# REVIEW ESSAY

# THE CONTENT OF COMPOSITION: THRESHOLD CONCEPTS AND TRANSFER IN WRITING PROGRAMS

**Sara Wilder**

**Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle.** ***Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies.*** **Logan: Utah State University Press, 2015. 256 pages. ISBN 978-0-87421-989-0.**

**Carillo, Ellen C.** ***Securing a Place for Reading in Composition: The Importance of Teaching for Transfer.*** **Logan: Utah State University Press, 2014. 224 pages. ISBN 978-0-87421-959-3.**

**Yancey, Kathleen Blake, Liane Robertson, and Kara Taczak.** ***Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing.*** **Logan: Utah State University Press, 2014. 215 pages. ISBN 978-0-87421-937-1.**

Five years ago, as a newcomer to rhetoric and composition, I began my graduate education simply trying to get a sense of what composition was. What were the key questions and methodologies in the field? What was the relationship between studying and teaching writing? How did other scholars in the field define it? In short, what was—as Kathleen Blake Yancey calls it in her introduction to *Naming What We Know*—the "content of composition?" (xviii). What were

the "questions, kinds of evidence, and materials" that define the discipline? (Yancey xviii). Now, after five years learning about and conducting research in the field, some of these questions continue for me, but they have become more pointed and more nuanced: Given what I now know about writing and the teaching of writing, how do I develop my composition courses to facilitate my students' learning? How do I, as a writing center administrator, support tutors as they continue to develop their practice as both tutors and writers? How might I make sense of my own learning as a writer and doctoral student in rhetoric and composition?

In this essay, I review three texts that help me to answer those questions. Together, they articulate disciplinary knowledge in the field of composition and point to how teachers of writing can deploy that knowledge, particularly in the composition classroom. Each of the above texts, Adler-Kassner and Wardle's *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts in Writing Studies*, Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*, and Carillo's *Securing a Place for Reading in Composition: The Importance of Teaching for Transfer*, takes up in some way the question of the "content of composition." They ask readers to consider how naming the disciplinary knowledge of the field can help composition teacher-scholars to articulate our work for a variety of audiences and to help students develop their writing knowledge and practice.

Though they all address the "content" question in some way, each book takes a different approach and focus in response to different exigencies. Adler-Kassner and Wardle broadly map the field's key concepts, while Carillo and Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak focus more narrowly on the content of first-year composition courses. The broadest reaching, Adler-Kassner and Wardle's collection defines the *threshold concepts* of writing studies, articulating the field's knowledge of writing and learning to write and explores how those concepts might be put into action across courses and programs. More narrowly focused, Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's *Writing Across Contexts* focuses on the theory and efficacy of a first-year composition curriculum designed to encourage successful transfer. *Writing Across Contexts* points to how the disciplinary knowledge mapped out in

*Naming* might be deployed explicitly in the composition classroom and, further, why teaching writing as both a practice and a subject of study can help first-year writing students as they continue to write beyond the composition classroom. Carillo is also interested in transfer of learning but turns to the role of reading in composition scholarship and curricula, emphasizing its importance alongside writing in the act of composing meaning. Carillo's *Securing a Place for Reading in Composition* raises questions about what might be missing—or at least not explicitly articulated—in *Naming*'s map of writing studies. Her argument for securing a place for reading in composition scholarship and classrooms points to one means of continuing to develop curricula like that addressed in *Writing Across Contexts*.

## Threshold Concepts and the Importance of "Naming What We Know"

Taking up the challenge of naming the disciplinary knowledge of writing studies, the first part of Adler-Kassner and Wardle's collection is comprised of an encyclopedia-like list of threshold concepts in writing studies. Part II then focuses on these concepts in action within specific sites of writing instruction. Threshold concepts, as Adler-Kassner and Wardle define them, are "concepts critical for continued learning and participation in an area or within a community of practice" and so they provide a framework for mapping the disciplinary knowledge of the field (2). Threshold concepts are generally transformative and, once understood, are not forgotten, leading to paradigm shifts in the learner's way of thinking. They tend to involve counterintuitive knowledge, making them particularly difficult or "troublesome" for learners (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2). Because of the nature of writing studies, Adler-Kassner and Wardle argue that threshold concepts can speak "both to and beyond our disciplinary community" (3). That is, threshold concepts are foundational for participation in the discipline of writing studies, but threshold concepts from writing studies can also help writers and teachers writing outside of the discipline. While Part I

articulates threshold concepts of writing studies, Part II begins the work of helping readers understand how they might use, teach, and talk about threshold concepts for various audiences—from first-year students to writing tutors to faculty and administrators. As the editors put it:

