The University of Maine
DigitalCommons@UMaine

7-13-2018

Inaugural Lifespan Writing Research Conference Report

Ryan J. Dippre

University of Maine, ryan.dippre@maine.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/lifespanwriting_reports

Part of the Other Rhetoric and Composition Commons

Conference Report

to the

Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration

July 13, 2018

Conference Report

Summary

From May 31 – June 2, 2018, an international group of scholars met in Athens, Ohio to discuss lifespan writing research and plan the next steps of the *Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration*'s central goal: a multi-site, multi-generational study of writing. The conference consisted of five plenary talks, four small-group discussion sessions, eighteen individual presentations during three breakout sessions, and a full day of reviewing the progress of both the *Collaboration* and the conference and planning next steps for lifespan writing research. The proceedings of the conference and the June 2 meetings were recorded and are available on Box for conference attendees and members of the *Collaboration* who were unable to attend. At the conclusion of the June 2 meetings, it was decided that the *Collaboration* would move forward in four specific steps. First, it would hold another conference in Athens, Ohio in mid Summer 2020. Second, it would release an edited collection based on the work of the conference. Third, it would organize multi-site studies of writing through the lifespan via *lines of inquiry*, preliminary versions of which will be released in late summer. Fourth, it would explore the methodological and theoretical challenges of lifespan writing research further between now and a conference through a series of virtual works-in-progress meetings with interested lifespan-oriented researchers beginning in early Fall 2018.

Rationale for the Conference

At the 50th Anniversary Dartmouth Conference in August, 2016, Talinn Phillips and Ryan J. Dippre issued a call for participants to form the *Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration*, an international collection of writing researchers of various backgrounds that would take up the challenge issued by Charles Bazerman at the end of the Dartmouth Conference: to launch a multi-site, multi-generational study of writing around the world. Meetings of interested researchers began in March, 2017, when key questions, overlapping methods and themes, and emerging issues were identified. These meetings were followed by a series of blog posts (May-June, 2017) and a second round of meetings (October-November, 2017). Throughout these discussions, *Collaboration* members submitted manuscripts for special issue journals focused on lifespan research, presented their lifespan-oriented work at various conferences, and even had *Collaboration*-focused meetings at some conferences. Even early in this collaborative work, it seemed that it would be necessary to create a place for researchers to come together and work exclusively on lifespan writing research—not as a panel of a larger conference, or asynchronously as part of a collection of like-minded work, but in the same place, at the same time, with the broad questions of lifespan writing research in mind.

Conference Planning

Conference planning began in earnest after the second round of virtual meetings in October-November 2017. Several members of the *Collaboration*—Jessica Early, Diana Arya, Matt Zajic, and Nicholas Jackson—agreed to serve on the conference steering committee. Drawing on the themes that emerged from the second round of the virtual meetings (see Appendix B), they, along with the co-chairs, developed a Call for Proposals that was sent out in December, 2017.

The initial deadline for proposals was February 15, 2018, but was extended to March 4, 2018 to accommodate interested potential participants who could not meet the initial deadline. A total of 30 submissions (a combination of panels, individual presentations, and works-in-progress presentations) were received. Of the 30, 28 were accepted, with 18 able to attend.

An ad-hoc local committee organized by Talinn Phillips and consisting of Christopher Barber, Susan Fletcher, David Johnson, Kate Hope, and Rachael Ryerson organized conference programs, abstracts, hotel and dorm reservations, dining reservations, and other local arrangements between March and May 2018. The Conference Steering Committee extended plenary speaker invitations to Charles Bazerman, Steve Graham, Sandra Tarabochia, Shannon Madden, Anna Smith, and Ryan Dippre, which were all accepted.

Conference Summary

May 31: Plenary Talks and Small Group Discussions
The first day of the conference consisted of four plenary talks and three small group discussions. Each plenary speaker had the freedom to frame their own discussion questions, but the following questions were offered at the top of a [Google Doc](#) for all conference attendees to think through:

1. **Key Constructs.** What constructs and practices did you find most salient and/or related to your work? How would your work contribute to these or related constructs? Are there alternative constructs you are developing that might enrich our understanding of lifespan development?

2. **Methodological Considerations.** Which lines of inquiry and/or methodological approaches seem most promising for our collaboration, which aim "to develop a robust, multidimensional understanding of how writing develops from cradle to grave"?

3. **Moving Forward.** What questions do you have, or issues would you like to raise for our "Consultant" senior researchers who are committed to supporting junior scholars in conducting longitudinal investigations related to writing?

Charles Bazerman opened the plenary talks with "The Puzzle of Conducting Research on Lifespan Development of Writing," a talk that reviewed his emerging concern with lifespan writing research and its inter-disciplinary development. He posed the following questions after his talk:

- How does your current research contribute to an emerging understanding of lifespan development of writing?
- For which population under which conditions?
- What phenomena, processes, or concepts extend beyond your study populations and their conditions?

His talk also sparked the following questions, which were used to generate discussion in the small-group discussion afterward:

1. How can we trace the puzzle-solving that is individually consequential, particularly since "writing is everywhere?"
2. If all dimensions are always "at stake" in any act of writing, how can we coherently trace such consequential, multi-dimensional work?
3. How can we most effectively characterize the relationship between writing development and curriculum?
4. How might we discuss writing in ways that are not, in Brandt's words, "socially normative?"
5. How might we operationalize (or study the operationalization of) the lifespan principles?
6. What periodic data collection of writing makes the most sense for you and your research questions/interests?
7. When does writing really peak?
8. What will the writing world (it's tools, processes, methods) look like in 5, 10, 20, 50+ years?
9. What do we learn in school that is generalizable outside of school?

Steve Graham's talk, "The Writers-within-Community Model of Writing," and Anna Smith's plenary, "Beyond Comparison: Orientations to Consider in Longitudinal Writing Development Studies" occurred after the first small-group discussion round, punctuated by lunch. They generated the following questions:

Questions from Steve Graham's Plenary	Questions from Anna Smith's Plenary
1. When you talk about cultural mechanisms of writers, you talk about modulator, can you talk more about it?	1. How can we complicate our methods to capture the "how" as well as the "what" of longitudinal writing development?
2. I'm interested in the way you are developing writing communities, and wondering what it's contributing to Writing Studies. I've read your chapter, and you mention in it briefly that a writing community can be as small as a couple. The work that I am doing is on a couple and the work that they do as a community, and I am wondering if you have any thoughts about intimate communities of two.	2. How can we complicate Lemke's "adding up"?
	3. What historical layering must we attend to in our pursuit of lifespan writing? How might we do that?
	4. What's the relationship between historical layering and intrinsic motivation?
3. Have you thought of simultaneous communities, or communities within communities? What impact does that have on the model?	5. How might we transform our methods to write 'with' students rather than 'about' them?
4. Discussion of the challenges of the word "community" - would it be better to have a more clearly identified and specific relationship?	6. How might we more effectively conceptualize the problematic dichotomy of "in school / out of school?"
	7. How can we locate and trace the impact of "crystallizing moments" in the lives of writers?
	8. What obstacles and opportunities are offered to us with our current methods

5. Does everyone in a writing community know that they are in the writing community?
   a. What happens to those who are excluded?
   b. Do these communities "feel like" communities?
   c. How do these communities navigate everyone's biases/expectations of those communities?
	for attending to and working across timescales?
	9. Writing is sometimes dangerous. What kinds of risks do we take when working with writers, particularly case studies, etc.?
	10. Did you notice crystallizing moments that were tied to the intervention that you were making as a researcher? Or perhaps conversations that you had with them?

Sandra Tarabochia and Shannon Madden wrapped up the first day of plenary addresses with their talk "Inventing the Parallax Approach: Reflections on an Alternative to Longitudinal Methods in Lifespan Writing Research." Their talk generated the following questions:

1. How might the parallax method be problematized and expanded in research beyond school-focused settings?
2. How might the insights of the parallax method and attempts to move beyond the in-school / out-of-school dichotomy (see above #6) be situated in relation to each other?
3. How might the parallax method help us avoid the pitfalls of comparison that Anna Smith's presentation highlights?
4. What opportunities do you see for adapting this method…
   a. For other populations?
   b. For different types of data?
   c. For different writing contexts or epochs of the lifespan?
   d. To address methodological quagmires and limitations?
5. What if you took a generalizability theory approach?
6. Have you considered recruiting more faculty?
7. What studies do you think this approach would not work for?
8. In your survey, did you pay attention to where they were in the dissertation process when they took the survey?
9. What is the constant presence of emotional labor in your segments telling you about the conditions of graduate students?
10. Could you try this again five years down the road with the same groups of people to see what has happened?
11. Have you taken the codes back to your subjects?

Audio recordings of each small group discussion are available on Box.

