionist philosophical beliefs struggled to maintain a balance between their desires for their students to be engaged in their research from a personal point of view and the required conventions of the research paper.

Finally, while all the teachers who participated in this study categorized the teaching of a research paper into steps, tasks and procedures, some held a general-knowledge stance with regard to the type of knowledge about composition students needed to write research papers; others held a task-specific stance. Those who held a general knowledge stance typically taught the research paper as if it were an essay except that in this case, students used more than one source to support their thesis. The general knowledge teachers also tended to rely on the same formulaic models for essay-writing instruction that they used when they were teaching the essay. In other words, they prescribed for students what type of information would go in each paragraph. While it is not only questionable whether a formulaic approach to essay instruction is in and of itself

an effective instructional model, it seems evident that following such a form would allow for even less inquiry or less synthesis, since the focus is on filling the paragraphs with the correct information, rather than building an argument and supporting the argument with effective claims. The only difference between other essays the general knowledge teachers assigned in class and the research paper was that in the research paper, students needed to follow the conventions of citation.

On the other hand, those who held a task-specific stance tended to consider that each of the parts, or sub-tasks of the research paper, offered instructional opportunities that were specific and driven by the tasks involved. They were more also more likely to teach students to read critically. In teaching students to read critically, they also assumed a task-specific knowledge approach in that they taught students that the research paper was a persuasive paper, and showed students models of other persuasive essays.

Alexandra went one step further and had begun to adopt a community-specific approach, especially with regard to reading instruction. She reported that she taught students to be aware of how the author's intent and intended audience for a piece of writing influenced how the author developed his or her argument.

Defining the High School Research Paper: Inquiry or Investigation

The teachers who participated in this study described their processes of teaching students to write research papers in terms of various steps and procedures. This is not surprising given the complexity of the tasks involved in teaching students to write this type of paper. Kantz (1990) described this complexity as a series of subtasks, and it appears that these six teachers, in recognizing this complexity, attempted in some fashion

to break down the process of writing a research paper into a series of sub-tasks that could be categorized into four general categories—information gathering, critical reading, writing, and conventions—which are further elaborated in Figure 9. Teachers placed varying instructional foci on each of the aspects.

The amount of attention teachers paid to instruction in any of the four quadrants seems to be relative to their own conceptualizations of the reasons for doing research. Teachers who conceptualized the reasons for conducting research and writing a research paper as an act of investigating and reporting on information reported that they felt it was important to spend their instructional time on practices in the first and fourth quadrants—in information gathering and conventions; whereas teachers who conceptualized the reasons for writing a research papers as an act of inquiry reported that they also felt it was important to spend instructional time teaching students to read critically.

Table 7. Four aspects of teaching the research paper

<p><i>Information Gathering</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use search strategies • Have information literacy • Locate information and evidence • Select information and evidence • Explore topics • Evaluate sources • Take notes 	<p><i>Critical Reading</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use pre-reading skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Use prior knowledge ✓ Use concept & academic vocabulary • Identify the argument of a text • Identify appeals • Evaluate the argument of a text • Use outside sources to evaluate an argument • Use multiple sources in creating an argument in response to a research question • Integrate others' ideas with own.
<p><i>Writing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop research questions • Record information • Summarize and annotate • Construct an argument • Organize • Integrate source information • Integrate others' ideas with student's own. • Use academic/formal language • Draft full texts 	<p><i>Conventions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format papers correctly • Use proper citation forms • Report referenced materials following proper conventions.

Teachers who coupled either expressionist or mimetic philosophical beliefs with task specific knowledge about writing instruction (e.g. Alexandra, Janie, Evan, and Ellen) were more likely to have implemented other instructional practices designed to improve students' critical reading of non-fiction texts. Interestingly, of this group, only Ellen conceptualized the research paper as an act of investigating and reporting on information; however, she also indicated that she saw the need to change that. It was unclear whether or not she would change either the instructional focus of the research paper assignment or her pedagogical beliefs and knowledge without support.

Through this study it became evident that, as Brent (1992) argued, we need to have a better definition of what it means to do research in English. A possible way to define what it means to do research may lie in Langer's (1993) work. Langer reported that the underlying questions which English teachers have toward the discipline ask students to identify their own personal responses to the texts they read, develop further interpretations of their responses by exploring multiple perspectives, and to also consider multiple implications of those interpretations. If this is so, then research papers in the discipline of English, may be well-served if they were constructed to address those questions. It certainly seemed apparent that the disciplinary foci of some of the English teachers who participated in this study was for their students to address the underlying questions as laid out by Langer. For example, Ellen, who wanted students to research an American author, expressed that when she assigned students to read a work by the author, she hoped they would identify their own personal responses, and then would further develop those responses by investigating other perspectives and other interpretations. However, her instruction approach, which focused on the form and correctness of the

final product, seemed to impede or interfere with instructional time that might otherwise have been spent on tasks that were more aligned with her mimetic philosophy.

In other cases, the research paper assignments seemed to meet the disciplinary goals of disciplines other than English. For example, Langer (1993) noted that history teachers were oriented toward identifying and contextualizing a particular content and in refining an understanding of the content from multiple perspectives. The teachers who taught students to research a controversial issue seemed to have that goal in mind. They wanted students to understand and contextualize a controversial issue from multiple perspectives in order to take an informed stance on it. Likewise, Janie's research assignment, which asked students to research an event from American history from three perspectives, also seems to address a social science focus. The nature of the disciplinary foci, whether it be English or Social Science or another discipline is not necessarily an issue, unless it creates a mismatch between what a teacher communicates explicitly as the goals of the assignment with those that he or she implicitly hopes that the students' work achieves.

Factors Influencing Conceptualizations

Other aspects of teachers' beliefs and knowledge influencing their conceptualizations and practices with regard to teaching students to write research papers revolved around organization of the paper as a whole and quote integration activities. For the most part, these activities tended to be prescriptive in nature. An example of this lies in Sylvia's prescribing what type of information might go into each section of the controversial issue paper she assigned, or when Ellen prescribed the four sections of the American author paper. Both of these prescribed ways of telling students what to include

did not seem to help students understand how to develop an idea or further an argument. In both cases, it seemed to invite students to merely report information. Both Sylvia and Ellen sadly reported that they thought students did just this, but neither Sylvia or Ellen seemed to recognize the relationship between the outlines they provided as guidance and the resulting papers their students wrote.

Additionally, several of these teachers had appropriated the Jane Shaffer language of concrete detail and commentary. In most cases, it seems that these designations confounded teachers' conceptualizations about plagiarism and citation. In Shaffer terminology, concrete details are facts. But this simplistic way of labeling parts, or sentences in a paragraph, lead teachers to questions that they are often unable to answer. For example, Is a quote a fact? Is it always a concrete detail? When facts or quotes are used as commentary, how are those handled? How are complex sentences that may include both a concrete detail and commentaries cited? For the most part, these two concepts of concrete detail and commentary seemed to confuse teacher's thinking about what and how to cite information and how to distinguish between source material information and student analysis.

The research literature describes how researchers across disciplines follow very similar models in reporting their research (Russell, 1991). Teachers need to heed these models for teaching students to report on their research. Although most high school English teachers are not researchers, they need to become aware that when they ask students to write a research paper, they are referring to a genre that does exist both across the academic disciplines and within each discipline. In this genre, researchers pose questions or search for "truths." The high school research papers that teachers assign

often seem to be essays of justification, in which the student is expected to provide a thesis and justify it with the information they have located from other sources, rather than following the model of the research paper genre in which students, as researchers, pose questions and then attempt to answer them.

Implications For Instruction and Professional Development

The findings and lessons learned from this research study lead to several implications for instruction as well as for professional development. First, it would be more productive if teachers treated student research paper assignments as acts of inquiry, the questions from which emerge from course content. Second, research requires knowledge of discipline-specific thinking. Conceptualizing of research in this manner would allow teachers to address the conventions and critical reading within the context of the overarching questions that drive inquiry in the discipline. Third, when critical reading and academic writing skills are embedded into and across the curriculum, teachers can attend to instructional needs related to critical reading and academic writing. Finally, if teachers are to discover the discipline-specific questions that drive their discipline, professional development opportunities should provide teachers with opportunities to, time to plan inquiry-based research papers and occasions to work collegially to embed critical reading skills into and across the curriculum. Further discussion of these four implications follow.