> Ultimately, then, the argument here is that our field knows a lot about its subject of study. We know much about how writers write and learn to write, and how best to assess writing. Yet we continue to lose the battle over discussions of writing to stakeholders who have money, power, and influence but little related expertise. If we want to actively and positively impact the lives of writers and writing teachers, we must do a better job of clearly stating what our field knows and helping others understand how to use that knowledge as they set policy, create programs, design and fund assessments, and so on. (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 7)

Through its encyclopedia-like entries, *Naming* begins the work of clearly stating what we, writing studies scholars and teachers, know, or at least what we know for now (8). The threshold concepts are key touchstones of disciplinary knowledge and are grouped into one "metaconcept" and five organizing threshold concepts. Wardle and Adler-Kassner first explain the "metaconcept" that Writing is an Activity and a Subject of Study—a crucial concept for the book itself, laying out as it does the threshold concepts of writing studies both for scholars and for writers (15). Their entry on this metaconcept sets up the general structure for most of the other entries: They explain the concept, its significance to the field, and why understanding the concept is often troublesome for learners. Part I then continues with Concept 1: Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity; Concept 2: Writing Speaks to Situations through Recognizable Forms; Concept 3: Writing Enacts and Creates Identities and Ideologies; Concept 4: All Writers Have More to Learn; and Concept 5: Writing is (Also Always) a Cognitive Activity. Each of these organizing concepts contains between five and ten

threshold concepts, each explained by a prominent scholar in the field and each containing cross-references to other threshold concepts.

The entries on each threshold concept in Part I are themselves a valuable conceptual map of the field, yet it is Part II that shows the richness of the concepts as they are put into action across different programs and sites of writing. Part II is divided into two subsections: "Using Threshold Concepts in Program and Curricular Design" and "Enacting Threshold Concepts of Writing across the University." The scholars contributing chapters to the subsection on program design explore threshold concepts in comparison to learning outcomes (Estrem), as a framework for first-year composition (Downs and Robertson), as tools for planning writing and rhetoric majors (Scott and Wardle), and as concepts in rhetoric and composition doctoral education (Taczak and Yancey). The final section of the book looks beyond particular programs and curricula to consider threshold concepts at the crossroads of educational and writing theory in assessment practices, in the writing center, faculty development and outreach, and writing across the curriculum.

The chapters in Part II were particularly compelling in the way they used threshold concepts to reframe student learning and program design. Because threshold concepts are troublesome, it takes time and repeated experience with them for learners to fully understand them, to cross the threshold. In her chapter on using threshold concepts as a framework for developing Communication in the Disciplines (CID) courses with faculty from across campus, Heidi Estrem explains that threshold concepts offered faculty a framework for understanding student learning not only through learning outcomes—snapshots at the end of a direct process—but also throughout the long, messy learning process itself. The threshold concepts framework, she writes, reminds us that learning to write is "like scrambling across rocky terrain: learners make progress, slip back, try again, get a little higher, slip back again" (Estrem 93). The chapters in Part II take readers through the process of identifying the threshold concepts that students are asked to learn in a particular course or program, and show how teaching those

threshold concepts requires both explicit attention to the concepts and opportunities for students to experience the concepts for themselves. Using threshold concepts in first-year writing courses or tutor-education courses, for example, can help students "scramble across the rocky terrain" by helping orient them to that terrain even as they struggle through it. For teachers and tutors, understanding learning about writing not as a series of outcomes that are met or not met in a particular course, but as stumbling through and sometimes slipping away from thresholds puts the first-year course or single writing tutorial into perspective as only singular moments in which students can begin to build theories of writing that help them across writing situations. Students will continue to grapple with these concepts in other spaces, perhaps in later writing classes or in the writing center.

During a meeting with a group of tutors in my writing center, I shared the first two threshold concept entries: 1.0 Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity and 1.1 Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 17-20). After reading the entries, we talked about how threshold concepts like these are enacted in writing center practice, which relies on conversations between readers and writers, and considered how we might more explicitly talk about these concepts with clients. One tutor pointed out that sometimes, often in frustrating sessions, it seemed to her as though clients might have entirely different conceptions of writing. Tutors' observations were similar to those of Rebecca Nowacek and Bradley Hughes, who contribute a chapter in *Naming* on threshold concepts in the writing center. Nowacek and Hughes argue for using threshold concepts as a framework for tutor education because they help articulate the key concepts upon which writing centers are built, namely that Writing is a Knowledge Making Activity; Learning to Write Effectively Requires Different Kinds of Practice, Time, and Effort; and Revision is Central to Developing Writing (Nowacek and Hughes 174). One of the advantages of using threshold concepts as a framework for tutor education that I found particularly compelling was that "it can help tutors view their conferences not in terms of the idiosyncratic 'deficits' of individual writers (or particular

demographics of writers) but in terms of processes of learning that challenge *many* individuals at *many* different stages of their academic careers" (178). This is a crucial shift for many tutors, who, rather than being discouraged during frustrating or difficult sessions, might think more productively about how to help their clients as learners just starting to grapple with particular threshold concepts. Even in that first conversation I had with tutors about threshold concepts, we were able to start reframing the task that tutors and their clients undertake.