June 1: Concurrent Sessions: Searching for Actionable Coherence
On June 1, three rounds of concurrent sessions were held in Ohio University's Baker University Center. A combination of panel presentations, individual presentations, and works-in-progress presentations indicated a range of theories, methods, and sites for examining writing throughout the lifespan. The abstracts of these presentations can be found in Appendix E.

The concurrent sessions closed with small group discussions. However, these discussions were not as structured as the May 31 discussions, and so were not recorded.

Ryan Dippre gave the final plenary address, "Operationalizing a Lifespan Orientation: Charting Paths Forward in Theory and Methods," after the discussion session. He reviewed the development of the conference from the October/November virtual meetings of the *Collaboration* through June 1. He articulated the threads (and other metaphors) that seemed to be prominent throughout the sessions he saw, and he suggested using *resonance*—that is, keeping studies in communication with one another—to create an *actionable coherence* to the various methods, sites, and theories we bring to lifespan writing research. In order to get the work of coherence started, Dippre offered three keys to attend to:

1) Maintain a focus on the phenomenon of interest;
2) Maintain an openness to methods, theory, and connections between methods and theory; and
3) Resist regimentation: it is the people's self-destruction method of choice. Keeping methods and theories aligned is important, but allowing the alignment to blind us to new insights and opportunities is a possibility we must always be on guard against.

Day 2 of the conference concluded with a Conference Dinner at Ohio University's Nelson Hall Private Dining Room.

June 2: Collaboration Organizing
The third day of the conference was set aside for organizing the next steps of the *Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration*. Members of the *Collaboration* (conference attendees interested in joining were also invited) had four work sessions throughout the day.

The first session was focused on outlining the progress that the organization has made since its inception in 2016. Once these accomplishments were outlined, the group turned its attention to the next steps that the *Collaboration* would have to take. Prior to the meeting, Talinn Phillips identified five "pillars" we'd been using up to this point to move the organization forward:

1) Build infrastructure for any lifespan research;
2) Plan our study;
3) Build infrastructure for the *Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration*;
4) Build relationships; and
5) Forward our individual research.

Participants were asked to identify three things that they saw as important for the *Collaboration* to do in the future, and list it under one of the pillars. There was also a "parking lot" for ideas that did not cleanly fit in any of the pillars.

After reviewing the pillars, the participants were organized into groups of four to discuss possibilities (in methods, resonances, and commonalities) and obstacles to the work of the *Collaboration*. While these discussions were going on, Talinn Phillips and Ryan Dippre organized the comments from the pillars into three categories.

The first category consisted of short-term goals that Ryan and Talinn saw as important coming into the third day of the conference:

1) Writing a white paper on lifespan writing research;
2) Producing an edited collection as a result of the conference;
3) Developing pilot studies / working through IRB challenges with pilot studies;
4) Forming a strategic plan for funding and a budget; and
5) Long-term planning to diversify membership.

While many of these goals overlapped with or became components of the goals that others in the *Collaboration* set in their discussions, some (such as the white paper) did not. The second category was focused on the pilot study:

1) Identify core data to gather;
2) Determine guiding principles of data collection;
3) Develop data archive;
4) Develop data-sharing methods and protocol;
5) Elicit easy-to-grab data sets;
6) Look across fields for methods;
7) Choose (and pilot) research questions and methods;
8) Tackle IRB issues across institutions; and
9) Solidify research agenda.

These items, taken from the various pillars, will be central to the work of developing a multi-site, multi-generational study. A third category also emerged from looking across the pillars, one that we labeled "Potential Action Items." These items would benefit the *Collaboration*, but how, when, and in what order to prioritize them were open questions.

1) Diversify membership;
2) Maintain momentum electronically;
3) Budget for potential funding;
4) Establish interest groups;
5) Increase within-group communication;
6) Define/clarify membership roles;
7) Determine research sites (ensuring diversity across age, context, race, class, etc.);
8) Partner with established organizations/infrastructures (including outside of writing); and
9) Develop journal, special issues, conference panels, etc.

After discussing possibilities and obstacles, and after reviewing the categories listed above, participants were asked to vote for **one** of the "Potential Action Items" that the *Collaboration* should take up as a next step. Four items received the majority of the votes:

1) Diversify membership;
2) Maintain momentum electronically;
3) Establish interest groups; and

4) Define/clarify membership roles.

Before adjourning for lunch, participants identified one of the items that they would like to participate in during the final session of the day.

After returning from lunch, participants used a session to review Ryan Dippre's draft of a constitution. This constitution was aspirational in nature, designed to fit the needs of an organization that the *Collaboration* would grow into over time. Participants were tasked with

1) Identifying issues for revision;
2) Taking up what revisions were possible in the time allotted; and
3) Deciding how to best begin mobilizing various parts of our aspirational constitution.

Comments are viewable in the Google Doc, and audio of the discussion is available via Box. As a general summary, however, the group decided that

1) The breakdown of membership as currently listed should be simplified;
2) Some of the officer positions may be superfluous;
3) The time-in-office of officer positions may be problematic;
4) The relationships between Special Interest Groups and the *Collaboration* need to be clarified; and
5) The timing of the conferences (every two years vs. every three years) needs to be considered further.

At the conclusion of the session, participants voted by acclamation to keep Talinn Phillips and Ryan Dippre as *Collaboration* co-chairs until such time as the organization was stable enough to maintain momentum through leadership changes.

Results of Day 3: Next Steps

At the conclusion of Day 3, the *Collaboration* members present reviewed the list of tasks that the *Collaboration* would have to take on in the future. They decided on four areas to address as its immediate next steps: clarifying membership roles; organizing interest groups; maintaining momentum electronically; and diversifying membership. An edited collection on the work of this conference, as well as a second conference set in 2020 were also recognized as necessary for moving the *Collaboration* forward, the details of which are available below. Two working groups were assembled in the final hour of the conference: one to take on "organizing interest groups" and "clarifying membership roles;" and one to take on "maintaining momentum electronically" and "diversifying membership."

2020 Conference
Given the positive atmosphere at the inaugural conference, the question of a future lifespan conference was less a matter of "if" than of "when." Given the significant time and effort required for such a conference, however, a 2019 conference seemed counterproductive to the *Collaboration's* efforts. Longitudinal research takes time, after all, and the process of organizing pilot studies around lines of inquiry (see below) will only add to that time. The suggestion was

made that the conference be held every three years, keeping it in sync with the Writing Research Across Borders conference. Three years, however, was agreed by most to be too much of a gap between conferences, particularly in the early years of exploring lifespan-oriented methodologies. We need more opportunities to talk to one another about our work face-to-face, not fewer. Two years seemed to be an appropriate amount of time, so the next conference date was set 2020 in Athens, Ohio, July 9, 10, and 11. In order to encourage longitudinal studies, a "save the date" announcement for the 2020 conference will be sent out in early Fall 2018, giving interested participants time to prepare studies, organize travel, etc.

Edited Collection
Interest in lifespan perspectives on writing and literacy continues to grow, with editorials (Bazerman et al., 2017), edited collections (Bazerman et al., 2018), and a forthcoming special issue in *Writing and Pedagogy*, not to mention lifespan-oriented research presentations at the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication and the American Educational Research Association annual meeting. The inaugural lifespan writing conference certainly contributed to this rising interest in lifespan writing, and the *Collaboration* members in attendance at the conference believed it would be valuable to continue to build momentum on the issue by publishing an edited volume based on the presentations at the conference. The CFP for the volume was released June 22. (see Appendix F).

Plotting Lines of Inquiry
The original vision for the *Collaboration*, following Bazerman's initial challenge in 2016, was to identify between 20 and 30 research sites around the world that could study writing across generations using a particular method or set of methods, with initial researchers handing off their work to others upon retirement. While the concept of a multi-generational hand-off is certainly still an interest of the collaboration, honing in on particular sites and selecting particular methods that could endure for an entire century seemed like a tall order for the working group. Drawing on a conceptual map from an earlier discussion session, the working group decided instead to use the areas of interest that various researchers had to take advantage of strategic research sites, particularly during the pilot stage of the *Collaboration*'s work.

In order to identify areas of interest in the *Collaboration*, the working group began the process of identifying *lines of inquiry*—that is, researchable questions that seemed common across multiple researchers and could be approached with an array of research methods. This process began with highlighting keywords, such as "agency," "identity," "transitioning," etc. These keywords could be operationalized into one or more questions that invite a plurality of research sites, methodological choices, and theoretical frameworks to work together to collect, analyze, and share data and findings. Researchers could then agree to join particular lines of inquiry, which would help to clarify the roles of particular members.

The working group is currently mining the artifacts (notes, audio recordings, video) of the conference to plot initial lines of inquiry. These will become available in early Fall 2018 to the *Collaboration* for comment and revision. It is very likely that certain areas of interest to the *Collaboration* at large were underserved in the conference itself, so the initially-plotted lines of inquiry can best be seen as a starting point from which the *Collaboration* can more fully articulate its research interests.

