

WPA as TPC: Defining, Mapping, Limiting, and Transforming

Writing Program Administration (WPA) and Technical and Professional Communication (TPC) both include interdisciplinary, intersectional, and boundary work (Selfe & Selfe, 2013; Hart-Davidson, 2013), all of which affect the fluid and dynamic identities one must maintain in order to be a successful writer and teacher of writing in the university. The central thread of this paper exploits the connections between WPA and TPC work, asking a question that may initially appear meek: What can WPAs take from TPC scholarship and apply to their work? But this quiet question became a gateway, revealing possible ways to enrich concepts and frameworks that are at the heart of my research. This boundary work can transform not only how an individual views herself but also how we view learning and knowledge along with the value of looking beyond the traditional boundaries of disciplines and institutions.

Identity as a Threshold Concept

In my research, I aim to consider teacher-writer identity as a threshold concept in the context of transformative WAC/WID professional development. Using an activity theory framework enriched with ideas from expansive learning and boundary crossing offers a dynamic method for examining teaching and learning, reflecting on implicit and explicit institutional structures and values, and determining methods for enacting local change.

In broad terms, my research considers how WPAs can and do structure writing across the curriculum professional development to create a transformative experience in which faculty can begin to open up discourses of topics including writing in and across the disciplines, the teaching of writing, and disciplinarity itself in order to support the development of strong student-writers. By examining teacher-writer discourse in PD participants' writings, interviews, and classroom artifacts, my research project aims to

- gain a greater understanding of how faculty-writers discuss writing in their disciplines, the practices and processes involved with that writing, and the values and identities this discourse constructs;
- examine assumptions about writing in the disciplines, the challenges teaching such writing creates for instructors, and how instructors experiences as writers may disrupt the norms of writing in the disciplines;

I want the participants and I to look together at our discourse and artifacts and, with Foucault (1973), ask, "How is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?" (p. 27) together Specifically, I am curious about how establishing and exploring a teacher-writer identity through writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID) professional development activities may be a threshold concept. I am also thinking about how establishing and exploring one's teacher-writer identity in professional development activities can evoke teacher-writer self-knowledge,

efficacy, agency, confidence... while disrupting the normative, disciplinary power that is dominant in WAC/WID scholarship and institutional structures, overall;

After thinking about these research ideas in the context of TPC scholarship, I have recently started considering how such work could be conceived as a boundary crossing activity, encouraging the transfer of such key knowledge and practices into participants' pedagogical understandings and practices. I hope that this participant-based research can work to evoke teacher-writer self-knowledge, efficacy, or agency to disrupt the normative, disciplinary power that is dominant in WAC/WID scholarship and institutional structures, overall.

The institutional and societal task and challenges of teaching writing within and across the disciplines create spaces for communities of practice (CoP) within the university. CoPs like the WAC Academy function at boundary zones and promote boundary-crossing, offering a productively disruptive alternative to the restrictive nature of institutional disciplines. In spaces like the WAC Academy, differences in participant experience and positioning transform what could be the otherwise fallow soil of a WAC PD curriculum into a polycontextual, multi-voiced, and multi-scripted community that can be characterized by its alternate and competing discourses. It is these conflicts, contradictions, and tensions that create rich zones of learning and afford opportunities for transformations. Using activity-theoretical frame combined with expansive learning and concepts from transfer theory, the community creates itself and an emerging mediation in its activities, its discourse, and its objectives (Bracewell & Witte, 2003). Rather than looking to a rigid curriculum or other institutional structure for direction, we can often find more meaningful and encompassing objectives and motives for our activities and learning in the process of resolving these contradictions, transforming both the activity system itself and the individual participants.

Because it is necessary to know the various aspects of a field in order to determine what areas may contribute to my research in a purposeful and meaningful way, I start by developing a construct of TPC, relating it to some aspects of WPA work and reflecting on the communicative practices involved in this work. This section is followed by a discussion of how TPC has (re)considered what disciplines are and could be in addition to how my research relates to thinking beyond common disciplinary and institutional boundaries. In the next section I turn specifically to my research, considering activity theory as a tool for postmodern mapping, transformative PD as expansive learning, transfer as boundary crossing, and disciplines as institutions. I close with a discussion of what TPC's *boundary crossing* and writing studies' *transfer theory*, when put in conversation with each other, offer to each other, TPC and writing studies, and my identity theory work.