Beyond the writing center, the essays in Part II of *Naming What We Know* also helped me to understand how threshold concepts might be useful as a framework in the composition classroom. In their chapter, Doug Downs and Liane Robertson argue for teaching threshold concepts in FYC courses that aspire to two major goals: "(1) for students to examine and ideally reconsider prior knowledge about writing in light of new experiences and knowledge offered by their FYC course(s) and (2) for the course itself to serve as a general education course, teaching transferable knowledge of and about writing" (105). They make connections between the threshold concepts laid out in the book with their respective FYC courses, Downs' "Writing about Writing" course and Robertson's "Teaching for Transfer" course, detailed in Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak. Although both Downs and Robertson explain that they have only recently begun explicitly considering threshold concepts as the framework for their FYC courses, both affirm that these concepts have already *implicitly* been part of the "declarative content" of their composition courses (Downs and Robertson 106). Their chapter explains how threshold concepts make up the content of their composition courses, and provides direction for teachers of first-year writing who may be considering including threshold concepts in their course.

Downs and Robertson identify the threshold concepts that their first-year students, given their prior knowledge of and experience with writing, are most likely to struggle with and offer suggestions about how to construct a FYC course that will help students master these concepts. Ultimately, they argue that threshold concepts like

these provide a framework through which students can re-imagine prior knowledge to transform their current perceptions of writing and then transfer this new knowledge to future writing tasks. Essentially, as Downs and Robertson write, to learn threshold concepts is to experience paradigm shifts, and so learning them requires a "series of experiences and data points that create strong dissonance with prior knowledge… only with a critical mass of dissonance-inducing learning and experiences will there come the 'aha!' moment that constitutes crossing the threshold into the new concepts" (116). Also critical to this process is "explicit, extensive reflection on what's being learned" (116). To help students through the process, Downs and Robertson offer three suggestions to approach teaching threshold concepts in FYC: Provide research-based explanations via writing studies scholarship and ask students to do primary research; use metaphors and analogies to help students understand the concepts; and use writing assignments to set up opportunities for students to experience the concepts firsthand. For example, students who are assigned readings from writing studies about ways of knowing and writing tasks that require them to conduct primary research will encounter the threshold concept that Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity. The key part of this process seems to me that students need opportunities not only to experience the threshold concept, but also to name it and reflect on how it coincides with or differs from their previous writing experiences.

Downs and Robertson's chapter on FYC, like the other chapters in Part II, offers a rich starting point for using threshold concepts, but it also left me with questions about how students and teachers might experience such a course. Reading *Writing Across Contexts* gave a much more in-depth look at how students engage with threshold concepts in writing studies. By reviewing the literature on transfer of learning and presenting research on how curriculum design affects student transfer, *Writing Across Contexts* expands on just how students can benefit from an approach that makes key writing studies concepts the declarative content of the course.

## Threshold Concepts in the Teaching for Transfer Course

*Writing Across Contexts*, although not explicitly framed in terms of threshold concepts, develops a fuller illustration of the affordances of a first-year composition course taking writing studies as its content. Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak argue for a curriculum they call Teaching for Transfer (TFT) grounded in scholarship on transfer both in and beyond writing studies. The heart of the book is their study of students' development of writing knowledge and successful transfer during and following the TFT course when compared to two other FYC courses, one based on an Expressivist model and the other a media and cultural studies course. They find the TFT course more successfully helped students transfer as they moved into new writing situations. *Writing Across Contexts* provides readers with a strong theoretical foundation for understanding the TFT course and illustrates for instructors the assignments and readings that will help students continue to develop frameworks for writing. It developed more fully for me the links between transfer and threshold concepts that are identified but not as fleshed out in *Naming What We Know*.

*Writing Across Contexts* begins with a nuanced review of the literature on transfer, layering definitions of transfer, empirical studies of students' transfer of writing knowledge and practice, and the role of students' prior knowledge in this process. Through these layers, the authors build the foundation of a course that understands students' transfer from course-to-course, even assignment-to-assignment, as "boundary-crossing" (33), which requires assistance of a travel guide or passport to help them navigate their way. For Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak this passport comes in the form of a set of key terms about writing—terms that are also scattered throughout the threshold concepts in *Naming*. They write, however,

> We can't simply give students frameworks, and if we could such giving would be futile given that transfer … is a dynamic rather than static process, a process of using, adapting, and repurposing the old for success in the new. The value of such frameworks, we believe, is more in the nature of a Bakhtinian

> exercise: students need to *participate* with us in creating their own frameworks for facilitating transfer. (33)