Planning Virtual Meetings
The second working group examined ways to maintain momentum and diversify the membership of the *Collaboration*. It concluded that a good first step for both would be to encourage multiple virtual meetings that would allow lifespan writing researchers to present works-in-progress to one another. These meetings could occur on a monthly basis, beginning in September 2018. A tentative schedule and a request for presenters will be sent out via the Lifespan Listserv in early July.

The working group suggested that the works-in-progress virtual meetings could be expanded in several ways. First, the meetings could be announced on the WPA-L and other sites, so that researchers who are interested in lifespan work but not yet part of the *Collaboration* could join in if they wished. Second, particular meetings could be set aside for graduate students to present, so that emerging scholars interested in lifespan work could have a chance to showcase their thinking. Third, experts from lifespan-oriented research in other fields (notably, psychology and sociology) could be invited to provide an outside perspective on the work of the *Collaboration* and its scholars.

These works-in-progress meetings would not replace the virtual discussions that the *Collaboration* has been having for the past two years. It is expected that occasional meetings of *Collaboration* researchers to discuss the next steps of the organization will continue as well.

Appendix A: Initial Questions for Discussion

The themes below emerged from an analysis of blog posts on the Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration *website (www.lifespanwriting.org) from mid-May to mid-June, 2017.*

Theme 1: Implications for Teaching and Learning
A number of blogs indicated a concern with how teaching and learning might be impacted by (or an important element of) writing development across the lifespan. While this is directly in line with Principle 8 of the LWDG, we saw people take this issue in a number of directions that connected with a number of other principles. Diana Arya, for instance, linked the work of composing up with the composing processes of reading a text. Nick Jackson, on the other hand, took a different route by attending to the role of political and structural decisions like dual enrollment. Elizabeth Narvaez took yet another approach with her take-up of the ICFES exam as an opportune moment for examining writing development. Furthermore, issues of transfer (Bugdal) and otherwise transitioning across settings (Tarabochia) usefully brought out issues of teaching and learning.

These decisions—where to engage in what is typically "first-year composition activity," how to frame the relationship between reading and writing, examining the writing practices of post-secondary writers, and transfer—are consequential in to writers' development. Participants in this theme will explore the structural, curricular, and pedagogical implications of a "writing through the lifespan" approach to studying, teaching, and learning writing. How do we become different kinds of teachers and learners when we engage in the day-to-day work of writing instruction with the lifespan in mind? In what ways might we look to the policy decisions of school districts, state boards of education, and even national education departments anew with this lifespan perspective? Furthermore, how might we use the lifespan perspective to provide a common orientation for more carefully examining the overlaps and convergences in educational designs in different countries?

<div align="center">

Theme 1 Questions

</div>

1. What does it look like to teach—in a single course, in a semester- or quarter-long experience with students—with the lifespan in mind? What might the consequences be? (Ryan Dippre)
2. How might we consider reshaping our curricular and pedagogical decision-making to orient the teaching of writing to the lifespan? (Ryan Dippre)
3. How do current conceptions of teaching for "college and career readiness" align (or misalign) with a lifespan perspective on writing development? (Rachel Stumpf)

Theme 2: Theorizing Writing Development Through the Lifespan
A number of posts drew on a range of theories to problematize how we might conceive of "development" from cradle to grave. Issues of opportunity (Rosenberg), social class (Krall-Lanoue), and the changing demands of writing situations over time (Clary-Lemon, Dippre & Smith) usefully problematize how we might think of development. It seems, based on various posts, that some sort of normative "curve" or "trajectory" of development is inherently problematic, leaving out already-marginalized writers (Rosenberg), whitewashing the

"constellated experiencing" (Tarabochia) of writers across multiple dimensions of human activity, and perhaps undervaluing the power of a single (sometimes overlooked) factor to shape the rambling path of development one's life takes (Jackson).

So…what do we do now? How might we create useful models of writing development (Poch)? *Should* we create useful models of writing development? Is a model what we need? Is there a way we can tackle the difficult-to-imagine complexity of writing through the lifespan that a number of blog posts (i.e., Poch, Clary-Lemon, Zajic, Dippre & Smith) addressed and yet still have some sort of workable *something* that can shape, guide, and/or coordinate our research? How, in other words, might we be able to operationalize the principles of the lifespan in a useful (i.e., research-able) way via effective theorizing?

Obviously, these are questions for several lifetimes, and the goal of the meeting on Theme 2 is not to answer them, but rather to find ways to usefully corral the questions into productive channels, such as central concepts, essential keywords, usefully problematic definitions, etc. The important take-away from this meeting will not be a set of terms or frameworks to agree on, but rather a set of terms and/or frameworks that everyone agrees it is useful to focus their varied understandings, insights, theories, and findings on.

Theme 2 Questions

1. What might be an effective first step in organizing a model of lifespan writing development? (Ryan Dippre)
2. How are "models" used in other disciplinary contexts and how might we borrow/adapt modelling methods for our purposes? (Sandy Tarabochia)
3. What essential keywords are guiding our current understandings of writing through the lifespan? (Ryan Dippre)
4. How do we best draw from lifespan research across psychological, sociological, and broader academic research to further situate the complex roles of writing? (Matt Zajic)
5. What questions need to be asked that are often not explicitly stated when studying a shorter age range that may lend to further lifespan inquiry? (Matt Zajic)
6. Can we devise a flexible framework of analytical parameters that would remain operational and sensitive to change in time? (Lavinia Hirsu)
7. How do we conceptualize the core concepts of writing and do those change over time (e.g., from elementary to high school)? (Apryl Poch)

Theme 3: Writer Identity, Background, and Experiences

At the core of many blog posts was the concern of, in Sandy Tarabochia's words, "writer over writing." In other words, bloggers were less concerned with what happened to particular kinds of writing than how the writer became a different kind of writer—formed a different kind of writer identity (or identities? It was unclear to us whether some of our colleagues preferred to pluralize the term) as a result of engaging with particular acts of writing. Furthermore, some bloggers were concerned with the conditions that led writers *to* particular writing experiences (Rosenberg, Krall-Lanoue, Zajic) and their construction of that writing activity *as* experiences. This interest in writer identity, background, and experiences carried various bloggers in different directions, as the other two themes did. Matt Zajic, for instance, used a

particular site of research—a writer on the Autistic spectrum—to bring together (and problematize) both ASD research and Writing Studies research.

The meeting for this theme will thus address how we might make sense of identity (or identities) in writing. How can we, as we examine the writing that particular kinds of writers do, understand the relationship between writing, identity, background, and experiences? What productive tensions can we work out amongst ourselves and amongst the literature in the wider fields of writing studies, education, and psychology that will serve as interesting departure points for later talks, panels, and publications? Furthermore, given our own interests in particular sites of study, how might we usefully focus our energies and resources on issues of identity, background, and experience?

Theme 3 Questions

1. How might we most usefully frame the concept of "Identity" in our research? (Ryan Dippre)
2. What role does "experience" play in our understanding of writing through the lifespan? (Ryan Dippre)
3. How do different frames of identity and experience interact across the different contexts where writing is learned and performed in? (Matt Zajic)
4. As researchers, might we form collaborative teams to gather extant research (about identity, for example, as well as other concepts such as motivation and/or theoretical frameworks) to serve as a shared body of knowledge? (Sandy Tarabochia)
5. Might it be possible to share "raw" data in a way that allows us to work across ongoing research studies? (Sandy Tarabochia)

Theme 4: Individuality, Agency, and Context

The final theme that emerged across blog posts focused on the individual—in particular, the relationship between individual and context. Issues of agency in transfer (Bugdal), in creating contexts (Dippre & Smith), in relating to language (Rosenberg), and in making choices about context, writing, and even one's sense of self as an individual (Tarabochia) shape the ways in which our bloggers framed the work of the individual in the act of writing.

The participants in the Theme 4 meeting will focus on how we might usefully attend to issues of individuality, agency, and context in the work of writing through the lifespan. What counts as an individual? When? In what contexts? For what purposes? To what actors? How might we usefully and practically pursue understandings of agency, both in systemic terms and from the point of view of the participants? Finally, how might we productively bound a context? When can we consider a context to be changing? Should we even be attending to a changed context at all? If not, in what other ways can we highlight how writers move through settings as they complete writing across their lives?

Theme 4 Questions

1. In your conceptualization of lifespan writing development, how are you conceptualizing the individual? (Ryan Dippre)

2. What past research might we turn to as we think about "bounding" contexts in lifespan writing research? (Ryan Dippre)

Appendix B: Initial Conference Themes

Virtual Meetings, Round 2: Emerging Questions

Overview

In late October and early November 2017, the Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration held four virtual meetings in response to the Lifespan blog posts written between April and June, 2017. These meetings were focused on four themes:

1) Implications for teaching and learning;
2) Theorizing writing development through the lifespan;
3) Writer identity, background, and experiences; and
4) Individuality, agency, and context.