WPAs as TPCs

A review of literature reflects the complex and dynamic nature of technical communication that seems to exist in a state of in-between-ness. Two, distinct aspects of TPC are highlighted throughout the literature, each representing the two words in the term itself: technical communication. On one hand, TPC is business driven, based on capitalism and valuing expert-based ideologies. On the other hand, work in TPC requires one to be collaborative and flexible according to the local context of the workplace. Both of these ideas are evident in Cook, Cook, Minson, and Wilson's (2013) discussion on professional development in TPC as their key competencies and skill focus on technology and collaboration and both are included in all three levels of key competencies and both are part of the key skillsets. Additionally, Dush's (2015) four characteristics of *content* when writing becomes content, like it is in TPC, also reflect these two aspects. While the *conditional* and *networked* characteristics all point to the importance of context and collaboration, *computable* and *commodified* are clear indications of the capitalistic aspects. Hart-Davidson's (2013) work patterns are more collaborative in nature while the practices he identifies highlight the aspects based in capitalism. While Hart-Davidson's (2013) work patterns are more collaborative in nature, the practices he identifies are based in capitalism.

In many ways, both WPAs and TPCs could use this quote from Foucault to describe their work: "My job is making windows where there were once walls." Like TPC, WPA work includes interdisciplinary, intersectional, and boundary work (Selfe & Selfe and Hart-Davidson) that requires one to embody multiple and at times conflicting identities in contexts that stretch far beyond the insulated silo of a department or discipline. TPC requires one to be collaborative and flexible according to the local context of the workplace, but this is a workplace composed of budgets, agendas, and reports like any other. Both WPAs and TPCs are organizers, assessors, articulators, translators, creators, mediators, potential activists, record keepers, archivists, curators, reflective practitioners, storytellers, and rhetoricians (to name just a few). In addition to these roles, both WPAs and TPCs are mindful writers, frequent collaborators who work with everyone from freshmen to chancellors within their institution and field. We work in the margins of knowledge, practice, and histories. And we are positioned/situated from a perspective that provides a with a broad(er) overview of the system in which they work, the material and spatial conditions that hold the possibilities of change in the epistemological and phenomenological cracks and gaps that the collaboration, innovation, and opportunities of working across/within the disciplines, at the intersections, and in boundary zones offer. Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) observe the benefits of such in-between-ness in stating, "While the core of a practice is a locus of expertise, radically new insights and developments often arise at boundaries between communities" (p.153).

Of course, such work also comes with both power and responsibility. By "becoming a profession" and attaching identifiers like titles, disciplines, and __ come certain affordances and constraints. Forming such defining lines and attributing names can make one's work easier to recognize, study, and validate, there can also be a kind of

rigidity in what was once more organic and fluid. Longo (2006) inadvertently points to the brute colonization and standardization that can come with such power when she states, "If technical writing is the mediator between technology and what we have come to term *users*, technical writing practices work to conquer user's naïve know-how and reformulate these uneducated practices into scientific discourse that can partake of the cultural power residing in scientific knowledge" (p. 117). Within academic institutions, the development of disciplines can also serve as an example of the struggles that come with professionalization.

Learning from PTC History Heuristic (Longo & Foutain p. 175-176)

Dismantling Disciplines

Considering the concept of *discipline* through a TPC lens offers new perspectives on a hackneyed topic to those within and outside of writing studies as the capitalistic, expert-based aspects emerge and are related to the collaborative, context-based aspects TPC. Discipline is discussed as a concept that can be understood in many different ways. They have been described as the epistemological and knowledge-making units that define and constitute scholarly communities; in institutional terms, as generally equated with academic departments; and characterized by a degree of insularity and, often, a kind of stasis (Gere et al., 2015). Carter (2007) and Cater et al. (2007) combine these two sides of the disciplines of tech comm by commenting on how a collaborative, flexible re-seeing of writing and education can lead to increased value in the capitalistic system of the institution. They form an approach to writing in the discipline that is social in nature with the goal of mastery of different "apprenticeship", or workplace, genres.