Treat Research Papers As Acts Of Inquiry That Emerge from the Content

The research literature informs us that academic researchers start their research from their own knowledge base, from their own interests, from their own research libraries (Russell, 1991). Fundamental to this ideal of inquiry is knowing enough about a

topic and its content area to know which questions are worth asking. Also important is the research assignment as presented to students. Sisserson, Manning, Knepler, and Jolliffe (2002) presented a framework for considering the intellectual rigor of a task. It was clear that some of the research assignments, as they were presented to the students, placed greater emphasis on those factors, which they argued would lead to a more authentically and intellectually rigorous task. The factors put forth by Sisserson, et al, mirror the type of thinking that academic researchers do when conceptualizing and conducting their own research; namely, the assignment asks students to connect their learning to situations significant to their lives, and the assignments require that students construct knowledge and conduct disciplined inquiry.

Teachers who participated in this study, for the most part, did not conceptualize that students should experience either conducting or reporting on research in the same manner that academics do. As Russell (1991) noted, academics conduct research on questions that arise from their own interests. While it may be an unrealistic expectation that in high school classes, where the goal is for students to learn new content and where they have an admittedly limited knowledge about an area of study, students would have the deep content knowledge needed in order to ask questions of the field of study; however, it seems reasonable that students would be more motivated and interested if they were allowed to choose their research questions, even if confined by the topic assignment. It also seems reasonable that a research paper field of study should grow out of course content, once a knowledge base, even a limited one, has been established through the course content and should cause students to have questions. While in no case did the course research paper grow out of an existing knowledge base, one teacher in this

study, Alexandra, did go to great effort to give students an opportunity to learn first about their topics before they starting asking research questions. Once they had acquired some information about the topic they were researching, they were given opportunities to ask questions. Alexandra reported that she worked closely with students as they asked these questions and gave them guidance and support about which questions would be researchable and answerable. Throughout the research process, students in Alexandra's class were given opportunities to reform and revise their questions. This process of teaching research as a recursive, vital process seems more like the process that academic researchers follow as they pose research questions. In the other cases, teachers reported that they had students write their thesis statement early on and were instructed to find information in order to prove their thesis.

The differences between how academics write and report research and how teachers instructed their students to write and report research was most evident when we discussed how students were taught to write research papers. Russell noted that academic research is reported in much the same way, in five sections—the introduction, the background (or review of the literature), the methods, the results, and the discussion. None of the teachers in this study asked students to report their information in this manner, although several gave students outlines that covered the sections of the paper. In most cases, it seemed that these teachers assigned their students to write reviews of the literature or to review the background information about a topic. This is not necessarily a poor course of action. Writing a clearly constructed literature review is not a simple task. However, if teachers could define the research papers they assign as such, when it is the

intent of the paper to investigate and report, it might help teachers better understand and define what their expectations are with regard to the research paper.

Additionally, even though teachers had differing conceptualizations of what it meant to do research, they all had students present their research papers as essays rather than the way research is most often reported (e.g., introduction, background, method, results, discussion). Although all six teachers provided students with instructions about how to write the paper, some instruction was more formulaic than others. However, even the least formulaic models described the internal features of writing the research paper in rather formulaic terms. For example, all teachers required that students write the introduction with a thesis statement at the end. In truth, this may be an accurate way to represent what happens in an academic paper. Sutton (2000), drawing on the work of linguist John Swales, who analyzed how academic introductions make four “moves,” described how student academic paper introductions can do the same thing. In brief, he describes how student introductions should first begin by establishing the significance of the topic; second, briefly summarize relevant information related to the topic; third point out a gap or possibly pose a question as to whether previous interpretations are reliable or valid; fourth make clear that the rest of the paper will present the student’s original research to fill the gap pointed out in step three. Perhaps having students end an introduction with a thesis statement is not so far off the mark, but requiring that all introductions end with a thesis statement certainly is more prescriptive than the descriptive way Sutton advocates teaching it.

Finally, high school English curriculum is both an ill-defined and well-defined field. In the state of California, content standards exist for math, science, social sciences

and reading/language arts. While the math, science, and social science standards define the content to be taught in those disciplines, for the most part, the reading/language arts standards define the skills by which contents are learned and used. Although the reading/language arts document asserts that it is “everyone’s job to teach students to be literate,” in practice in high schools the reading/language arts standards are the domain of the English departments. In other words, the content of English (the what) is ill-defined; the reading, writing, listening and speaking skills to be used to learn the content (the how) are well-defined. It is notable that in the case of the research paper almost the opposite is seen. In the case of the six teachers who participated in this study there was some agreement about the topic of the research paper. With the exception of Janie, who assigned a historical research paper, these six teachers taught students to write one of two topics, either a controversial issue paper or a report about an author. In other words, there was some agreement about the content. Where they differed was in the intent of the paper, how to teach it, and the skills to be focused on, all of which are outlined, quite specifically, in the state standards. This seems contrary to Grossman (1989) and Grossman and Stodolsky (1995) assertion that there was little agreement about the content of secondary English curriculum.

Recognize Research Papers as a Discipline-Specific Genre

Some aspects regarding how to present research ought to remain consistent across the disciplines; however, each discipline needs to make more transparent what the overarching questions are that guide the inquiry. If high school English teachers want to teach a discipline-specific paper, they would be well served to define what the discipline-specific guiding questions are and how they may differ from other disciplines. A deeper

recognition on the part of teachers of the underlying questions to which they are drawing their students' attention would seem to help them refine the type of critical thinking they want students to do in the research paper, a skill which most of these teachers saw as lacking.

While some teachers seemed to orient students' attention to English discipline-specific questions, be they English specific or in some cases social studies specific, there appeared to be disconnects between this and the reasons they communicated to students for why they were writing a research paper. In many cases, it appeared that the primary reason communicated to students was to cite sources correctly. In no case, whether this was either the implicit or explicit goal of the paper, did the teachers express that they were pleased with the outcome. This may be because the reasons for following citation conventions are de-contextualized. As I examined the data from this research, I had to consider my own purposes for citing information in my research. In most cases, my reasons and the reasons given to students are vastly different. As an academic writer, I cite sources to show that my work is trustworthy, that it has authority, that I have a basis for the questions that I ask, and that others whose work has come before mine have informed my work and my ideas. With the exception of Alexandra, who repeatedly spoke of texts as evidence that would support an argument, teachers did not describe to students the reasons for citing others' work in this manner. An example of this was Ellen's story about the student who cited himself and who admitted that he'd been studying Ayn Rand "all his life." The question should have been, "How have you studied her? What have you read? How have these things helped your form an opinion." Rather than, "You are not an

authority yet.” Both the teacher’s and the student’s responses indicate that the idea of intellectual authority was incompletely understood.

Unfortunately, too many English teachers do not come from research backgrounds; they are years from the seminar papers they wrote in college and too few have reflected upon their own research practices, even when they had completed a Masters Thesis. All these teachers, at some level, wanted their students to solve their research question or prove their thesis. This seems to indicate some level of understanding about the act of doing research. Yet the focus in most of these teachers’ beliefs and instructional practices was to get students to manipulate or use the research to “fit” the thesis. To this end, most of these English teachers assigned students researched essays, regardless of whether the teacher conceptualized the act of doing research as inquiry or investigation and reporting.

All teachers mentioned that they had problems with student plagiarism; however, teachers with different philosophies saw the issue of plagiarism differently. Teachers who had formalist beliefs tended to see that student problems with plagiarism came as a result of students not being motivated or interested in following the rules for formatting conventions. Sylvia and Ellen, both of whom either had formalist beliefs or who taught according to them, mentioned this issue repeatedly throughout the interviews. Each expressed that she was quite frustrated about this issue. Both noted that no matter how many times they taught students the rules for when to parenthetically cite, students frequently did not adhere to the rules. Ellen also noted that students downloaded and used book summaries rather than read the assigned novel. Both of these sets of problems related to student plagiarism seem to ignore or simplify the reasons that academic papers

cite information to begin with. In fact, both teachers gave rather superficial if not incorrect directions about what to cite and when. Neither teacher introduced the idea that, in addition to issues of academic honesty and integrity, proper citation lends authority to a paper.

Embed Critical Reading and Writing Skills into the Curriculum

The school site itself also seemed to play an important role in influencing teachers' conceptualizations about teaching students to write research papers. It seems obvious to report that school with a focus on teaching students to write research papers would have developed a cohesive and integrated plan for teaching students to write them, such as at Hilltop's teachers Alexandra and Evan. Although they held very different philosophies about the role of composition instruction—Evan leaning toward expressionist philosophy and Alexandra toward a mimetic/rhetorical philosophy—both had included instruction in critical reading of non-fiction texts as part of their class curriculum. This appears to have occurred as a result of the school's focus on integrating critical reading instruction into the English curriculum. They both recognized that the critical reading and thinking and academic writing skills students needed to complete a complex task, such as an independent research paper, could not be taught only in the context of the one assignment if students were to achieve some level of mastery.