The purpose of the October and November meetings was to begin identifying the kinds of questions that the members of the Collaboration were interested in pursuing. Practically speaking, we were hoping to identify a few questions that would serve as generative for small group discussions and panel presentations during the Lifespan conference in late May / early June 2018.

The Current Task

After the meetings ended, Ryan Dippre reviewed his notes and the audio files to work out a handful of driving questions that seemed to (1) specify the concerns and interests of the group further and (2) frame those concerns and interests in ways that would allow for various interests, approaches, theories, and methods to be put into productive conversation with one another. These questions are below.

Essentially, the four themes were reorganized into three keywords that will (should everyone agree they are useful) drive the conference and set panels and small group activities in conversation with one another. Essentially, themes 3 and 4 were largely combined (there proved to be a great deal of overlap in the discussions), and theme 1 was expanded beyond teaching and learning and into "society" in general. This was an attempt to highlight the slippage of the conversation on teaching and learning between the curricular and the extracurricular.

Please review these questions and add, subtract, revise, edit, and otherwise comment on them so that we can be sure that the questions driving our upcoming conference are moving us in a productive direction, toward the set of long-term, integrated studies that we wish to get moving.

As you are looking through these questions, think about your own interests, concerns, and positions. Are these questions going to help you bring those into conversation with others in the Collaboration? Could you see yourself organizing a presentation that relates to one or more of them? If not, what has to change? Do we need another question? A sub-question? A revision of an existing question?

The Framework and Questions

The Long View at Work: Theory, Identity, and Society in Lifespan Writing Research

Theory: An "Umbrella for Complexity" / Mapping Our "Bag of Birds"

1) What new language and metaphors can we use to think about writing and the development of writers?
2) How might we account for the complexity and variability of writing across different epochs of the lifespan?
3) What role might normativity, models, and constructs play in our emerging attempts to understand writing from cradle to grave?

Identity: Where's the Fire?

1) How is awareness at work in writers' emerging understandings of themselves as writers across their lives?
2) How do perceptions of role and agency within communities of writers shape writing identity?
3) How does motivation and affect shape perceptions of a writing self, as well as literate action?
4) How do the technologies/media available for writing influence writer identity?

Society: The Changing Shape of Location and Structure

1) How might the relationships among writing curricula, writing pedagogy, and life outside of schooling be understood from a lifespan perspective?
2) In what ways can we frame the histories, systems, and individuated action involved in writing for research purposes that respects both the complexity of the phenomenon and the demands of a research agenda?
3) How does the proliferation of writing media (e.g. social media, digital composing) and the increasing accessibility of those media impact writers' understanding of their work and its value?
4) What mechanisms can we use to set local moments of writing in relation to more expansive and increasingly digitized systems of literate activity?

Addendum: Research Ideas, Questions, and Methods

Throughout the meetings, many topics emerged that were focused on particular research sites, methods, and questions. They did not quite fit the purpose of the questions above, but they may be very useful for people, particularly if they choose to do a small study to present on for the Lifespan conference. These methods, questions, and sites may also be good springboards for piloting multi-institutional studies (a topic we still need to negotiate). These questions, comments, topics, and methods are listed below in the order that they came up during the meetings. If you are interested in pursuing them, make a comment and see if anyone else is interested in jumping on board. If you have other ideas, add them to the list.

·   In what ways are teachers operating without a lifespan orientation, and where is that problematic? Lara Costa Apryl Poch

- How can we conceptualize development, methodologically? Are we looking for patterns of change or change that emerges in sudden "bursts"? Sandy Tarabochia Lara Costa Apryl Poch
- How might lifespan findings be oriented toward educational policy? Lara Costa Apryl Poch
- Mining Twitter as a data source for development in one venue
- Narratives of writing development Sandy Tarabochia
- What is the flexibility of context?
- How do people negotiate their writing identity across sites of literate activity?
- Meta-analysis on writing intervention research Lara Costa Apryl Poch
- How do networks shape us?
- Tracing informal mentorships / relationships regarding writing Sandy Tarabochia
- Studying autobiographical accounts of writing development
- What do you feel competent to do as a writer?
- How are major changes in the lifespan negotiated through writing?

Appendix C: Conference CFP

Writing Through the Lifespan is a collaboration of nearly 40 scholars around the world who are in the beginning stages of sharing related and complementary research studies focused on key conceptual and developmental aspects of writing across one's life (lifespanwriting.org). This burgeoning research community invites proposals for its [inaugural conference](), "Theory, Identity, and Society in Lifespan Writing Research" to be held May 31-June 1, 2018 in Athens, Ohio, USA. The goals of this first gathering are to (1) showcase writing research using a lifespan perspective, (2) to further such research, and (3) to provide an opportunity for lifespan researchers to network.

All researchers who investigate writing (broadly defined as inscribed, multimodal communication within and across communities of life and work) within and across any populations and who adopt longitudinal, developmental perspectives are encouraged to submit proposals. We particularly seek research that addresses the following questions:

Theory

- What new language and metaphors can we use to think about writing and the development of writers?
- How might we account for the complexity and variability of writing across different epochs of the lifespan?
- What role might normativity, models, and constructs play in our emerging attempts to understand writing from cradle to grave?

Identity

- How is awareness at work in writers' emerging understandings of themselves as writers across their lives?
- How do perceptions of role and agency within communities of writers shape writing identity?
- How does motivation and affect shape perceptions of a writing self, as well as literate action?
- How do the technologies/media available for writing influence writer identity?

Society

- How might the relationships among writing curricula, writing pedagogy, and life outside of schooling be understood from a lifespan perspective?
- In what ways can we frame the histories, systems, and individuated action involved in writing for research purposes that respects both the complexity of the phenomenon and the demands of a research agenda?
- How does the proliferation of writing media (e.g. social media, digital composing) and the increasing accessibility of those media impact writers' understanding of their work and its value?
- What mechanisms can we use to set local moments of writing in relation to more expansive and increasingly digitized systems of literate activity?

We seek proposals for individual research presentations (20 minutes), panel presentations (3 or more researchers, 60 minutes total), or work-in-progress presentations (10 minutes of presentation followed by 15 minutes of discussion).

Individual Research Presentations:

- This category is for oral presentations on individual research that is connected to one (or multiple) of the above themes. Individual research presentations will be grouped thematically to specific topics or by broad conference theme by conference committee members during the review process. Individual research presentations allow for researchers to propose new ideas grounded in the literature or to report on findings from either in-progress or completed research projects. Presenters will have 20 minutes (15 minutes speaking with 5 minutes for questions).
    - Word count limit: 350 words

Panel Presentations:

- This category allows multiple researchers to examine one topic (either a theme or subtheme) from a variety of perspectives or from an in-depth perspective. Panel presentations should be submitted by a team of researchers (3+) and should be focused on a specific linking theme or topic. Submissions should include a brief statement concerning how the panel session will be structured (i.e., three separate presentations, presentations of different lengths, two presentations with a discussant, etc.). Panels will have 75 minutes (60 minutes for all speakers with 15 minutes for questions).
    - Word count limit: 850 words (750 for presentations and 100 for session description)

Work-in-Progress Presentations:

- This category is for projects or ideas in their early stages or already in progress that would benefit from discussion and insights from colleagues. Work-in-progress presentations will be done in roundtable formats grouped thematically to allow for discussions amongst colleagues. Submissions should include sufficient information about the project and potential questions that the researcher is seeking feedback or further insights about. Presenters may share empirical findings in this format as well, and we encourage discussions around preliminary findings that might spark future research trajectories with projects that are currently underway. Presenters will have 25 minutes (10 minutes speaking with 15 minutes for discussion).
    - Word count limit: 350 words

Proposals are due by February 15, 2018 and should be submitted **here**. Participants may EITHER submit proposals for an Individual Research Presentation OR as part of a Panel Presentation. All participants are eligible to submit a Work-in-Progress proposal in addition to an Individual or Panel proposal. All co-authors and affiliations will be entered at time of submission. Presenters will have the opportunity to submit their work for possible inclusion in an edited collection on lifespan writing.

Conference Organizers: Talinn Phillips, Ohio University & Ryan Dippre, University of Maine

Conference Committee: Diana Arya, University of California at Santa Barbara
Jessica Early, Arizona State University
Nick Jackson, University of Louisville
Matthew Zajic, University of California at Davis

Appendix D: Conference Schedule

Thursday, May 31: Bentley Hall 306
Note: The accessible entrance to Bentley Hall is off the portico between Bentley Hall and Bentley Annex. It's on the right side of the building when facing it from President Street.