Carter (2007) introduces another way of viewing disciplinarity in his discussion of metagenres and metadisciplines. He uses the term *metagenre* to designate "broader patterns of language as social action, similar kinds of typified responses to related recurrent situations" (p. 393). He describes how metagenres are determined by examining two key characteristics: the kind of research that is done and the goal of the research. In the context of his discussion of academic writing, metagenres describe similar ways of knowing, doing, and writing in related disciplines. These collections of disciplines that share an emphasis on certain metagenres are referred to as *metadisciplines*. Metadisciplines are made up of the various genres within each metagenre while highlighting the broader patterns of disciplinary ways of knowing, doing, and writing.

Porter, Sullivan, Blythe, Grabill, and Miles (2000) discuss *institutional critique* as a rhetorical methodology for change represents both aspects also. Although it includes a more capitalistic, macro-level grounded in pre-established hierarchy, it invites us to ask how we can better situate ourselves in our local, discursive spaces on a micro-level. Such connections can also lead to alternate constructions of disciplines. Institutional critique is also a methodology and pedagogy through which individuals can rewrite

institutions via rhetorical action. It insists that institutions contain spaces for reflection, resistance, revision, and productive action. In this context, institutions are rhetorical systems of decision-making that exercise power through the design of material and discursive spaces. Grounded in postmodernism and critical action combined with material and spatial analysis, institutional critique offers tools for a plan of action that is locally responsive and informed by critique on macro-level (how our public lives are organized and conducted for and by us in an abstract manner) and micro-levels (how we can better situate ourselves in our local and discursive space to make what we wish to chance more visible and dynamic (and, therefore, changeable)). The authors offer two key spatial methodologies for such work: postmodern mapping and boundary interrogations.

Postmodern mapping is discussed as a strategy for exploring social, disciplinary, and institutional relationships in order to destabilize and re-temporalize what is being mapped via a focus on the map's construction and the partiality of any one map, calling for the use of multiple maps in discussions of social spaces. An emphasis on how space is designed, constructed, and inhabited to achieve certain purposes (and not others) results in the idea that all relationships exist all at once in the now. Boundary interrogations are identification processes that focus on how exclusionary practices and devices are used to maintain and extend groups' social identities and powers. They consider zones of ambiguity as opportunities and spaces for change, difference, or conflicts of values or meanings because of the boundary instability they highlight.

Britt (2006) argues for criticism aimed at the middle ground of micro-institutions as it extends beyond organizational borders by "attending to the power relations inherent in particular spatial and material conditions" (p.135). She describes institutional critique as a labeling strategy that calls attention to power by characterizing organizations as kinds of institutions - powerful entities and, therefore, possible sites for critical analysis and change. The resulting institutional critique is a fundamentally pragmatic effort to use rhetorical means to improve institutional systems by examining structure from spatial, visual, and organizational perspectives; seeks gaps or cracks as paces where resistance and change are possible; and undermines the binary between theory and empirical research by engaging in situated theorizing and relating that theorizing through stories of change and attempted change.

Other scholars encourage us to look beyond the imaginary boundaries of the university and find new ways to see the work we do. Gere et al.'s (2015) introduce Marcovich and Shinn's (2011) *new disciplinarity*. As Prior's (2013) explains, disciplinarity embodies a complex configurations of networks shaped by what they study, methodologies, theories, institutional sites and roles, audiences, and personal relationships, a concept that stands in opposition to the more static notion of disciplines. This is a more dynamic view of disciplines as flexible entities whose elasticity enables its members to engage in activities that bring together different kinds combinations of disciplinary representatives. New disciplinarity also offers the concepts of borderlands, temporality,

and elasticity to the conversation on disciplinarity. *Borderlands* allow one to recognize the remaining boundaries of disciplines while identifying and designating spaces for interdisciplinary collaboration, called borderland interactions, that are temporally bounded. It is *elasticity* that refers to the fluidity and movement of participants into and out of such borderlands along how they change and are changed by these projects.

Boundary Zone Communities of Practice

Boundary zones and communities of practices are both central concepts in both cultural historical activity theory and situated learning theory. A *boundary* can be described as a sociocultural difference that leads to a discontinuity in action or interaction (Engeström, Engeström, & Karkkainen, 1995). Boundaries offer a kind of complexity as they suggest a sameness and continuity in that within discontinuity, two or more contexts are relevant to each other in a particular way. While *boundary zones* can be seen as sources of potential difficulty, they also offer opportunities for innovation and renewal. Boundary crossing and boundary objects are two concepts considered central in maintaining a kind of continuity in these situations. While *boundary crossing* refers to a person or group's transitions and interactions across different contexts, *boundary objects* are artifacts doing the crossing by serving as a bridge of sorts (Tsui & Law, 2007). For example, a teacher may engage in boundary crossing by sharing their teaching portfolio (a boundary object) with instructors from other disciplines. Discussions of boundaries can also be a rich topic for learning in groups like communities of practice.