The teachers at Northern seemed to be working toward the goal of including more non-fiction critical reading into their curriculum, although they had just recently begun to discuss incorporating the strategies across the curriculum. Neither had the site's Literacy Focus Group garnered support from teachers across the disciplines to make curricular agreements which would support the teaching of critical reading and academic writing

across or even within the disciplines. Without such a framework, a teacher like Ellen, who is considering changing the nature of the research paper assignment, may change the topic of the assignment. As with other teachers in this study who were dissatisfied with the research papers that their students wrote, Ellen thinks that if she just changed the topic of the research paper, then her students would be more engaged and would produce better work. While some topics may elicit higher student motivation than others, merely changing topics seems to gloss over other real factors that may be contributing to students inability to write research papers, namely teachers' misunderstandings about writing the research paper genre itself, other instructional practices that do not include instruction in teaching students to read critically, or focusing instruction on the formatting and convention aspects of writing a research paper, rather than on inquiry and answering research questions, as opposed to reporting on information found.

Still, there is much promise for schools like Northern High School who adopt the goal of implementing critical reading instruction of non-fiction texts into the curriculum, not only in English classes, but in all disciplines. Even though Northern's motivation for including reading comprehension instruction into the curriculum stemmed from the State's testing emphasis on reading non-fiction texts, both Ellen and Janie had recognized that their students' limited skill in reading non-fiction texts was evident when they wrote research papers. The department's focus on teaching students to paraphrase and summarize had also focused teacher's attention on how these skills also applied to students' ability to write research papers.

It is both curious and worrisome that a school site, such as Valley High School, which had been labeled as being an underperforming school site and which had

purportedly indicated that it had gone to great lengths to train its teachers to improve student literacy, had two teachers who felt that they worked in such isolation and that one of them did not consider it her job to teach students to improve these skills. This seems to speak to the emphasis on discrete skill building and “covering” of standards that is prevalent in many of today’s professional development programs. This focus on coverage and teaching to the test seems to exclude instructional planning for authentic, academically rigorous assignments, as well as excluding time for teachers to come to agreements about what constitutes rigor in their assignments.

It became evident that teachers who focused on information gathering, reporting and using conventions correctly were most frustrated by their students’ apparent inability or unwillingness to follow the rules. It is in the translating of ideas into visible language where the issue of automaticity with regard to writing occurs. The beginning or inexperienced writer's short term memory may become overburdened with the demands of spelling and grammar, or in the case of a research paper, the form and function of citations. This may be especially true when those conventions are seen as extrinsic to the act of writing. At this point, the writers may be focusing so much attention on the correctness of the piece that they become less able to communicate the ideas they may have about the topic or how they are addressing the rhetorical task.

Having students write researched papers also shines a light on the very real problem of critical reading of non-fiction texts. All six teachers recognized that their students had difficulty reading texts critically and had problems integrating source materials for the purpose of supporting a point of view or using source materials as evidence to support an argument. Several teachers had implemented instructional

practices to meet that need. Those, such as Alexandra, who had made instruction in critical reading of non-fiction texts part of their curriculum, reported that they believed it was having a positive influence on the final product.

When there were mismatches between beliefs and practice, teachers became frustrated. In some cases, it became the students' fault that they wouldn't follow directions or would not do the work required of them. Some teachers would complain that students were not willing to do the work, were disengaged from the process, or in some instances were simply incapable of doing the higher level work. One implication for instruction with regard to teaching students to write research papers is not to treat the issue of citation as if it belongs only to research papers as a separate genre. The issues related to intellectual property are abstract. Students need to learn that citing source material lends authority to their argument. It does not make their argument. They should learn and incorporate this notion of academic authority consistently from early in their education, so that the function of and reasons for citation are clear.

Provide Teachers With Opportunities to Plan Inquiry-based Research Papers and to Consider the Overarching Questions that Drive their Discipline

It seems obvious that teachers need time to plan, organize, and reflect on their practice, and that those teachers who have those opportunities become more effective. However, the need for giving teachers time to plan inquiry-based research papers and for teaching students to write for complex purposes seems at odds with the current educational/political movement toward accountability and high-stakes testing. Much current professional development aimed at secondary teachers seems focused on strategies teachers can use to prepare students to pass high-stakes and other standardized

tests. What much of this professional development seems to ignore is that students who can read critically and write academically tend to do well on these tests and on college entrance exams.

Directions For Further Research

In many respects, this study gives only a limited glimpse into the conceptualizations and pedagogical decision-making of teachers and was limited to one, albeit one important, academic assignment that required high ability levels to read critically and write academically. In this study, I examined how factors, including but not limited to beliefs and knowledge, influenced teacher thinking and pedagogical decision-making when they were teaching students to write research papers. The findings of this study entertain the notion that teachers who simultaneously held either mimetic or expressionist beliefs, a task-specific knowledge stance, and other pedagogical knowledge so that they conceptualized the research paper assignment as an act of inquiry were also engaged in teaching students how to better read critically and write academically. However, it did not examine how teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influenced student learning of such.

More research is needed if we are to understand how teachers' beliefs and knowledge about critical reading and academic writing influences student learning, especially the beliefs and knowledge of high school teachers. While some studies have been conducted in this field, they are largely concerned with freshman college composition students and their instructors. Research that examines how high school teachers' beliefs influences students' understanding of inquiry would inform this field of study, as would examinations of high school students' perspectives of what they were

taught when learning to write research papers. Additionally, a research study that examined which specific teacher beliefs and/or knowledge are likely to positively influence students to think like academics would be useful.

Finally, Hilltop and Valley high schools taught highly diverse student bodies and the students in teachers' College Prep English classes represented that diversity. While it was not an explicit research question of this study, there existed an underlying question regarding the learning needs of students who were English Learners, who came from low-socioeconomic situations, or who spoke and wrote non-standard forms of English that remains difficult to answer. For the most part, teachers did not appear to consider that the critical reading, or academic writing problems the students in their classes were having was an academic language acquisition issue (Montano-Harmon, 1991). The teachers may have considered meeting the needs of the diverse populations in their classes when they assigned content (e.g., they looked for authors or works that represented diversity), but they did not seem to consider that their students also needed to instruction in order acquiring academic discourse. While did not specifically ask questions about teachers' beliefs and knowledge related to the discourse acquisition issues of their diverse student populations, neither did teachers reflect on this issue unprompted. This is a concern given the ethnic diversity I saw represented in their classes, especially at Valley High School where over 35% of their student population was Hispanic, 11% were African-American and 21% had been designated English Learners. If students in college-prep English classes are truly being prepared to attend college, then their teachers' instructional practices ought to meet the needs of those students, yet in these teachers, it did not seem to be an instructional issue. A study which examines how

the beliefs and knowledge of teachers with regard to teaching critical reading and academic writing to students whose home language is not mainstream English would greatly inform the field of academic and adolescent literacy.

Researchers have defined what good readers do so that effective reading instruction can teach students what good readers do (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Others have described how a focus on professional development and a school-wide focus on improving literacy instruction practices can improve teacher practice and deepen teachers' understandings of when and why specific literacy instructional practices are appropriate (Farnan, Harris, Hays, & Fisher, 2003). It follows that effective critical reading and academic writing instruction in an academic genre such as a research paper would be well served by following similar models.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, P. A., Schallert, D. L., & Hare, V. C. (1991). Coming to terms: How researchers in learning and literacy talk about knowledge. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(3), 315-343.
- Alvermann, D. E. (2001). *Effective literacy instruction for adolescents* (Executive Summary and Paper Commissioned by the National Reading Conference). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Angrosino, M., & Mays de Perez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Second ed., pp. 673-702). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Applebee, A. (1984). Writing and reasoning. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(4), 577-596.
- Applebee, A. (2000). Alternative models of writing development. In R. Indrisano & J. Squire (Eds.), *Writing: Research/Theory/Practice*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Behar, R. (1996). *The Vulnerable Observer*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bizzell, P., Herzberg, B., & Reynolds, N. (2000). *The Bedford bibliography for teachers of writing*. Retrieved September 9, 2003, from <http://www.bedfordstmartins.com/bb/history.html>
- Braithwaite, J. (1999). *Does it matter what I think? - An exploration of teachers' constructions of literacy and their classroom practices*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Lahti, Finland.
- Brent, D. (1992). *Reading as rhetorical invention: Knowledge, persuasion, and the teaching of research-based writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Brockman, W. S., Neumann, L., Palmer, C. L., & Tidline, T. J. (2001). *Scholarly work in the humanities and the evolving information environment* (143 Reports--Research). District of Columbia: Council on Library and Information Resources, Washington, DC. Digital Library Federation.