8:00 am - 11:00 am	Registration	*Bentley 304*
8:00 am - 9:00 am	Breakfast	*Bentley 304*
9:00 am - 9:20 am	Welcome	Talinn Phillips, Ohio University	*Bentley 306*
9:20 am - 9:30 am Dean of Graduate University	Welcome to Ohio University	Joseph Shields, VP for Research and College & Interim Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, Ohio
9:30 am - 10:30 am Barbara	*Bentley 306*	Plenary #1	Charles Bazerman, University of California at Santa
10:30 am – 11:15 am	Small Group Discussion	*Bentley 210, 215, 304, and 306*
11:15 am - 11:30 am	Break
11:30 am - 12:30 pm	Plenary #2	Steve Graham, Arizona State University	*Bentley 306*
12:30 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch on Your Own
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Plenary #3	Anna Smith, Illinois State University	*Bentley 306*
3:00 pm - 3:45 pm	Small Group Discussion	*Bentley 210, 215, 304, and 306*
3:45 pm - 4:15 pm	Break	*Bentley 304*
4:15 pm - 5:15 pm Madden, University	Plenary #4	Sandra Tarabochia, University of Oklahoma & Shannon of Rhode Island	*Bentley 306*
5:15 pm - 6:00 pm	Small Group Discussion	*Bentley 210, 215, 304, and 306*

Friday, June 1: Baker University Center

8:00 am - 10:30 am	**Registration |** *Baker University Center 239*
8:00 am – 9:00 am	**Breakfast |** *Baker University Center 239*

9:00 am – 10:15 am   **Concurrent Session A.1 |** *Baker University Center 237*

Sandra Tarabochia: "Self-authorship Development in Faculty Writers: A Longitudinal Study in Progress"
Dana Landry: "Experiences that Stick: Student Confidence as Writers in Academia and the World"
Ryan Dippre & Anna Smith: "Tracing Contexts' Development in Longitudinal Studies of Writing"

Concurrent Session A.2 | *Baker University Center 235*

Jeff Naftzinger: "A Portrait of Everyday Writing: A Writer-Informed Approach"
Summer E. Dickinson: "Collective Literate Lives: The Story of a Writer Who Raised a Writer"
Su-Yi Chou: "Writing Personal History with Grandparents: Spiritual Care in Changing Intergenerational Relationships in Taiwan"

10:30 am – 11:45 am   **Concurrent Session B.1 |** *Baker University Center 237*

Apryl Poch, Matthew Zajic, & Charles Bazerman (discussant): "Developmental Considerations for Theoretical Writing Frameworks Across the Lifespan: Perspectives on K-12 Children with Exceptionalities"

Concurrent Session B.2 | *Baker University Center 235*

Lauren Bowen, Lauren Rosenberg, and Ryan Dippre: "Writing and Agency in Old Age: Methodologies to Challenge a Curriculum of Aging"

11:45 am – 1:00 pm   **Lunch on Your Own**

1:00 pm - 2:15 pm   **Concurrent Session C.1 |** *Baker University Center 237*

Apryl Poch: "Theorizing About Writing: What Good Are Writing Models?"
Magdalena Knappik: "Writing for Viability: A Subjectivation Theory Perspective on Writing Development
Rachel Stumpf: "Trying to "Adapt Real Quick:: Students' Transition from High School to College Writing

Concurrent Session C.2 | *Baker University Center 235*

Ashley Fox: "Lifespan(s), Literacy, and Learning: Reimagining Scenes of Sponsorship"
Lauren Rosenberg: "Writing Practices of Military Personnel: Framing the Research for Publication"
Anthony Clairmont, Diana J. Arya, Sarah Hirsch, Daniel Katz: "Exploring and Building a Theoretical Progression of Complexity for Data Representations (Infographics)"
Matthew Zajic: "Methodological Considerations for Studying Writing Across the Lifespan from Developmental and Quantitative Psychology Perspectives"

2:30 pm - 3:15 pm   **Small Group Discussion |** *Baker University Center 235, 237, 239*

3:15 pm – 3:45 pm   **Break |** *Baker University Center 239*

3:45 pm - 4:45 pm   **Plenary #5 | Ryan Dippre, University of Maine |** *Bentley 306*

5:30 pm - 7:30 pm   **Conference Dinner |** *Nelson Hall Private Dining Room*

Saturday, June 2: Collaboration Organizing | Bentley 306

9:00 am – 10:00 am   Summarizing Methodological Issues

10:00 am – 10:15 am   Break

10:15 am – 12:15 pm   Framing Research Questions & Integrating Methodologies

12:15 pm – 1:30 pm   Lunch on Your Own

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm   Constitution & By-Laws

3:00 pm – 3:15 pm   Break

3:30 pm – 5:00 pm   Collaboration Next Steps

Appendix E: Conference Abstracts

9:00 - 10:15 am   **Concurrent Session A.1 | Baker University Center 237**

Self-authorship Development in Faculty Writers: A Longitudinal Study in Progress [work in progress]
Sandra Tarabochia, University of Oklahoma   sltarabochia@ou.edu

My research examines how faculty writer development is shaped by development in areas including "emotion, identity, politics, sense of efficacy, and collective action" (Bazerman et al., 2017, p. 356). I consider the value of self-authorship as a framework for theorizing the development trajectories of faculty writers. Originally conceptualized by psychologist Robert Kegan (1994), self-authorship is elaborated in Baxter Magolda's (2001) longitudinal study of undergraduate students to include the following dimensions: epistemological (how we know), interpersonal (how we relate to others) and intrapersonal (how we understand ourselves). Although self-authorship may seem most relevant for college students transitioning to adulthood, Carmen Werder (2013) argues that the "momentous move" to a faculty position "could very well entail a new professional and personal crossroad where faculty look to reconstruct their beliefs about knowledge, themselves, and their relationship to others" (p. 283). She proposes self-authorship as an integrated framework for understanding changes experienced by faculty writers; yet, "no studies have been done to show how faculty might gauge their self-authorship development" (p. 283). Therefore, my research seeks to uncover if/how faculty experience shifts in dimensions of self-authorship as academic writers.

Data collection and analysis for this IRB-approved study have occurred recursively over three years. Participants include members of writing groups organized around Wendy Belcher's *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks* and faculty who chose not to participate in a writing group. This presentation will focus on interview data collected using the Subject Object Interview protocol. Based on Kegan's (1982) constructivist development theory, the protocol was adapted to determine how faculty understand and respond to challenges impacting their identities as writers (Kegan, Noam, & Rogers, 1982; Lahey, Souvaine, Kegan, Goodman, & Felix, 2011). I will share findings from preliminary qualitative coding sessions and seek feedback on the following questions: What is the best way to analyze interview transcripts to capture the essence of faculty writers' developmental trajectories? Which qualitative coding methods are most useful for tracking changes over time? What role should the theory of self-authorship play in coding and analysis? How can initial findings shape future data collection and analysis?

Experiences that Stick: Student Confidence as Writers in Academia and the World [work in progress]
Dana Landry, University of the Fraser Valley   Dana.Landry@ufv.ca

I present a preliminary idea for a study that is framed by the questions, "How might the relationships among writing curricula, writing pedagogy, and life outside of schooling be understood from a lifespan perspective?" and "How is awareness at work in writers,' emerging understandings of themselves as writers across their lives?" I want to understand students' experiences of the course, "Introduction to academic culture," at a mid-size university in British Columbia, Canada. The course is designed to increase students' confidence as learners within academic settings as they begin to read and write in academic genres. I propose to trace the confidence and writing abilities of students who enter this course through the duration of the course, their studies in post-secondary education, and their lives, post-university. The objectives of the study include: 1) to understand in what ways the course might be fostering students' confidence as academic writers, 2) to analyze relationships of confidence with abilities to write across meta-genres encountered in this and subsequent courses, 3) to understand what experiences and skills from the course ,"stick" over an adult lifespan, insofar as they are recognized by students as playing a role in awareness and/or transformation of self. I intend to recruit students enrolled in CSM 108 in Fall 2018 and Winter 2019 and propose three phases of data collection. 1) During course: a) life writing (discourse analysis of features coded for confidence, b) formal assignments (features of academic writing taught in 108 using assignment criteria checklists), c) grades on those assignments (as one typical, systemic measure alongside the other two); 2) Post-course in university: a) some formal assignments from all courses (discourse analysis of features of academic writing taught in 108), b) life writing about confidence with the assignments; 3) Post university: a) questionnaire upon graduation from any program, b) questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups as

research develops. This longitudinal study can inform Canadian post-secondary academic writing curriculum that fosters student confidence and writing ability across research genres in academia and can shed light on the impacts their academic writing instruction might have on their lives as writers and citizens.