Wenger (1998) describes *communities of practice* (CoP) as groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact on a regular basis. The scope of this concept does not include intentionality, but learning can be the reason the community's interactions or just an incidental outcome of their meetings. Three key characteristics of a CoP are the domain, community, and practice that indicate the group cares about the same interests, interacts and learns together, and have the same (or similar) approach(es) to practice.

It is my argument that communities of practice formed in the boundary zones of the university can offer an alternative to the traditional construct of a discipline. As traditional academic institutions have the explicit boundaries of disciplines and departments composed of experts with specific specializations, it becomes more difficult for one to connect and mobilize herself across practices to avoid fragmentation. The challenge becomes creating possibilities for participation and collaboration across a diversity of contexts within and beyond one's discipline and institution.

Actively seeking to create spaces for *boundary zone CoPs* can provide faculty productively disruptive experiences, forcing them individually and as a group to take a fresh look at disciplinary and pedagogical practices and assumptions. While we are all expected to have and continue to cultivate a locus of expertise in specific areas, engaging with others at boundaries between communities can produce innovative and

creative insights and developments (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). In these boundary zone CoPs, elements from multiple activity systems and other communities are present, creating a group that is polycontextual, multi-voiced, and multi-scripted. The threads that pull the group together and maintain it come from its domain, interaction, and practice.

The WAC Academy as a CoP

Transformative Pedagogies & Expansive Learning

Standard theories of learning focus on processes where an individual or group acquires some identifiable knowledge or skills from a competent *teacher* in such a way that a corresponding, relatively lasting change in the behavior may be observed. There is an evident assumption in this approach that the knowledge or skill aiming to be acquired is itself stable and reasonably well defined. The problematic aspect of these theories is that much of the most intriguing kinds of learning in work organizations and institutions violates this assumption. Creativity and the ability to exceed and transcend given constraints and instructions are critical outcomes of both teaching and learning. The knowledge and skills being sought are not stable, and they are often not previously defined or understood. Learners must be adapt at learning new forms of activity which may not exist yet, and they must practice a kind of flexibility that will allow them to change what they *know* and *do* as the knowledge and skills are being created. As Engestrom (2001) asserts, "Standard learning theories have little to offer if one wants to understand these processes" (p. 137-138).

Transformative pedagogies involve social processes where actions are guided by the constructions and appropriations of new or revised interpretations of knowledge (Mezirow, 1994). They advocate for developmental intervention methods for crossing boundaries between individual learning, collective learning, and development of new organizational practices in educational institutions and systems. Three major aspects of transformative pedagogies include

1. Emphasis in learning is about changing how an individual thinks about things rather than changing the amount of knowledge an individual processes;
2. Learning includes cognitive, affective, interpersonal and moral aspects that involve a learner's existing knowledge and background as well as their ability to examine their own learning processes; and
3. Learner's ways of knowing or (frames of reference), are impacted when individuals are fully engaged in their own learning through reflection and dialogue.

Mezirow's (1994) theory includes notions of empowerment and the importance of critical reflection, where learning serves to empower those who actively participate in the process of learning. Critical reflection on participant's previous knowledge and

experiences works to support learning, promoting new self-knowledge and creating a community of learners united in shared experiences and meaning-making. Such a pedagogical approach has the potential to trigger changes, requiring educational institutions to operate in a new way based on concerted and continuous collaboration and creating to new benchmarks of individual and collective performance.

The goal of transformative PD is to educate instructors in such a way that their thoughts, behaviors, and classroom practices are changed due to their participation in PD in ways that promote student achievement (Mezirow, 1997). For teachers, such learning can be considered effective if what they do or create in the PD is applied or used to guide action in their teaching context. Therefore, examination of participants' classroom artifacts (including documents like course syllabi, writing assignments, response strategies, and evaluation tools) and their reflections on practices for teaching writing can serve as evidence of transformational learning. Classroom artifacts like these can reveal the production of novel social patterns and expansive learning.