- California Dept. of Education. (1999). *Reading/language arts framework for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Sacramento: California Dept. of Education.
- Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (Third ed., pp. 255-296). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Clifford, G. J. (1987). *A Sisyphean task: Historical perspectives on the relationship between writing and reading instruction* (Technical Report No. 7). Berkeley and Pittsburgh: National Center for the Study of Writing.
- Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (2002). What urban students say about good and bad teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 18-22.
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (Third ed., pp. 205-242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. New York,: Oxford University Press.
- Farnan, N., Harris, C. D., Hays, L., & Fisher, D. (2003, December 2, 2003). *The relationship between professional development and teachers' use of literacy strategies to enhance students' comprehension in content area reading*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.
- Fearn, L., & Farnan, N. (2001). *Interactions: Teaching Writing and the Language Arts*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4).
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Second ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fulkerson, R. (1979). Four philosophies of composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 30(4), 343-348.

- Gallagher, C. J. (2002). Stories from the strays: What dropouts can teach us about school. *American Secondary Education*, 30(3), 36-60.
- Gamoran, A., & Carbonaro, W. (2002). High school English: A national portrait. *The High School Journal*, 86(2), 1-13.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Greene, S. (1991). *Writing from sources: Authority in text and task*. (No. TR 55). Berkeley and Pittsburgh: Center for the Study of Writing.
- Grossman, P. L. (1989). A study in contrast: Sources of pedagogical content knowledge for secondary English. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5), 24-31.
- Grossman, P. L. (1991). The selection and organization of content for secondary English: Sources for teachers' knowledge. *English Education*, 23(1), 39-53.
- Grossman, P. L., Smagorinsky, P., & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education*, 108(1), 29.
- Hamel, F. L. (2003). Teacher understanding of student understanding: Revising the gap between teacher conceptions and students' ways with literature. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(1), 49-84.
- Haycock, K., Jerald, C., & Huang, S. (2001). Closing the gap: Done in a decade. *Thinking K-16*, 5(2), 3-22.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The Science of Writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hillocks, G. J. (1986). *Research on Written Composition*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, and the National Conference on Research in English.

- Hobohm, H.-C. (1999). *Social science information & documentation: Is the time ripe for a state of the art?* Paper presented at the 65th IFLA Council and General Conference, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 703-715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- HyperRESEARCH. (Version 2.6)(2003). [Qualitative Analysis Tool]. Randolph, MA: ResearchWare, Inc.
- Inspiration. (Version 7.0)(2002). Portland, OR: Inspiration Software, Inc.
- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates. (2002). *Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities* (141 Reports--Descriptive). California: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
- Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role, and context: developing academic literacies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kantz, M. (1989). *Shirley and the battle of Agincourt: Why it is so hard for students to write persuasive researched analyses. Occasional paper no. 14* (143 Reports--Research). California: Center for the Study of Writing, Berkeley, CA.
- Kantz, M. (1990). Helping students use textual sources persuasively. *College English*, 52(1), 74-91.
- Kennedy, M. (2002). Knowledge and teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3/4), 355-370.
- Langer, J. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 397-439.
- Langer, J., Confer, C., & Sawyer, M. (1993). *Teaching disciplinary thinking in academic coursework* (Research Report No. 2.19). Albany: University at Albany.

- Larson, R. (2000). The "research paper" in the writing course: A non-form of writing. In G. Tate (Ed.), *The writing teacher's sourcebook* (Fourth ed., pp. 216-221). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, I. (1998). Writing in the Hong Kong's secondary classroom: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 61-76.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 30, 73-84.
- Little, S. B. (1989). The research and development process and its relationship to the evolution of scientific and technical literature: A model for teaching research. *Technical Writing Teacher*, 16(1), 68-76.
- Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of context and standpoint. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43(5), 448-461.
- Many, J. E. (1996). Patterns of selectivity in drawing on sources: Examining students' use of intertextuality across literacy events. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 36, 51-63.
- McCarthy, L. P., & Fishman, S. (1996). A text for many voices: Representing diversity in reports of naturalistic research. In P. Mortensen & G. Kirsch (Eds.), *Ethics and representation in qualitative studies of literacy* (pp. 155-176). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- McMackin, M. C. (1994). How teachers and students view the task of report writing. *Clearing House*, 68(2), 107-110.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Milner, R. (2003). A case study of an African-American English teacher's cultural comprehensive knowledge and self-reflective planning. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 18(2), 175-196.

- Montano-Harmon, M. R. (1991). Discourse Features of Written Mexican Spanish: Current Research in Contrastive Rhetoric and Its Implications. *Hispania*, 74(2), 417-425.
- Moulton, M. R. C., & Holmes, V. L. (2003). The research paper: A historical perspective. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 30(4), 365-373.
- Murray, D. (1989). *Expecting the Unexpected*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- National Writing Project, & Nagin, C. (2003). *Because writing matters: Improving student writing in our schools* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nelson, J. (1990). This was an easy assignment: Examining how students interpret academic writing tasks. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24(4), 362-396.
- Nelson, J. (1992). *Constructing a research paper: A study of students' goals and approaches*. (Technical Report No. 59). California: Center for the Study of Writing, Berkeley, CA.
- Nelson, J., & Hayes, J. R. (1988). *How the writing context shapes college students' strategies for writing from sources* (Technical Report No. 16): The Center for the Study of Writing at Carnegie Mellon.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—One's own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17-21.
- Rabinowitz, C. (2000). Working in a vacuum: A study of the literature of student research and writing. *Research Strategies*, 17(4), 337-346.
- Rooney, M. (2003). Survey finds split between what college instructors and high-school teachers value in student writing, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Vol. 2003).

- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994a). *The reader, the text, the poem: the transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994b). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In H. Singer (Ed.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (Fourth ed., pp. 1057-1092). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Ruddell, R. B., & Unrau, N. J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 996-1056). Newark: International Reading Association.
- Russell, D. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines, 1870-1990*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Schwegler, R. A., & Shamoon, L. K. (1982). The aims and process of the research paper. *College English*, 44(8), 817-824.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (Second ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sisserson, K., Manning, C. K., Knepler, A., & Jolliffe, D. A. (2002). Authentic intellectual achievement in writing. *English Journal*, 91(6), 63-69.
- Smagorinsky, P., Lakly, A., & Johnson, T. S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation and resistance in learning to teach within a prescribed curriculum. *English Education*, 34(3), 187-213.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Smith, M. W. (1992). The nature of knowledge in composition and literacy understanding: The question of specificity. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 279-305.
- Spivey, N. N., & King, J. R. (1989). *Readers as writers composing from sources*. (No. 18). Berkeley and Pittsburgh: Center for the Study of Writing.

- Spivey, N. N., & King, J. R. (1994). Readers as writers composing from sources. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & D. L. Schallert (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (Fourth ed., pp. 668-694). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Stodolsky, S. S., & Grossman, P. L. (1995). The Impact of Subject Matter on Curricular Activity: An Analysis of Five Academic Subjects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(2), 227-249.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research : techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sutton, B. (2000). Swale's "moves" and the research paper assignment. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 27(4), 446-451.
- Thompson, G. L., & Joshua-Shearer, M. (2002). In retrospect: What college undergraduates say about their high school education. *The High School Journal*, 1-10.
- United States Dept of Education. (2002). *No child left behind: a desktop reference*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Valentine, B. (2001). The legitimate effort in research papers: Student commitment versus faculty expectations. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(2), 107-115.
- Venezia, A., Kirst, M. W., & Antonio, A. (2003). *Betraying the college dream: How disconnected K-12 and postsecondary education systems undermine student aspirations* (Research). Stanford, CA: The Bridge Project: The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and Language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix A.
Interview Guide 1

Interview Guide – Interview 1
Focused Life History

- Early experiences with reading and writing at home
- How did you learn to read?
- How do you remember learning to write?
- Early experiences with reading and writing in high school
- What do you remember about reading in high school
- What do you remember about writing in high school
- Did you write a research paper in high school? What was that like?
- Experiences with reading and writing in college
- What do you remember about reading in college
- What do you remember about writing in college
- Did you write research papers in college? What was that like?
- Experiences with research writing
- Have you had experiences doing research based writing since college? How do you do it?
- Experiences with teaching reading and writing
- How do you teach students to read for the purposes of doing research?
- How do you teach students to write research papers?
- How do you feel about teaching the research paper?
- How well do your students do on research papers? What do you think their biggest problem(s) is/are in writing research papers?

Appendix B.
Interview Guide 2

Interview Guide 2

Plagiarism

- When you say you have challenges in dealing with plagiarism, can you tell me more about what you mean by that? In what ways do students plagiarize?
- How do you teach students the relationship between putting things in their own words and plagiarism.

Evaluation/feedback

- How do you grade/evaluate the final draft?
- What types of feedback do you give to students during the process of finding research? Of writing it up?
- In the first interview I asked you what challenged students the most (and you said...). What part do they do best on? Why do you think that is?