Tracing Contexts' Development in Longitudinal Studies of Writing [work in progress]

Ryan Dippre, University of Maine   ryan.dippre@maine.edu
Anna Smith, Illinois State University   amsmi11@ilstu.edu

Concurrent Session A.2 | Baker University Center 235

A Portrait of Everyday Writing: A Writer-Informed Approach

Jeff Naftzinger, Florida State University   jeff.naftzinger@gmail.com

Drawing on David Barton and Mary Hamilton's *Local Literacies* and Cohen, White, and Cohen's "A Time Use Diary Study of Adult Everyday Writing Behavior," I present a portrait of the everyday writing practices of five everyday writers from across the US, who represent five different age groups and multiple demographic characteristics, including occupation, education, location, gender, and race. Utilizing time-use diaries and writing artifacts, this presentation shows what writing tasks these writers engage in over the course of a week and what media, genre, and modes they compose with. In particular, it highlights the fact that most of their writing is mundane and digital, in the form of Facebook posts, text messages, emails, etc. And that there is a generational divide: the two younger participants write more, and in more genres and modes, than the three participants who are older than 40.

As important, through the use of one-on-one interviews with these five writers, I discuss participants' perceptions and definitions of writing, and how their personal, educational, and occupational experiences have influenced their writing. These participants write often, but they do not see their writing as important and they do not define their practices as writing nor themselves as writers; for them "real" writing, the kind of writing they composed in school or what real "writers" do, is important, but what they do is a mundane, communicative activity regardless of its subject matter — even when it deals with their occupation, their health, or their relationships. Interestingly though, the younger participants see writing as more important, and they have a more capacious definition of what counts as everyday writing. The habits (e.g. list making) and perceptions (e.g. writing anxiety) of writing they develop at a young age can be seen in their adult lives. Similarly, the participants' definitions of, feelings about, and processes for writing have been heavily influenced by their experiences with writing education, regardless of how recent it was. Finally, this research shows that using the term everyday writing has the potential to change their perception of writing: it allows these participants to see themselves as writers and see their writing as important.

Collective Literate Lives: The Story of a Writer Who Raised a Writer

Summer E. Dickinson, Indiana University of PA s.e.dickinson@iup.edu

This study (my dissertation work to be exact) boils down to a series of questions: what do we study when we say we're studying how writing occurs? Do we study texts — pieces of writing only? Do we study the events that occurred in a person's life before they started producing those pieces of writing? Do we study their hobbies, their lifestyle, their beliefs? Where do we draw the line between what counts in a person's literate life, in their writing ability, and what does not? And related to this study, do we study generations within families?

Chronotopic laminated trajectory research has shown how the actual practices of writers — the ways in which writers compose academic texts specifically — differ from the dominant narratives often heard about how writing occurs (see Prior, Roozen, Shipka, Erikson, etc.). The process of showing a person's literate becoming (see Prior specifically) proves to be a complicated unraveling of multi-mediated and layered events within a lifetime. This study shows various ways participants make, think, and act with materials in order to make sense of the world and create complex compositions. It also argues that these

compositions form a collective stream of activity across multiple generations in the same family leading to co-genesis—intergenerational invention in semiotic activity. In other words, the transgenerational literate lives of the participants are affected by the deeply laminated plurality of semiotic activity happening across these three generations and over the lifetimes of all three participants' lives.

In short, this study showed significant evidence that the co-participants developed rich literate lives throughout their lifetime in various ways. Engaging with puzzles, sensory, photography, and spy games shows these writers used heteronormative methods of literate becoming throughout their lives and supports prior laminated trajectory research discussed in chapter two (Prior, Roozen, Erikson, etc.). Furthermore, looking at these non-normative literate practices of the participants collectively suggests we consider literate practices throughout the lifespan of families as being collective co-genesis.

Writing Personal History with Grandparents: Spiritual Care in Changing Intergenerational Relationships in Taiwan

Su-Yi Chou, University of Rochester   schou4@u.rochester.edu

My study aims to understand the nature of intergenerational (IG) relationships focusing on spiritual care, as viewed within an IG writing program in Taiwan, where high school students write English personal histories for and with their grandparents. This writing program serves as a way of learning English and a way of spiritual connection across generations. Taiwan has a historically embedded IG culture, featuring a tradition of valuing older people and an IG community across the boundary of life and death. However, the Westernized lifestyles have caused changing relationships and IG disconnects. At the same time, the acceleration of global aging is raising an awareness of aging issues. The government has developed sound policies in physical care of the aging population, but there is no effective policy for IG connections, which demonstrates a lack of spiritual care across generations. Current studies about IG issues focus mainly on instrumental or material aspects, without paying much attention to spiritual care. As a result, I proposed a study focusing on IG spiritual care. Writing a personal history serves as a form of spiritual care across generations in my study. Through a qualitative case study with the methods of survey, participant observation, artifact collection, and interviews, I explore the role of spiritual care in the changing IG relationships in Taiwan with a goal of improving IG relationships. Finding indicated that IG relationships work in a social exchange model. In a modified model in my study, spiritual care works as oil that fits the holes of any potentially imbalanced exchange, nourishing or lubricating any insufficiencies in IG relationships, making it a balanced exchange. As viewed in the writing program, through this writing activity, participants either developed an adjusting lens to look at IG conflicts or became aware of their adjusting process in dealing with insufficiencies in IG relationships as well as those in other issues in life.

10:30 am – 11:45 am Concurrent Session B.1 | Baker University Center 237

Developmental Considerations for Theoretical Writing Frameworks Across the Lifespan: Perspectives on K-12 Children with Exceptionalities

Apryl Poch, Duquesne University   pocha1@duq.edu
Matthew Zajic, UC Davis   mczajic@ucdavis.edu
Charles Bazerman, UC Santa Barbara   bazerman@education.ucsb.edu

Over the last almost 40 years, frameworks for understanding the skills and underlying processes required for effective writing have continued to refine the nature of writing research across elementary, secondary, and postsecondary contexts. While the research predominantly began from the seminal work offered by Hayes & Flower (1980), various additional, revised frameworks have been offered in recent years looking at developed (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 1996; Kaufer, Hayes, & Flower, 1986) and developing (Berninger & Swanson, 1994; Berninger & Winn, 2006; Juel, Griffith, & Gough, 1986) writers. Even more recently, revised comprehensive frameworks have been offered that speak to both social and cognitive processes across developmental periods (e.g., Berninger, 2000, 2015; Graham, in press; Hayes, 2012). However, research gaps persist that require further investigation (e.g., Kim & Schatschneider, 2017), particularly with individuals who exhibit heterogeneous challenges with writing like children with exceptionalities. This research is particularly needed within the context of a lifespan approach to

understand how underlying social and cognitive processes affect writing development beyond small developmental windows (Bazerman et al., 2017). This presentation discusses potential interdisciplinary approaches to addressing these theoretical gaps based on cognitive and social cognitive research within the school-age years investigating the writing challenges of children with learning disabilities (LD) and autism spectrum disorder (ASD).

Presenter #1 will focus on the roles of transcription and cognition by drawing from research on school-age children with LD. LD has been described as "a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes" (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004) and "presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction" (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities; LD Online, 2015). Specifically, many students with LD manifest an "imperfect ability" to write and spell. Graham and Harris (2012) identified two general domains in which students with LD struggle: approach to writing and knowledge of writing. Students with LD approach writing though a singular channel, to generate content, and give little attention to planning, editing, and revising. Moreover, these students lack knowledge of writing and of various writing genres. Though transcription level difficulties are common in young children, Cowan (2014) found that working memory increases across the lifespan, and Berninger, Mizokawa, and Bragg (1991) suggested that cognitive factors are more likely to influence writing after about middle school/junior high. Thus, understanding the centrality of memory—a component literally at the center of the Simple View of Writing (Berninger et al., 2002)—may be a useful starting place for deconstructing writing models in relation to learners with LD.

Presenter #2 will focus on the role of social cognition on writing development across the lifespan by drawing from research on children with ASD. ASD is a neurodevelopmental difference characterized by difficulties with social communication and restricted interests or repetitive behavioral patterns (APA, 2013). Though they offer more comprehensive perspectives, recent frameworks have not emphasized how the developmental roles of early executive functions and social cognition impact early language development and set the developmental trajectory for emergent and later writing abilities. For example, early joint attention draws on executive functions and social cognitive abilities to coordinate one's attention with other people in order to fluidly adopt common points of view with others (Mundy, 2016). Joint attention is a powerful predictor of later language and social cognitive development in not only typically developing children but also children with ASD, a population of individuals who show early joint attention difficulties. School-age children with ASD demonstrate a range of heterogeneous writing challenges, but research in this area has lacked input from theoretical writing frameworks and has not considered the potential developmental role of joint attention (Zajic, under review). These gaps suggest the need for writing researchers and ASD researchers to collaborate to understand a) how the developmental relationship between early joint attention and later social cognition may affect lifelong writing development and b) how underlying social cognitive processes may contribute to some of the heterogeneous writing challenges demonstrated by individuals with ASD across the lifespan.