Expansive learning, a part of activity theory and type of a transformative pedagogy, is a process in which a system or organization, like a workplace, resolves pressing internal contradictions by constructing and implementing new ways of functioning for itself (Engeström, 1987, 2001). It starts when an individual is involved in the collective activity of questioning pre-established knowledge or an existing practice or structure. The group then engages in a collaborative analysis of contradictions existing within the system, resulting in the development of a new activity. Expansive learning is a type of transformative pedagogy with the primary goal being change.

- Action – daybook p.126-127
- Expert/novice – [How] does this approach to disciplines affect ideas of expertise? (Penrose; Wardle & Scott)
- Reflecting on WPA work through a lens of rhetorical self-consciousness (Mehlenbacher p. 192 based on Bazerman) asks one to consider the
 - Fundamental assumptions, goals, and projects;
 - Structure of literature and community and your place in both;
 - Immediate rhetorical situation and task;
 - Investigative and symbolic tools; and
 - Processes of knowledge production.

In the end, this reflection asks one to accept the dialectics of emergent knowledge.

- Viewing WPA work through a TPC lens offers methods to (re)see one's department/ program's "big picture" and history. For example, the question from the PTC History Heuristic helped me unpack my WPA work in a way that could be useful for communicating with others outside of the university.

- Learning from PTC History Heuristic (Longo & Fountain p. 175-176)

Transfer Theory & Boundary Crossing

Transfer of Skills/Knowledge

While *learning* has been defined simply as the durability of knowledge or information stored in memory (Geoghiades, 2000), *transfer* involves the application of knowledge or skills acquired in one context to new or different contexts (Perkins & Saloman, 1992). Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's (2014) approach of teaching for transfer (TFT). The TFT provides opportunities for learners to *write their way into* composition (Sommers & Saltz, 2004, p. 134-135) by utilizing three interlocking, rhetorical concepts and practices:

1. Key rhetorical terms and writing concepts that help them understand writing as theory and practice;
2. Reflection as a way to facilitate learning, thinking, and writing in the course and beyond; and
3. The development of a theory of writing that helps students create a framework of writing knowledge and practice they can take with them.

Temperly 's(2014) idea of effective professional development "requires that the same pedagogical approaches are used to teach teachers as those used to teach students" (p. 138). With this idea in mind, this WAC PD utilizes certain aspects of TFT in its approach to collaborative construction of terms and concepts central to effective writing instruction, which serves to aid participants in the development of a community-based tool for assessing writing instruction.

Threshold concepts

"Learning as Boundary Crossing" Tsui & Law (2006) – daybook p.21

- Horizontal development
- Brokers
- Boundary objects
-

Boundary crossing as a tool for promoting learning and transfer – daybook p.114

metacognition – daybook pg. 69

While reading Brent (2011), I started wondering how TPCs discussion of *boundaries* and writing studies' *transfer* relate to one another and how both fields could benefit by putting them in conversation with each other. I selected the article because I was interested in how TPC views transfer and how facilitating transfer is discussed in the

context of TPC classrooms. His application of strategies to promote transfer for teachers and implications of transfer in the context of workplace writing proved fruitful, but I was particularly interested in his references to Tuomi-Grohn et al.'s (2003) *boundary crossing* in the context of transfer as a social activity (p. 409). Their research asserts that, because of the significant cognitive retooling one faces when entering a new activity system, transfer should be replaced by the more dynamic and complex idea of boundary crossing. I would argue that while it could always be expanded on, this is a complexity that transfer scholarship already tackles. For example, Wardle's (2009) *mutt genres* along with her contribution (2007) of an alternate, metaphoric (apples v. apple pie) method for identifying evidence of transfer (p. 69) address many of the ideas and complexities Tuomi-Grohn et al. are concerned with. Also, Carter's (2007) provides a product lens for thinking about the complexities of the transfer of writing skills.