Student skills

- How big a part does the ability to read critically play in a student's ability to write a research paper?
- Several people talked about critical reading as a skill that students need in order to do research. What do you think of that idea? Define critical reading.
- Some people talked about how the student's ability to use an academic voice plays an important role in their writing research. How big a part does the ability to use an academic register play in a student's ability to write a research paper?
- What is academic register to you?
- How would you characterize your students reading ability? What do you do to support your less able readers/writers?

Curriculum

- To what extent is the research paper project similar to other papers students write in your class?
- To what extent is the research paper project different than other papers students write in your class?
- To what extent is the research paper project you assign similar/different than research papers you have written in your academic career?
- What is the most important part of your instruction in teaching the research paper?

- How much of your course is focused on teaching the reading and writing skills necessary for this project?

Setting

- How much do your colleagues influence how you teach this project?
- How much does the school support/hinder your doing this project?
- What do you think other teachers at this site think about teaching students to write research papers.
- What do you think about the school-wide literacy effort at this school? How do you see the relationship between this effort and teaching students to write research papers.

Appendix C.
Focus Group Interview Guide

Focus Group Questions

Introduce myself, and Leslie. Explain our roles. Give each person a pad of paper. Tell them, I'll ask a question, give you a few minutes to think about your response or answer to the question.

Goal of the focus group: To give us an opportunity to discuss, as a group, some of the issues involved in teaching students to write research papers.

Some guidelines – try to speak loudly. If it's comfortable, try to start off your comments with your name, such as: This is Cindi, I think... I'll try to paraphrase what you're saying throughout the interview.

1. Introduce yourself, and share briefly the research paper topic you have your students do.
2. What are some of the important things that you think students should be able to do well in their research papers?
3. What is your definition of literacy and how does your research paper further that.
4. One of the issues that several of you brought up, was the issue of student's having a difficult time citing source material. Can you talk about some of the things you've done in order to help students understand how to do it.
5. Can you talk about some of the things you've done in order to help students understand why it is necessary to cite source material.
6. Do you think that the research paper belongs in the English curriculum? Why? Where does it belong?
7. If you could go back into your students educational history. Can you construct what you'd want their 4th grade teacher to teach them about writing research? Their 7th grade teacher? Their ninth grade teacher?
8. In your perfect world, describe how you would teach the research paper.
9. Are there any other things you'd like to add about teaching the research paper or about participating in this study?

Appendix D.
Contact Summary Form

Contact Summary Form
(Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Contact Type: _____ Site _____
 Visit _____ Contact Date _____
 Phone _____ Today's Date _____
 Email _____ Written by: _____

- 1. What were the main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?**

- 2. Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions you had for this contact**

Questions	Information

- 3. Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this contact?**

- 4. What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next contact with this person?**

Appendix E.
Coded Summary Form

Coded Summary Form
(Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Contact Summary

Name	_____	Place	_____
Phone	_____	Date	_____
Email	_____	Coded by	_____
Data type	_____	Date coded	_____

1. Pick out the most salient points in the contact. Number in order on this sheet and note line number (from transcript) or page number (from field notes) on which point appears. Number point in text of transcripts or field notes. Attach theme or aspect to each point in CAPITALS. Invent themes where no existing ones apply and asterick those. Comment may also be included in double parenthesis.

Page/ Line #.	Salient Points	Themes/ Aspects

Appendix F.
Ellen's Research Paper Assignment

Junior English Research Paper Final

This quarter you will be working on a library research project. This project will count as your final exam. You will have approximately 8 weeks to work on it. This handout will give you information about how to proceed with this assignment; therefore, it is important to hold on to this and refer to it when you have questions.

Selection of Author

Look over the attached list and select a first, second, and third choice. Each student will research a different author. We will draw numbers for selection order.

What to Include in Your Paper

1. **Biographical Information.** Find information about your author's life. Include what you find on the author's childhood, family, education, travel, career, marriage, health, significant experiences, personal philosophy, etc. (1 page)
2. **Historical Background.** Find out what occurred in the United States during your author's life. Were there any important historical events that happened which may have influenced his/her writing? (1 page)
3. **Literary Works and Criticism.** Trace your author's literary career. What were his/her major and minor works? What is the subject matter of his/her writing? How were works received by the public and by literary critics during his/her lifetime? How are they perceived at the present time? Has opinion of his/her work changed? Why? What is your opinion of the author's work? (1 page)
4. **Read One Selection Written by Your Author.** Choose a novel that you have not read before, or that we will not be reading in class this year. You must get approval of all titles. This may count for your outside reading requirement, however, you must complete the book in order to complete the outline requirement for the paper. This outline may be due before the pages are due for your outside reading.
5. **Book Review.** Write a review of the book you read by your author. Include a summary of what the book was about (plot), the setting, the characters, the theme, etc. Write about your opinion of the book. Consider how the book ties into your author's life and history of the time. How did you feel about the

value of the book as a classic piece of literature? How did your opinion compare with the critic's opinion? (1 page)

6. **Summary.** Write a summary in which you explain what you learned by doing the research. What impressed you most about your author? Evaluate the learning experience as a whole. (1 page)
7. **Oral Presentation.** During finals, you will give a 3-5 minute oral presentation on your author. You will introduce your author to the class. Include the highlights of his/her life, works, history, and literary criticism. You will prepare a Power Point presentation that illustrates the information you discuss. You must include a picture of your author.

Points to Remember

1. This project is worth 400 points. The paper is worth 300 points, and the oral presentation is worth 100 points.
2. You will be receiving grades for different parts of this project during the quarter.
3. Make sure you ask questions if you don't understand any portion of this project.
4. Check your calendar often. You will be given a timetable of due dates. Do not miss any deadlines! All assignments are due on the date given.
5. No late papers will be accepted for credit. If you are absent on the day the paper is due, you must have someone turn it in for you, or you may e-mail it to me at _____ No exceptions will be made! Also, if your printer should fail, bring your paper to school on disc and print it at school. No excuses.

American Authors Selection List

Agee, James	Lawrence, D.H.
Aiken, Conrad	Lewis, Sinclair
Albee, Edward	London, Jack
Alcott, Louisa May	Malamud, Bernard
Anaya, Rodolfo	McCaffrey, Anne
Asimov, Issac	McCullers, Carson
Baldwin, James	Melville, Herman
Bellow, Saul	Miller, Arthur
Bierce, Ambrose	Mitchell, Margaret
Bradbury, Ray	Mitchener, James
Buck, Pearl S.	Morrison, Toni
Capote, Truman	O'Neil, Eugene
Cather, Willer	Potok, Chaim
Chopin, Kate	Pynchon, Thomas
Cisneros, Sandra	Rand, Ayn
Cooper, James Fennimore	Rawlings, Marjorie K.
Cormier, Robert	Salinger, J.D.
Crane, Stephen	Sinclair, Upton
Dreisser, Theodore	Steinbeck, John
Ellison, Ralph	Stowe, Harriet Beecher
Faulkner, William	Tan, Amy
Fitzgerald, F. Scott	Thoreau, Henry David
Grey, Zane	Twain, Mark
Haley, Alex	Tyler, Anne
Hawthorne, Nathaniel	Updike, John
Heinlein, Robert	Vonnegut, Kurt
Heller, Joseph	Walker, Alice
Hemingway, Ernest	Wilder, Thornton
Hurston, Zora Neale	Williams, Tennessee
Irving, John	Wolfe, Thomas
James, Henry	Wouk, Herman
Kingston, Maxine Hong	Wright, Richard

All about note cards

1. As you conduct your research in the library, take all of your notes on note cards. Use the same size note cards for all of your research.
2. Each note card should be labeled at the top with one of the following headings: Biographical, Historical, or Literary. This will allow you, at a glance, to know what kind of information is contained on that card. This heading goes on the top left corner of the card.
3. On the top right corner, put the last name of the source and page number in which you found the information. This is extremely important for parenthetical citations.
4. Write notes on one side of the card only. (front)
5. Note cards should be written in your own words unless you plan to quote the information in your paper.
6. Note cards should not be written in complete sentences; you should paraphrase and abbreviate the information.
7. Note cards do not need to be completely full. Organize your cards by pieces of information. Go on to a new card when your subject changes.

All About Bibliographies

1. The bibliography/Works Cited page is the last page of your paper.
2. The bibliography shows what sources you used for your research and acts as a reference list for your parenthetical citations.
3. The bibliography is arranged in alphabetical order by the first letter of the first word of each entry. **DO NOT NUMBER ENTRIES!!**
4. The format of a bibliography must be exact. A sample bibliography is included in this packet. Refer to the handout on documentation for examples.
5. You must have a minimum of six sources. One source may be the book you chose for your book review. The other sources can be a combination of primary sources and secondary sources.