Concurrent Session B.2 | Baker University Center 235

Writing and Agency in Old Age: Methodologies to Challenge a Curriculum of Aging
Lauren Bowen, UMass, Boston   **lauren.bowen@umb.edu**
Lauren Rosenberg,   **laurenr@nmsu.edu**
Ryan Dippre, University of Maine   **ryan.dippre@maine.edu**
The presenters in this panel view agency as emergent and circulating, resulting in new meanings. Agency is an inherent function of writing (Lu and Horner). For the elder writers we research, agency is especially challenging since old age brings shifts in the social, material, and physiological. The language practices of elder writers become entangled with the "curriculum of aging, "an assemblage of rhetorics that circulate and amplify cultural ideologies of age and aging" (Bowen). Presenting on methodologies from three studies, we focus on literate actions that attend to a "long view" of writing, and to the salient experiences of aging.

Speaker 1 begins by illustrating how the curriculum of aging in contemporary American culture places constraints on the circulation of and response to elders' writing, and thus the ways agency can operate as a function of elders' literate activity. For example, when aging becomes conflated with cognitive

decay, elders' literacy and "rhetoricity" is called into question, since "to be disabled mentally is to be disabled rhetorically" (Prendergast 202). Then, through an illustrative case from a larger study of elders' experiences with literacy-related technologies, this speaker examines the contributions of life story research (Atkinson; Bruner), which allows for both a "long view" of literacy development, as well as a situated view of literate life in the context of old age. Modeled on the projects of disability studies (Couser) and age studies (Ray), life stories can help researchers to trace alternative accounts of the elder experience, which can reflect, complicate, or counter prominent cultural narratives of aging. Ultimately, this speaker illustrates how life stories can uncover the agentive work of literate activity in later life by presenting accounts of agency as a component of resilience. Defined not as a stable personal trait but as a process of engaging in mutually constitutive relationships with others (Flynn, Sotirin, & Brady), relational resilience captures ways in which writers make meaningful connections with others, drawing on whatever resources are available, to achieve tactical goals through literate activity.

Speaker 2 unpacks the material work that underscores the life stories that Speaker 1 used to identify and trace relational resilience. Drawing on a case study of one retiree who writes on a regular basis, Speaker 2 follows the material, moment-to-moment work of linguistic agency and its impact on a writer's participation in functional systems of activity (Prior). Responding to recent work into the materiality and situatedness of literate action (Rule, Dobrin, Pigg), Speaker 2 traces this subject's literate action across the various lifeworlds that she inhabits in order to understand how she constructs and expands her agency over time. A set of interviews that traces a subject's literacy history (Brandt) and environment selecting and structuring practices (Prior and Shipka) provide a detailed picture of both the individuated history of the writer and the material practices of that writing. Transcripts of these interviews provided a context for a close examination of texts provided by the participant, which were analyzed via a line-by-line coding scheme (Glaser and Strauss). The interviews and documents allowed for a triangulation of particular moments of material work that connects across different timescales to circulate, expand, and perpetuate agency for this participant. By following the material chains through which this writer establishes, circulates, and expands her agentive range, Speaker 2 identifies how, when, and why linguistic agency develops into the kinds of wide-ranging agency that significantly impacts the life and social action of elderly members of society.

Responding to Bazerman et al in their assertion of principles guiding Lifespan research ("Towards an Understanding of Writing Development Across the Lifespan"), Speaker 3 argues that Lifespan studies need to attend to the writing development of adults who have extensive life experience outside of traditional educational modes, such as the older adult learners she studies, who can broaden and complicate assumptions about how writers develop--and decline--in older age. When we speak of older writers in these presentations, we refer to a large, under-recognized population that struggles to maintain a sense of agency and dignity. The people Speaker 3 researches have been considered nonliterate writers throughout their life because of material conditions that restricted their ability to become literate. How do terms like "good" and "able" writer shift during the period of older age? What are the exigencies for continuing to write? Drawing upon her longitudinal research with a group of older adult basic learners, Speaker 3 expands on the idea of mutual contemplation, an approach taken in her previous research, informed by Royster and Kirsch's work on "strategic contemplation," in which researched and researcher linger and reflect together on themes emerging from their case study interviews and writing samples. This presentation considers a couple of participants' decision to steer the research in a direction of their choosing, a move that corresponds with a commitment to continue examining their writing development in older adulthood.

1:00 pm - 2:15 pm   Concurrent Session C.1 | Baker University Center 237

Theorizing About Writing: What Good Are Writing Models?" **[work in progress]**
Apryl Poch, Duquesne University   PochA1@duq.edu
In the Lifespan's November 2017 session on Theorizing Writing, the group contemplated the role of writing models and whether there was a need for modeling writing. During that meeting I started diagraming a "model" that provided an initial attempt to blend the ideas that were being spoken of as important to writing. However, several questions remain. For example, is one model of writing sufficient? Is it sufficient if it only addresses one perspective or one theoretical lens? At what point do

theoretical perspectives converge? Should they? Is a theory of lifespan writing appropriate? If so, what might it look like? And, how can theory inform practice, particularly as it relates to the education of students with and without exceptionalities?

Because writing occurs within multiple contexts, across time, across groups, across genres, across a range of abilities and includes knowledge of genres, knowledge of writing, knowledge of history and context, and must be a communicative attempt between parties that may never meet in real time, and because there is likely some type of motivation for the writer who may perceive his/her abilities potentially disproportionately, how does one capture writing? Working in special education, my research to date has focused on cognitive models of writing, though time has also produced a schism in the seemingly juxtaposed theoretical writing paradigms that exist and which, to some extent, lies within the eye of the beholder (Flower, 2017; Hayes, 2017).

This session will present a brief overview of the complexity of attempting to wrestle with different theoretical writing paradigms, present a working model, and allow for a collaborative discussion of how the Lifespan group might continue to simultaneously untangle and re-braid the multiple threads that make writing the complex, interwoven, and colorful tapestry that we seek to understand.

Writing for Viability: A Subjectivation Theory Perspective on Writing Development
Magdalena Knappik, University of Vienna,   magdalena.knappik@univie.ac.at
Writing development is most commonly conceptualised as a process of cognitive maturation (Kellogg 2006), or as a process of mastering complexity in writing (Vyatkina et al. 2015). In this paper, I suggest a broader view, one that is interested in the interrelations of individual writing development with institutional practices of the teaching of writing and with powerful societal discourses on language that form subject positions for developing writers. In my work, I used Foucauldian (Foucault 1982) and Butlerian (Butler 1997) subjectivation theory to investigate how institutional and societal factors form writers over an extended period of time.

I collected 59 writers' biographies, texts written by students. These biographies span about twenty years—from earliest encounters with literacy to the students' current academic writing experiences. I analysed these texts using Grounded Theory Methodology (Strauss/Corbin 1991, Charmaz 2006).

The data show the following trajectory: Through institutional writing practices, such as a focus on good penmanship or the focus on assessed writing, writers learned that their status as viable participants of an educational institution depended on their ability to produce viable texts, texts that show that they are able to write according to an institution's criteria for what constitutes a viable text. Criteria for viability were not only genre-specific but extended to genderised and native-speakerist (Holliday 2006) expectations. Students learned that every text they produced would become an arena for negotiating their viability as writers.
In this interrelated process between learning to write and the quest for viability through writing, three phases were discernible: (1) writing before a need for viability, (2) writing for viability and (3) writing in viability. The period of writing for viability tended to be a vulnerable phase. The period of writing in viability, however, was often accompanied by an emotional detachment from writing. In this phase, many writers reported feelings of regret for this withdrawal, and of loss, because in learning to write academic texts, they abandoned earlier, more creative and playful types of writing. These phases are non-linear: the quest for viability and the vulnerability it entails start again when the institutional context of writing changes.

Trying to "Adapt Real Quick": Students' Transition from High School to College Writing
Rachel Stumpf, UC, Irvine   rstumpf@uci.edu
"College readiness" has become a national buzzword in light of efforts to improve high school students' success in postsecondary settings. One component of this transition that has long been an area of concern is students' readiness for college writing (Sheils, 1975), and the prevailing narrative behind these concerns is that many students are "underprepared" for the demands of college writing (e.g., Achieve, 2005).

However, taking a developmental perspective on writing problematizes the idea that the challenges college writing presents for students can be solely attributed to preparation. Research suggests that even experienced adult "expert" writers may struggle when they encounter new writing tasks (e.g., Anson, 2016). It is for this reason that Bazerman and colleagues (2017) have argued, "Teachers at more advanced levels should not be too quick to blame prior teaching and learning, when the real issue could be the time necessary to develop as a writer and unfamiliarity with new expectations" (p. 357). Although some studies have sought to document the ways in which college students' writing develops over time (e.g., Sommers & Saltz, 2004), few have considered students' experiences as they write in both high school and college. Without this perspective, our understanding of how students' writing develops as they move across contexts is incomplete.