<daybook p. 116> I do wonder what TPC's scholarship on boundary crossing could add to writing studies' conversation on transfer and vice versa. For example, some TPC scholars discuss boundary crossing by situating it in the context of disciplinary discussions. While some transfer scholarship does explore this topic, more research is needed. Transfer theory could also benefit from considering how *new disciplinarity* and *borderlands* (Gere, Swofford, Silver, & Pugh 2015) may promote opportunities to identify and then look beyond traditional boundaries. Such concepts could add to Brent's (and others') discussion of *bridging* (and other) strategies for encouraging transfer. *Boundary interrogations* (Porter, Sullivan, Blythe, Grabill, & Miles, 2000) could also be used to identify opportunities for transfer, and *postmodern mapping* - a tool to map out social, disciplinary, and institutional relationships - could be used to promote transfer by providing a way to detect *bottlenecks* or other practices and devices that promote exclusion to maintain institutional systems along with their members' social identities and power.

Other relationships between boundaries and transfer could be possible. In some contexts, boundary crossing and transfer seem like different terms for same thing, which Brent (2011) alludes to in his discussion on a student's ability to adapt to a new, workplace setting (p.410). There is a possible cause and effect relationship too: boundary crossing, which inherently involves the risk of voyaging into new or different disciplinary or workplace territory, can create opportunities for transfer as transfer can be prompted by situations that require taking such risks. Transfer could also be thought of as a kind of boundary crossing activity in which transfer, especially that involving *threshold concepts* (Meyer, Land, & Baillie, 2009), changes an individual's ways of knowing/doing/writing, affects their perceptions of boundaries, and potentially affects how they view themselves, their identities.

Objects, materiality, artifacts

???Activity Theory as a Tool for Postmodern Mapping????

Activity Theory??? – values implied by using this theory, alignment with my assumptions, values, and situatedness

- Contextualize
- Situate
- Apply (WAC Academy)
- Explore – combine and connect
- Synthesize

“Learning as Boundary Crossing” Tsui & Law (2006) – daybook p.23

WAC Academy → activity theory – daybook p. 25

“Tasks, Ensembles, & Activity” Bracewell & Witte (2003) – daybook p.29

- Work ensemble (Witte, 1998)

The cultural-historical view offers activity theory as a method for analysis of activity as the mediation between individuals and social dimensions human developments and actions that are historically evolving, collective, and artifact-mediated. Knowing is a living process in which knowledge is generated in the course of acting, thinking, and talking with fellow practitioners (Wegner, 1998). An activity-theoretical frame highlights the intertwined natures of the learning of an activity system and the learning of an individual. In this context, an individual’s learning is only understandable if we understand the learning of the activity system, a concept also known as collective developmental transfer (Tuomi-Grohn, 2003). Activity theory assumes that activity systems driven and directed by motive, and such activities are realized by goal-directed actions that are subordinate to motives. In this context, an activity is a theoretical construct that functions to explain or account for a collocation of human behaviors and behavior outcomes that are centered around some set of performance parameters (Bracewell & Witte, 2003). These actions must be understood within the context of the motive of the collective activity system, and the object of the activity is the factor that distinguishes one activity from another, whether or not the participants are aware of it.

Activity theory research aims to capture the influences and interactions of cultural, historical, and social factors of particular human acts, like creating or using discourse (Tsui & Law, 2007). Contradictions are inherent within and between activity systems, and, as the expansive learning process shows us, they are the source of change of innovation.

What does this mean for the idea of identity as a threshold concept?

Activity Theory as a framework for

- (re)considering the WAC Academy as a boundary zone and micro-institution (Porter et al. 2000) along with its participant(s), communities, artifacts, activities, objects, and outcomes.
- (re)examining teaching artifact(s) as cultural, workplace tool(s) used to mediate action, knowledge, and writing (Carter, 2007) within specific contexts (class, discipline, institution)
 - Objective, cultural, cultural properties?
 - Reflections of communities, rules, activities, objects...
 - Externalization of internalized action
 - Level(s) of activity
 - Activity towards an objective carries out by community (Why?)
 - Action towards a specific goal carried out by an individual with possible goals (What?)
 - Operation structure of an activity (How?)
 - Motivated activit(ies) directed at object/goal (what object/goal?)
 - Rules? Division of effort/labor?

This framework can be used to begin the post-structural process of illuminating the transparency of writing (Russell, 1990), the teaching of writing, and ideas of writing and disciplines.