All About Parenthetical Citations

1. Parenthetical citations are used for information that is in quotes, and for information not generally known by you in which you found in your research. Any time you use a quote or a date you must use a citation.
2. Follow the examples on the handout on parenthetical citations. I will be grading on how well you use citations and how well you follow the proper format.

Bio
Historical
Literary

(Last name of source, pg.#)

Chunk of paraphrased information or quote

RESEARCH PAPER CALENDAR OF DUE DATES 2003

Monday, October 27, 2003- Project begins

Tuesday, October 28, 2003- Library Research

Thursday, October 30, 2003- Library Research

Friday, October 31, 2003 - 25 note cards due

Tuesday, November 4, 2003- Library Research

Thursday, November 6, 2003- Library Research

Friday, November 7, 2003- 25 note cards, bibliography due (typed, proper format)

Monday, November 10, 2003- Library Research

Thursday, November 13, 2003 - Library Research

Friday, November 14, 2003 - 25 note cards due

Tuesday, November 18, 2003 - Library Research

Thursday, November 20, 2003 - Library Research

Friday, November 21, 2003- 25 note cards due

Wednesday, November 26, 2003- outline due, typed

Monday, December 8, 2003- typed rough draft due, peer evaluation

Friday, December 19, 2003- **Final research paper due, no late papers will be accepted for credit-** you will turn in your note cards (100), outline, rough draft, peer evaluation, and typed final copy in class. Remember. If you are absent, you must have someone else turn in your paper for you. Also, no excuses about computer failures, no paper, left it at a friend's or relative's house, etc.

January 20-22, 2004- Oral presentations/Power point presentation

Appendix G.
Janie's Research Paper Assignment

Hold on to this sheet!

Research Paper

Directions

Select a single incident for study.
Develop your own research questions about the incident.
Ask about things such as these:

- What is the background for this incident?
- Who has been selected to present the first perspective on the incident?
What is his/her point of view?
- Who has been selected. . . . second point of view?
- Who has been selected. . . . third perspective on the incident?
- How do these perspectives compare/contrast?
- Why are they different from one another?
- What can I conclude from this research about attitudes toward this incident?

Select one of the following topics, or find your own and show me for approval.

- *The Trial of Susan B. Anthony in 1874 for voting*
- *The Triangle Shirtwaist Fire of 1911 in New York where workers were locked into a sweatshop*
- *The Seneca Falls Convention of 1848 in New York, launching the women's suffrage movement*
- *The 1963 bombing of a church in Birmingham, Alabama, killing four little black girls*
- *The current Terri Schiavo case in Florida where loved ones of a woman in a vegetative state fight over her right to die*
- *The Battle of the Little Big Horn of 1876, Custer's Last Stand*
- *Raising the American flag on Iwo Jima in 1945*
- *The dropping of the A bomb on Hiroshima, 1945*
- *First man walks on the moon, 1969*
- *Margaret Sanger jailed in 1916 for disseminating birth control information*
- *Kristallnacht -- "The Night of Broken Glass" -- of 1938 in Germany, when Nazis destroyed a Jewish neighborhood*
- *Assassination of Mahatma Gandhi in 1948*
- *Cassius Clay (Mohammed Ali) refused to be inducted into the army*
- *The My Lai Massacre in Vietnam in 1967 where U.S. soldiers killed 347 civilians*
- *The 1959 quiz show scandal involving Charles Van Doren*
- *The Memorial Day Massacre of 1939 where Republic Steel workers are confronted by police*
- *Geraldine Ferraro picked as first female vice presidential candidate*
- *The Three Mile Island nuclear plant disaster of 1979*
- *Execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg in 1953 for espionage*

- *The Lemon Grove Mexican deportation in the 1930's*
- *Massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890 where Indians and government soldiers clash*
- *The Boston Massacre in 1770*
- *Kent State killings of 1970 where students protesting the Vietnam War are fired upon by National Guard*
- *D-Day landing/beachheads in 1944*
- *The Alamo 1836*
- *The Trail of Tears in 1838. Cherokee people in Georgia are removed by government resulting in 4000 deaths*
- *Nat Turner rebellion of 1831*
- *Preston Brooks' beating of Charles Sumner, an anti-slavery proponent, on the floor of the senate in 1856*
- *Battle of Gettysberg in 1863*
- *Lee's surrender to Grant in 1865*
- *Homestead Strike of 1892 where workers at Carnegie Steel strike and are met with violent resistance*
- *San Francisco earthquake of 1906*
- *Chicago Fire of 1871*
- *Wright Brothers first flight in 1903*
- *Pancho Villa raids New Mexico in 1916*
- *Stock Market Crash of 1929*
- *Bataan Death March of 1942—American soldiers vs. Japanese captors*
- *Tet Offensive in Vietnam—turning point in Vietnam war for America*
- *Gulf of Tonkin incident which gave U.S. the entre into the Vietnam War. 1964*
- *Desegregation of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957 when nine black students faced violent opposition to entering the school*
- *Elvis appears on the Ed Sullivan Show in 1956*
- *American U-2 spy plane shot down over USSR. 1960*
- *The LA Zoot Suit Riots of the 40s and 50s*
- *Nixon-Kennedy TV debate of 1960*
- *Marian Anderson, black opera singer, is barred by the Daughters of the American Revolution from singing in Constitution Hall in 1939; Eleanor Roosevelt resigns from that organization and arranges for her to sing at the Lincoln Memorial before 75,000 people*
- *Amelia Jenks Bloomer becomes first female owner and publisher of a newspaper; she advocates women's rights and temperance, along with reform in dress for women*
- *Sandra Day O'Connor is named first woman to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States, 1981*
- *Elizabeth Seton of New York City is canonized in 1975, making her the first American Saint*
- *Jeana Yeager is first woman to circle the globe on one tank of gas—in the lightweight aircraft Voyager, 1986*
- *Jane Addams founds Hull House in 1889, a settlement in the slums of Chicago, receives the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931*
- *Harriet Beecher Stowe publishes the controversial novel **Uncle Tom's Cabin** in 1852*
- *Jessica Lynch rescued from Iraqi captors, 2003*
- *Shoshanna Johnson rescued from Iraqi captors, 2003*

Sample Outline for Your Research Paper:

My Lai Massacre – War in Vietnam

Introduction and Thesis: On March 16, 1968, members of Charlie Company entered a Vietnamese village, and over the next two hours, killed approximately 300 civilians. Lt. William Calley, leader of the unit, who ordered his men to eliminate any living thing in the area, was, in his opinion, following orders of high command. The event would have been buried were it not for the fact that an American helicopter came upon the scene. Calley was subjected to a court martial, sentenced to life imprisonment, he served three years. ***His account of the incident at My Lai conflicted with those of two other witnesses, thus creating a controversy that exists today.***

I. Further description of the incident

II. Point of view of Calley

- A. Who he was
- B. Conditions of battle and his perceptions of his duty
 - 1. Frustrated, anxious men in suspected Viet Cong hiding place
 - 2. Calley's understanding of his mission there ***his own words***
- C. Calley's orders and actions
- D. Rationale for support of Calley by defense and a segment of the American public

III. Point of view of Hugh Thompson, pilot of helicopter

- A. Who he was
- B. His reactions to the scene of carnage
 - 1. His course of action
 - 2. Basis for his actions: ***his own words***
 - 3. Repercussions of his decisions that day
- C. Rationale for support of Thompson's actions by prosecution and a segment of the American public

IV. Point of view of Pfc. Robert Maples, soldier who refused to fire on villagers

- A. Who he was
- B. His behavior during the action in My Lai
 - 1. Description of his actions
 - 2. Explanation for his decisions: ***his own words***
- C. His supporters and detractors

V. My connection to a current issue; reflection; speculation; personal connection.

OR

Significance of this incident to this day

OR

Your spin on the topic

Appendix H.
Sylvia and Tracy's Research Paper Assignment

RESEARCH PAPER**Format & Requirements**

Name _____

Period _____

Date _____

1. Type or word-process, letter quality; 10-12 point, standard typesize. Indent each paragraph (hit the tab key once). Double space between each line of text (not between each paragraph). **YOUR BEST WORK!!!** Spell correctly (use spell-✓ function!). Grammatically/mechanically correct; virtually no errors.

2. Staple all pages together in the upper left corner, with the **OUTLINE** on top. (Do not use a folder or other fancy cover.)

3.	Finished Product = OUTLINE:	1 page (Minimum)
	+ MAIN TEXT:	5 pages (Minimum)
	+ WORKS CITED:	1 page

	= FINISHED REPORT:	7 pages <u>minimum</u> (9 pages max.)

4. No cover sheet! Follow this format for your heading (on **OUTLINE** and **MAIN TEXT**):

Your name
.....
Period #
Date

5. Use the following margins: **TOP** and **LEFT** 1 and 1/2 inches; **RIGHT** and **BOTTOM** 1". (You may need to reformat computer's preset margins.)