My work contributes to this body of knowledge by tracing the writing trajectories of twelve diverse California students from their last semester of high school into their first semester of college. Drawing upon student interviews and writing samples collected during both time periods, I document how students' writing beliefs and practices develop as they move from high school to college and what factors impact this development. In tracing this development, I identify patterns that emerge across the sample, as well as differences in students' individual writing trajectories. Because my participants enrolled in a variety of two-year and four-year colleges, I also examine the ways in which students,' college writing experiences vary by institutional context. Findings from this work can help to inform the practices and policies that are used to support the writing development of students within both secondary and postsecondary settings.

Concurrent Session C.2 | Baker University Center 235

Lifespan(s), Literacy, and Learning: Reimagining Scenes of Sponsorship
Ashley Fox, Wright State University   fox.182@wright.edu
An emerging area of focus in literacy scholarship is reimagining Deborah Brandt's "Sponsors of Literacy." Literacy sponsorship, in all of its forms, calls for scholars to reimagine the potential of literacy's power. Brandt claims that "the concept of sponsors helps to explain, then, a range of human relationships and ideological pressures that turn up at the scenes of literacy learning" (168). Whether future scholars define sponsorship as commercial, economical, political, communal, spiritual, self-sponsored, or a combination of those factors, sponsorship studies at its core is about relationships. A richer definition of literacy sponsorship can help scholars begin to ask why these scenes of literacy learning are so imperative to understanding the range of human relationships. Therefore, scholars interested in literacy sponsorship should also be interested in human experiences across the lifespan—experiences which propel individuals to seek out their identity through literacy. If studies were to encompass the scope and depth of a lifespan approach, scholars need to determine what else sponsors literacy. Is it within transactions between people, places, events, or a lifetime of encounters between all of these aspects? Can these moments across a lifespan transcend awareness of literacy sponsorship? Can these transactions widen to consider events, moments, memories, trials, actions as capable of being sponsors of literacy? Can these moments across the lifespan where such encounters propel individuals further into literacy sponsorship help to mold their identities?

Brandt's original inquiries in Literacy in American Lives states that, "what mattered was how and when people appealed to certain social logics about literacy, as resources, constraints, explanations, puzzles and problems of their existence (331). I argue that sponsorship and lifespan studies should analyze the potential of the "how" and "when" of this claim. In this presentation I propose a fuller definition is necessary to understand human experiences across a lifespan, events which act as an agent "local or distant, concrete or abstract, [experiences that] enable, support, teach, model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy" (166). These events may be the very explanation to one's literacy sponsorships existence—may even be the very explanation of one's identity.

Writing Practices of Military Personnel: Framing the Research for Publication **[work in progress]**
Lauren Rosenberg, New Mexico State U   laurenr@nmsu.edu

The goal of this research is to understand how servicemembers experience and value their literacies when they write within military workplace contexts, and how their perception of writing tasks, and of themselves as writers, impacts the literate behaviors they bring to their work in the university and beyond. As a literacy researcher who is an outsider to military culture, I approach the project differently from some veterans' studies scholars whose focus is on transition to academic settings or designing university programs. I am interested in the ways servicemembers relate to writing in their military jobs and how that knowledge morphs when they write in civilian settings such as the university. Through a series of case study interviews, I began to explore the writing practices of veterans. Though my initial objective was to consider paths that student-veterans take to navigate academic writing informed by the contexts in which they wrote in the military, because of expressed interest from personnel who are not students, the project expanded to include participants who are Army officers and faculty.

The interviews and collection of writing samples is complete. I have shared preliminary findings at a few conferences. Now I seek feedback on ways to pull together the individual analyses and the themes they bring up in terms of writer identity and development of a sense of the value of writing. I want help mapping emerging themes. These include: sense of authorship and ownership of writing, ghostwriting, learning workplace genres through informal mentoring, and the conflicting identities of the military servicemember as a person of action, a doer, rather than as a person of inaction, a writer at a desk.

I ask that roundtable participants help me explore these areas of possibility:
1- changing conditions in people's lives that influence a sense of self as a writer—military self and the development of the military writer
2- motives for writing in and outside military workplace contexts—social, personal, material situations
3- paths to writing development—military work, university and professional work—exigencies for writing in these contexts

Exploring and Building a Theoretical Progression of Complexity for Data Representations (Infographics) [work in progress]

Anthony Clairmont, Diana J. Arya, Sarah Hirsch, Daniel Katz
UC Santa Barbara   **darya@ucsb.edu**

We are currently engaged in ethnographic research focused on building a theoretical model of complexity for sense making and argumentation related to data representations (data figures, tables, maps, etc.) that are steadily growing in number and prominence in social media. We will describe our process for searching, analyzing and discussing selected representations, and we look forward to feedback from attendees on suggested resources and next steps in the development process.

Methodological Considerations for Studying Writing Across the Lifespan from Developmental and Quantitative Psychology Perspectives [work in progress]

Matthew Zajic, UC at Davis   **mczajic@ucdavis.edu**

Approaches to studying the development of writing abilities across the lifespan are as diverse as the theories guiding these points of inquiry. Developing and improving writing abilities across the lifespan changes across contexts, is complex and multifaceted, is variable with no single path or endpoint, develops based on socially situated needs and practices, relies on developing cognitive processes, occurs within the context of other reciprocal and mutually supporting relationships, relies on the use of language resources in educational contexts, and draws heavily on the curriculum used across the school-age years (Bazerman et al., 2017). To approach such a diverse set of issues, writing researchers need to be well versed in a variety of different methodological tools, both quantitative and qualitative.

This discussion will speak to the need for quantitative methodology to help understand how writing changes dynamically across development by providing an overview of available quantitative methodologies available to help answer these questions. By doing so, I hope to begin a discussion about the role of quantitative methodology in the ongoing effort to understand writing development across the lifespan across early, school-age, and adult years.

This presentation will focus around three core ideas. First, I will provide a brief overview of developmental and quantitative psychology, focusing on their roles in understanding broader questions about lifespan development. Second, I will conceptually walkthrough the use of advanced quantitative methodologies, specifically focusing on the history of structural equation modeling and the use of approaches like path analysis and latent growth modeling (Westland, 2015). Third, I will offer suggestions to preliminary points of inquiry and further considerations that writing researchers must further address before the use of such statistical frameworks that echo longstanding issues within writing research (e.g., the issue of assessing the changing construct of writing across the lifespan). In closing, my goal is to leave attendees more knowledgeable about the conceptual understandings of advanced statistical models as additional methodologies we can bring to the study of writing development across the lifespan.

Appendix F: Edited Collection CFP

Call for Proposals

**Approaches to Lifespan Writing Research:
Steps Toward an Actionable Coherence**

Edited by Ryan J. Dippre, University of Maine and Talinn Phillips, Ohio University

From May 31 – June 2, 2018, an international group of scholars met in Athens, Ohio to discuss lifespan writing research and plan the next steps of the *Writing through the Lifespan Collaboration*'s central goal: a multi-site, multi-generational study of writing. Through plenary talks, small group discussions, and concurrent presentations, these researchers thought deeply, broadly, across methods and sites, and through various theoretical frameworks about what it means to study writing through the whole of the lifespan.

This edited collection aims to move the many productive conversations of this conference forward by publishing some of the work presented at that conference, proposing new approaches for multi-site, multi-generational writing research, and incorporating new theories, methods, and studies that emerged from the conference. We are also excited to include additional theories, methods, and studies in order to give as well-rounded a view on lifespan writing research as possible. By demonstrating what Christiane Donahue calls a "methodology of generosity," we hope to put the many methods, sites, and theories brought to bear at the conference (and some outside of it) into some kind of "actionable coherence"—that is, we can highlight the resonance at work among the wide variety of approaches to lifespan writing research that the conference showcased in order to inform and encourage future lifespan writing research.

We seek chapters offering:
1) a report on a study that has implications for lifespan writing development. This can be a longitudinal study across a swath of time, a retrospective study of particular cases, a study of under-represented ages and populations with a broader frame of development in mind, a study that looks across multiple sites of writing, etc.
2) an investigation into particular theoretical, methodological, ethical, or other hurdles for studying writing through the lifespan.
3) an introduction to a particular method for studying writing through the lifespan.
4) resonances: that is, a piece (perhaps co-authored) that indicates resonance among methodological or theoretical orientations which could inform future lifespan writing research.

Chapters may address one or more of the criteria above. All proposed chapters must be original, not previously published or under consideration elsewhere at the time of submission. All studies must have IRB (or equivalent) approval; please provide the institution and IRB number with submission. Final chapters will run approximately 5,000-6,000 words.

Please send either a proposal of no more than 500 words or a drafted chapter to lifespanwriting@gmail.com by September 10, 2018. Acceptances will be sent in late fall with

initial chapters tentatively due in February, 2019. Inquiries about the fit of topics, etc. are also welcome.