Combined with strategies from postmodern mapping (Sullivan & Porter, 1997; Grabill, 2001), this can be a tool to determine various moments and perspectives in the WAC Academy, participants' artifacts, and the curation of their artifacts. Postmodern mapping can be used to

- (re)consider relationships, development, activities, contexts, objects, artifacts, objects, and outcomes;
- (re)conceptualize identities, and communities; and
- empower participants to reflect on their experiences.

This approach will also encourage questions like

- How were these tools created and transformed during development of activities during the WAC Academy?
- What are evidences of the culture(s) that tools carry with them? The historical remains of their development?
- How are these artifacts an accumulation and transmission of social knowledge? What is that social knowledge?
- How may these artifacts/tools influence external behavior and mental functioning of individual(s)/group(s) in writing classrooms?

Utilizing Foucaultian archaeological approach combined with critical theory and Longo's (2006) five themes of discourse as an object of study to examine teaching artifacts from WAC Academy participants and their curations. Each of the objects below could be considered in the application of Activity Theory to the WAC Academy.

This process will lead to questions like: How do their artifacts and curations reflect the idea of discourse as a struggle mediated by culture (Longo)? How is it that particular statement(s) appeared rather than another (Foucault cited in Longo)?

Conclusion

Identity work – teacher-writer identity as a threshold concept

I end where I began: With the complexity of dynamic and fluid identities. While much of this synthesis does not directly relate to my research, it has provided a space to think about what were familiar concepts to me in a different way. It was a refreshing process, and I feel rejuvenated. I am especially excited about looking in more depth at boundary crossing, considering how boundaries may play a role in my larger research project. I am also interested in learning more about how TPC discusses identity in general, workplaces, and the classroom (see Appendix 1 below). This aspect of my research could benefit from TPCs ideas on the expert-novice binary and professional development (Appendix 2). Although I have started collecting some sources that I could use for this course's final project and my research overall, I am still early in the process. I welcome recommendations and ideas.

Carter et al. (2007) metagenres and metadisciplines

Daybook p. 125 – movement across boundaries of activity contexts – knowledge/whole person moves. Because of movement, reconstruct herself in relation to the next context.

How can PD that is situated in a boundary zone promote transformative learning (and therefore a shift in identity) and transfer? How can/are boundary zones and threshold concepts [be] related?

Appendix 1: A Brief Guide to Postmodern Mapping

A Brief Guide to Postmodern Mapping

Chapter 4: Postmodern Mapping & Methodological Interfaces
Opening Spaces: Writing Technologies & Critical Research Practices
P. S. Sullivan & J. E. Porter (1997)

Key Procedural Ideas

Frame the research scene for your study to show shifts over time.

Point out mismatches.

Show change across maps.

Include contrasting views.



Understand philosophical positions.

Position your work within larger field(s).

Use multiple maps to avoid totalizing, flattening, or freezing "situations".

Articulate key terms and explain why they matter.

Advice for Map Makers

Locating binaries operating in your research can be a useful place to begin.

Position yourself within the scene as a researcher.

Find a way to account for changing stances over time.

Be sure you are working with a continuum, not a set of categories. If you are working with a set of categories, you can map them against a continuum.

I need to figure out how to form dual and intersecting continuums into my grids...

You're in luck! Here are some ideas.

Map time on the X (horizontal) axis because that disrupts the notion of mapping space. Because time is important in this kind of research and theory, researchers could consider making two maps at different times.

It is often better to make multiple maps rather than trying to fit too much in one map. For example, if you are thinking through several continuums, it may be helpful to coordinate several maps.

Make sure the Y (vertical) axis continuums are all oriented in the same direction. For example, all conservative positions should be at the top and all liberal at the bottom.

Keep one continuum as the X (horizontal) axis in all maps.

Works Cited

Adler-Kassner, L. & Wardle, E. (Eds.) (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Logan, UT: Utah State University.

Bracewell, R. J. & Witte, S. P. (2003). Tasks, ensembles, and activity: Linkages between text production and situation of use in the workplace. *Written Communication*, 20(4), 511-559.

Brent, D. (2011). Transfer, transformation, and rhetorical knowledge: Insights from Transfer Theory. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 25(4), 396-420.

Carter, M. (2007). Ways of knowing, doing, and writing in the disciplines. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(3), 385-418.

Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. N. (2007). Writing to learn by learning to write in the discipline. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 21(3), 278-302.