6. Include the typed **OUTLINE** as a cover sheet with the following (see *sample* in this packet).

7. Number pages in the upper right corner. Begin with text page number two; the **OUTLINE**, and the first page of the text are not numbered. The **WORKS CITED** page is also not numbered. Use numerals rather than spelled numbers.

8. You must use **AT LEAST FIVE (5) PARENTHETICAL CITATIONS**, which give source information immediately after a direct quotation or paraphrased material. Plagiarism will **NOT BE TOLERATED**, and may result in failure on this assignment!

*Example of **QUOTED** sentence: "The introduction of the micro-computer to America's high schools has greatly changed the way students view the research process" (Anderson 175).

*Example of **PART QUOTED** sentence, part student's own sentence: With computers available all over school, this has "greatly changed the way students view the research process" (Anderson 175).

*Example of **PARAPHRASED** fact: Computers have changed much of the way students learn and research (Anderson 175).

- Citation = (Author's last name 1 space page # info. found on). If no author, use next available info.: article title, website title, or book title).
- Quote marks go before the citation/parenthesis.
- Period, ending sentence, goes after the parenthesis.

9. Conclude with a **WORKS CITED** page. This is an alphabetical listing of all sources you use in your research paper. **FIVE SOURCES MINIMUM. MAXIMUM of 3 from the Internet or other electronic sources (CD-rom, Electric Library, etc.)!!**

10. Write the entire paper in the third person point of view. Never refer to yourself with a personal pronoun such as I, me, mine, OR second person, you, etc.

11. To be successful with this project, the following assignments, each due on a specified date, worth points, are to be completed before proceeding to the next stage. I will collect **ALL** parts. If you don't have all parts completed, I won't accept the final.

Points Possible

____ * Research Notes: _____ (I will collect; handwritten or highlighted photocopies or Internet print-outs ok.)

____ * Rough Outline: _____ (worksheet; eventually typed)

____ * First Draft Text: _____ (5 handwritten pages minimum for credit!)

____ * Final Report/3 PARTS (outline, text, Works Cited) **TYPED ALL**

DUE: _____ (No exceptions!)

** Library research date(s): _____

IDEAS FOR CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Argue for (**pro**) or against (**con**) on any of the following issues. If you have another issue you would like to research, please see me first, so we can make sure it's arguable, and that information is available at our library.

Euthanasia, right of family to pull the plug on terminally ill family member, doctor assistance to patient who wants to die
 Death penalty; capital punishment
 Censorship (music, T.V., media)
 Pornography and its effects on members of society
 Teenage pregnancy/abortion
 The teaching of evolution or creationism in school
 Animal experimentation
 Legality of hand weapons (gun control)
 Anti-smoking laws, tobacco industry
 Adoption: by single parents, gays or interracial couples adopting, rights to cancel adoption and return babies to natural parents, Internet adoptions
 Surrogate motherhood
 Sex education in schools; giving out contraceptives at school
 The pay of superstar athletes -- professional athletes are overpaid
 The insanity plea as defense for crimes
 School prayer
 School uniforms, dress code
 Open/closed school campuses
 Teenagers being tried as adults or under juvenile jurisdiction
 Gay rights, gays in the military, legalization of gay marriages
 T.V./movie over-emphasis on sex and violence (rating system?)
 Government's responsibilities to provide welfare; welfare reform
 Right of companies to drill offshore, other environmental issues?
 Legalization of illicit, illegal drugs
 Immigration: legal quotas or illegal immigration; Prop 187
 Affirmative action in colleges, employment, business
 Cloning and other genetic advances: should we continue to clone?
 Skating: should the state provide parks? Should it be legal on school/public property?

Another controversial issue you can suggest???? You choose and okay it with the teacher, for after all, it's your paper!! Choose something that interests you!

Sample Research Outline Typed
English 6C

John Smit.
Period 2
3/22/01

Abortion

I. Introduction

- A. Shocking statistic: 1.5 million abortions performed annually in the U.S.
- B. **Thesis Statement:** Though millions of abortions are obtained by American women every year, they should not be allowed because they are (1) **unsafe and unnecessary**, and they jeopardize the (2) **mental** and (3) **physical health** of confused frightened pregnant women.

II. Counter-arguments

- A. Abortions are safer than pregnancy and childbirth
- B. Modern medical equipment makes abortion safe
- C. Women should have a "choice" of alternatives concerning their bodies

III. Arguments

- A. First Argument: **Abortions are unsafe and unnecessary**
 - 1. Lack of medical supplies result in internal damage
 - 2. Unsanitary equipment used
 - 3. Other choices are available
- B. Second Argument: **They cause psychological/mental problems**
 - 1. Women go through guilt
 - 2. They experience depression
 - 3. Traumatizing experiences
- C. Third Argument: **Procedures are risky to health**
 - 1. Aborts by touch
 - 2. Induced labor
 - 3. Opening of the cervix

IV. Conclusion

- A. Restatement of Thesis Statement
- B. Closing: Strong personal opinion and belief, suggestions for those who do have abortions.

WORKS CITED

1. A book with one author

Author's Last Name, First (if given). Book Title. City where published: Publisher's/Printer's Name, year printed (It might help to look for the ©). Page numbers used/read.

2. A book with two or more authors

Last Name, First and First Name + Last (of other authors). Book Title. City where published: Publisher's/Printer's Name, year printed (Look for the ©). Page numbers used/read.

3. Electronic (CD-ROM), online information, INTERNET

Author's Last Name(s), First (if given). "Article Title/heading of page." Publication/SITE Title/manager of site (if given). Date. URL/Address (example: www.grossmont.k12.us.ca).

4. Magazine article or "Magazine Express" Service (including ELECTRIC LIBRARY)

Author's Last Name(s), First (if given). "Article Title." Magazine Name. Month Year: article's page numbers.

5. Newspaper article (including ELECTRIC LIBRARY)

Author's Last Name(s), First (if given). "Article Title." Newspaper Name. Month Year: article page numbers.

6. Essay, poem, article, encyclopedia article or anthologies: a collection (book) of pieces by different authors

Author's Last Name(s), First (if given). "Article Title." Book Title. City where published: Publisher's/Printer's Name, year. Page numbers read.

7. SIRS pamphlet

Author's Last Name(s), First (if given). "Article Title." Publication Title. Month year, page numbers of article (example: 35- 43). (Reprinted in SIRS Topic Title, Vol. #, Article#).

8. See me for information on : movies, videos, music CD's/tapes, etc.

** EXCELLENT ONLINE SITES **

A. Student page = <http://www. :t/students/research.html>

• Electric Library • Facts.com • Issues and Controversies

Username:

Password: wel

B. CQ Reader = <http://library.cqpress/trials>

Username: /

Password: /

SAMPLE WORKS CITED PAGE: it looks like this!!

(no page number!!)

Works Cited

(centered, not underlined, no quote marks!)

(Do NOT number entries: ALPHABETIZE!! Indent 2nd & 3rd lines only.)

"Big Battle Ahead for Tobacco Firms." USA Today. 20 February 1995: 2-3.

Breo, Dennis. "Kicking Butts-AMA, Joe Camel and the 'Black Flag' War on Tobacco."
Journal of American Medical Association. 27 October 1993. 1978-1984.

Briggs, Bruce. "The Health Police are Blowing Smoke." Taking Sides. Guilford, CT:
The Dushking Publishing Group, Inc. 1993. 27-30.

Mackay, Judith. "A Tobacco Advertising Free World by the Year 2000?" World Health.
July/August 1995. 22.

"Tobacco Deal 'Dead' -- So Battle Moves Back to the Courts." CNN.com.
<http://www.cnn.com/US/9705/tobacco/>

"Tobacco Industry Seeks New Recruits." American Educator. Spring 1992. 42.

REMINDERS:

- * Punctuation and Spelling are IMPORTANT.
- * Alphabetical order (not numbered).
- * Hanging (reverse indentation), each entry is single space.
- * Double space between source entries.
- * No page number on this page!

ROUGH

English

Name _____

Pd _____

Date _____

I. INTRODUCTION

A. How will you start, creatively, in a way that will grab the reader's attention, and introduce your topic? Quote? Startling statistic? Anecdote/brief example story? Give your general idea for a beginning.

B. **Thesis Statement** (Your overall opinion, + 3 general reasons why you believe what you believe—the general arguments which support your thesis.)

II. CON ARGUMENTS (What people say who disagree with you: opposing arguments.)

A. First Counter-argument _____

B. Second Counter-argument _____

C. Third Counter-argument _____

III. PRO ARGUMENTS (General reasons why you believe your opinion is right, this is how you will prove your argument/Thesis.)

A. First Reason/Argument: _____

1. Fact/Quote: _____

2. Fact/Quote: _____

3. Fact/Quote: _____

B. Second Reason/Argument: _____

1. Fact/Quote: _____

2. Fact/Quote: _____

3. Fact/Quote: _____

C. Third Reason/Argument: _____

1. Fact/Quote: _____

2. Fact/Quote: _____

3. Fact/Quote: _____

IV. CONCLUSION

A. Major Thesis (restated, with 3 reasons why/arguments) _____

B. Final say/powerful closing (How will you wrap-up your paper? Emotional plea? Convince again? An insightful quote or fact?)

NOTE: COMMENTARY/ANALYSIS OF EACH OF YOUR FACTS/QUOTES IS MISSING HERE ON THE OUTLINE, BUT WILL, MUST APPEAR IN THE TEXT OF YOUR PAPER!!

CONVINCE, PERSUADE, ARGUE!!!!!!!!!!!!

Appendix I.
Alexandra's and Evan's Research Paper Assignment

Junior Paper Research Packet

Inside this packet you will find researching tips, thesis worksheets, organizational and editing tools, yes tests, sample grading sheets, and all sorts of prewriting activities. It is important for you to understand that this will help guide you through the research process. Because you will be receiving points for some items as well as learning crucial elements of the research process with the handouts enclosed, I expect you to use this as your "research bible" so to speak.

Please keep these items with you at all times:

- 1) This research packet
- 2) All sources/articles you find during your research
- 3) Your style manual
- 4) Paper, pens and highlighters
- 5) Note cards
- 6) Any other research materials you are using
- 7) Blue research point sheet

I STRONGLY suggest you keep a separate folder with all research materials listed above in order to stay organized and prevent loss of any items.

Important due dates:

Preliminary draft: **12/9**

Official rough draft:

~~Research packet:~~

Final draft: **12/12**

WRITING A PERSUASIVE RESEARCH PAPER

A persuasive research paper presents an extensive analysis of a noteworthy issue based on thorough research and logical, persuasive thinking. This analysis stems from the writer's (that's you) position, or stance, on the issue. Your goal is to explain, as effectively as you can, your particular line of thinking about a subject. You are informing, explaining, speculating and arguing. Your argument, or main idea, should include convincing evidence to support your position as well as reasonable counters to opposing points of view. An effective essay enlightens and persuades the reader with clear analysis and research-based support.

Searching and Selecting

Searching: Think of current developments in the news (decisions, laws, advancements, or controversial issues) that you feel strongly about. Also look over your current readings and course notes for ideas. Focus on subjects that are serious, specific, timely and debatable.

Reviewing: If need be, review a recent issue of the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* for subjects as well as other guides or indexes in the library (SIRS, CQ Researcher, Newsbank, etc.). Also search the Internet; it can be an extremely valuable source. Vary your sources!

Generating the Text

Collecting: Gather and focus your own thoughts by writing freely about your subject (quickwriting), clustering main idea possibilities, and/or listing. Then collect as much additional information as possible through researching, reading, interviewing, and so on.

Noting: List what you already know about your subject, and state your initial position on it. Also decide what you hope to learn as you further investigate the subject.

Investigating: Collect as many facts and details as you can to help you develop your paper. Complete works cited cards and notecards (be sure to organize your notecards based on the topic of the chosen quotes).

Focusing: Reassess your position/main idea after you have thoroughly researched the subject. Then determine how you will analyze (defend, explain) it, and plan accordingly. You may have to adjust it in order to explain and defend it more effectively. Then decide on the best arrangement of ideas.

Writing: After organizing your notecards based on main ideas that support your thesis, create a thorough outline. You will then have a "skeleton" of your paper. Use the outline to get started writing. Use your planning notes as a general guide to help you work in facts and details.

Evaluating

Does the paper present an in-depth discussion of a timely subject?

Has the position been effectively analyzed? Are main ideas logical and convincing?

Research Paper Goals

What skills will you need to learn or polish in order to write the research paper?

(how to use the Internet, how to write a strong thesis with a clear opinion, how to make sure the works cited page is correct....)

What steps will you take to learn these skills?

(talk to teacher, check the style manual, look at previous handouts...)

What will be the most difficult part about writing this essay and why?

How can I help you?

Name three goals you are setting for yourself during the research process.

(think about both researching and writing the essay)

How are you going to reward yourself when you meet these goals?

(notice I said WHEN rather than IF you meet your goals...)

Generating Research Ideas: The Statement of Purpose

You are going to write a statement of purpose which will outline a possible focus for your senior research paper. This should be typed and double spaced.

On the top of the paper:

Summarize what topic you want to research and what you want to know/to prove about that topic. Be as specific as possible. For example, the topic "Racism" is too general – how could that topic be narrowed? "Racism in education", "racism and affirmative action", "whether racist publications should be allowed on the Internet" are stronger, more specific topics.

Below your explanation for your possible topic:

Write at least 5 essential questions you want to know and/or will need to answer about your topic.

This is your first crucial step in the research process. This will also allow me to help guide you in the right direction so you can begin researching to see if it is a topic you want to work with. If you get stuck or have questions, ASK ME FOR HELP.

Narrowed basic topic (with opinion):

Racist publications should not be allowed on the Internet.

OR

Through my research, I will decide whether I think racist publications should be allowed on the Internet.

Questions I will need to investigate:

1. What kinds of Internet publications are considered to be racist?
2. Have there been any connections between racist publications on the Internet and hate crimes?
3. How does the first amendment legally protect freedom of speech? Should it?
4. Has anything been done to attempt to limit the amount of racist publications on the Internet?
5. What kind of audience is looking for racist publications on the Internet?

- * www.researchpaper.com Find a ton of topics and links to sources.
- * <http://web.utk.edu/~guides/Pages/Essays/1a.html> Helpful guide to planning your research paper, from choosing and narrowing a topic to planning the outline and drafting.
- * <http://www.gs.manisota.edu/english/topic.org.html> Great list of possible topics and source info.

STEP 1: How to choose a general topic for your persuasive speech/essay:

- o Consult a list of persuasive speech/essay topics if needed
- o Pick an issue or subject that you really care about.
 - Do you feel passionate about this topic? Do you care about it?
- o Pick something that is extremely controversial.
 - Are there two sides to the topic?
 - Is there a reason to persuade people to think a certain way about this topic?
- o Pick something for which there is evidence.
 - Can you find sources? (in the high school library? the public library?)
- o Pick something that your audience will be interested in hearing.
- o Pick something that is not overdone.

Example: Year round school

STEP 2: How to go from a general topic to a narrowed topic:

- o Decide whether you are for or against your issue.
 - Why do people need to be persuaded about this topic?
- o Put your topic in a question form and answer it.
 - Usually this question will begin with the word "should" and can be answered with a "yes" or "no."

Example: Should the school year be extended year round?

STEP 3: How to go from a narrowed topic to a thesis:

(The thesis is the main idea of your speech/paper. It is the point you are going to prove.)

- o Reword your question into a statement
 - If you want to, include your best support or an overall phrase about your ideas.
- o Make it unique - it will make your topic more interesting and fun.

Example: To ensure that students get the best education, the school calendar should be extended year round

More Tips For Narrowing Your Essay Topic

The first step in writing an essay is finding something to write about. Whether you are working from a list of assigned topics or selecting your own, try to find something which sparks your interest; not only will working on the assignment be more stimulating, but your commitment will also help you write a more convincing essay. Some *preliminary reading* may help determine how deep your interest goes, as well as letting you know what kind of material will be available as you write your essay.

A common problem of beginning writers is wallowing around in a topic too wide for their purposes. General words such as "media," "war," "life," or "nature" are often incorrectly used as if they were topics (even "dragons" is too broad). However, students often begin to write essays with nothing more in mind than a general concept, and the result is a vague and generalized essay, of little interest to the student and less to the instructor. If you start with a broad area, concentrate on narrowing your subject. It will also help you deal with your topic within the length of the paper assigned and the time you have been given to complete it.

You can narrow your topic by considering a particular approach to the subject, or a sub-topic within it. You might ask yourself key questions, such as the following:

War

- Am I writing of one war or of war in general?
- Which war do I wish to write about? WWI? WWII? The Gulf War? "War" taken more metaphorically, between the sexes, siblings, or members of different races?
- Am I concentrating on the history of the war itself, or its causes or outcome?
- What specific events or examples will illustrate my points?

In deriving a workable topic from your subject, be careful not to narrow it too far; your topic must provide scope to develop a sustained presentation and argument.

General subject: Media

Narrowed topic: Commercials

Specific topic: How commercials manipulate their audience

General subject: War

Narrowed topic: Media coverage during war

Specific topic: How media coverage of war can be biased and subjective