Cook, Cook, Minson, & Wilson (2013) *Critical Power Tools: Technical Communication and Cultural Studies*

Dush, L. (2015). When writing becomes content. *College Composition and Communication*, 67(2), 173-196

Engeström, Y. (1987). Learning by expanding. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.

Engeström, Y (2001). Expansive Learning at Work: toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 2001

Engeström, Y. (2004). "New forms of learning in co-configuration work." *Journal of Workplace Learning* 16(1/2): 11-21.

Engeström, Y., Engeström, R., & Kärkkäinen, M. (1995). Polycontextuality and boundary crossing in expert cognition: Learning and problem solving in complex work activities. *Learning and Instruction*, 5, 319–336.

Georghiades, P. (2000). Beyond conceptual change learning in science education: Focusing on transfer, durability, and metacognition. *Educational Research* 42.2, 119-39.

Gere, A. R., Swofford, S. C., Silver, N., & Pugh, M. (2015). Interrogating disciplines/disciplinarity in WAC/WID: An institutional study. *College Composition and Communication*, 67(2), 243-266.

Grabill, J. (2001). *Community literacy programs and the politics of change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Hart-Davidson, W. (2013). What are the work patterns of technical communication? In J. Johnson-Eilola & S. A. Selber, *Solving Problems in Technical Communications* (50-74). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Longo, B. (2006). An approach for applying cultural study theory to technical writing research. In J. B. Scott, B. Longo, & K. V. Wills (Eds.), *Critical Power Tools: Technical Communication and Cultural Studies* (111-132). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Longo, B. & Fountain, T. K. (2013) What can history teach is about technical communication? In J. Johnson-Eilola & S. A. Selber, *Solving Problems in Technical Communications* (165-186). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Mehlenbacher, B. (2013) What is the future of technical communication? In J. Johnson-Eilola & S. A. Selber, *Solving Problems in Technical Communications* (187-208). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Meyer, J. H. F., Land, R. & Baillie (Eds.) (2009). *Threshold concepts and transformational learning*. Boston: Sense.

Mezirow, J. (1994). Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44, 222-232.

----- (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 74, 5-12.

Penrose, A. M. (2012). Professional identity in a contingent-labor profession: Expertise, autonomy, community in composition teaching. *Writing Program Administration*, 35(2), 108-126.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1992). Transfer of learning. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Pergamon Press. Available <<http://learnweb.harvard.edu/alps/thinking/docs/traencyn.htm>>.

Porter, J. E., Sullivan, P., Blythe, S., Grabill, J. T., & Miles, L. (2000). Institutional critique: A rhetorical methodology for change. *College Composition and Communication*, 51(4), 610-642.

Russell, D.R. (1990). Writing across the curriculum in historical perspective: Toward a social interpretation. *College English*, 14, 504-554.

Selfe R. J. & Selfe, C. L. (2013). What are the boundaries, artifacts, and identities of technical communication? In J. Johnson-Eilola & S. A. Selber, *Solving Problems in Technical Communications* (19-49). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Sommers, N. & Saltz, L. (2004). The novice as expert: Writing the freshman year. *College Composition and Communication*, 56(1), 124-149.

Sullivan, P., & Porter, J. E. (1997). *Opening spaces: Writing technologies and critical research practices*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Timperly, H. (2014). Using assessment information for professional learning. *Designing Assessment for Quality Learning*. Eds. C. Wyatt-Smith & P. Colbert. Netherlands: Springer.

Tsui, A.B.M. & Law, D.Y.K. (2007). Learning as boundary-crossing in school-university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1289-1301.

Tuomi-Gröhn T., & Engeström, Y. (2003). Conceptualizing transfer: From standard notions to developmental perspectives. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn, & Y. Engeström (Eds.), *Between School and Work: New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary-Crossing* (pp. 19-38). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Tuomi-Gröhn T., Engeström, Y., & Young, M. (2003). From transfer to boundary-crossing between school and work as a tool for developing vocational education: An introduction. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn & Y. Engeström (Eds.), *Between School and Work: New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary-Crossing* (pp. 1-15). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Wardle, E. & Scott, J. B. (2015). Defining and developing expertise in a writing and rhetoric department. *Writing Program Administration*, 39(1), 72-93.

Wardle, E. (2009). "Mutt genres" and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication*, 60(4), 765-789.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Learning in communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Logan: Utah.