The TFT course detailed in *Writing Across Contexts* requires students to develop theories of writing using key terms (for example, *rhetorical situation*, *audience*, and *genre*) and readings from writing studies, thereby "creating their own frameworks for facilitating transfer." In taking this approach, *Writing Across Contexts* reaffirms the emphasis in *Naming What We Know* on what threshold concepts in the field allow us and our students to do. In assigning students to read about, define, and use key terms from the field to create theories of writing, the TFT course encourages students to engage directly with the threshold concepts of the field. As Downs and Robertson explained in their chapter on FYC in *Naming*, it is through repeated experience and explicit reflection on what they are learning that students cross the threshold into a new concept, or as Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak might put it, remix their previous conceptions of writing with the new knowledge offered them in the composition course.

*Writing Across Contexts* is particularly compelling paired with *Naming What We Know* because it both provides a more detailed description of a FYC course that asks students to engage with threshold concepts and shares the results of a comparative study between the TFT curriculum and two other curricular approaches. Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's findings that the TFT course—which follows through on many of the principles outlined in *Naming What We Know*—facilitates student transfer and their reflections on the study are particularly valuable for teachers and researchers interested in teaching for transfer using threshold concepts.

Chapters three and four of *Writing Across Contexts* present and discuss the study of the TFT course in comparison to the expressivist and media and cultural studies FYC courses. For this study, the authors analyzed the content of each course and, through student and teacher interviews and analysis of student texts, followed students throughout their courses and beyond each course, analyzing transfer from assignment to assignment and beyond into writing tasks during the next semester. The major findings suggested that students in all

courses used prior knowledge and experience as they approached various writing tasks. However, only the TFT curriculum provided students a language (in the set of key terms and students' theories of writing) with which they could reflect on and rework prior knowledge and apply it in practice from site to site (99). For example, Clay, a student in the TFT course, hit a "turning point" in completing a major assignment—a composition-in-three-genres—which helped him to understand "how contextual writing is, which helped him to clarify the concepts, such as rhetorical situation, that he'd worked with earlier in the term" (93). By the end of the term, Clay observed in an interview that "what he learned in FYC were not strategies, but *ways of thinking* about how to write in any situation" (93, emphasis in original). Through experiencing and reflecting on the contextual nature of writing, Clay was able to successfully apply concepts like genre and audience to assignments in other courses, such as a meteorology essay he wrote the next semester. He found that through reflective writing he was able to make connections between his theory of writing, the key concepts he was introduced to in the course, and his experiences writing both inside and outside the course. In contrast, students in the other courses did not have a framework for understanding the different writing tasks they faced and so were less successful in their approaches to these tasks. Glen, a student in the Expressivist course, did try to use some of what he had learned in his FYC course for analytical writing in a later humanities course, but the more personal, expressive writing valued in his FYC course was inappropriate for the new assignment. Though Glen did attempt to transfer his knowledge, the writing knowledge from his FYC course was not appropriate for the humanities course. Glen did not have a passport or framework with which he could understand the differences between the two contexts. The TFT course, in contrast, facilitated successful student transfer because it gave students the opportunity to develop their frameworks for writing in order to leverage their writing knowledge and experience as they moved into new writing tasks.

Although the authors did not design their study with an explicit focus on students' prior knowledge, the study findings indicated that

prior knowledge and experience played an important role in student transfer. In part, this had to do with how students identified as writers. Even students in the TFT course who identified strongly as successful writers were less willing to try out new strategies and concepts and so were less likely to develop their theories of writing using new writing knowledge from the class. Yancey, Robertson, and Tazcak found that students in the TFT course used their prior knowledge to develop their frameworks in three different ways: 1) *assemblage*, grafting bits and pieces of new knowledge onto old frameworks; 2) *remix*, reworking and integrating prior knowledge and practice with new knowledge as they approach new tasks; and 3) *a critical incident or failure* that motivates students to rethink practices and understanding of writing. The TFT course aims to help students remix their writing knowledge and practice through reflection on both the *how* and the *what* of writing. As the authors write in the final chapter, the TFT course assumes that

> *specific ideas* in the form of key terms for composition are critical to students' writing development, and that weaving these terms throughout writing assignments and the accompanying (intentionally designed and integrated) reflection assignments begins to equip students to move appropriately into new writing contexts. (131)

The content of composition presented to students is specific knowledge about writing, grounded in key terms—for example, that writing occurs in a rhetorical situation. When students explicitly reflect on this specific content or writing knowledge, they are better equipped to think about and understand new writing tasks.

As I came to the end of *Writing Across Contexts*, I had several questions, one about how teachers without expertise in writing studies would teach such a course and a second about the different kinds of prior knowledge students bring with them into the first-year composition classroom. At the end of the book, Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak themselves raise questions like mine, asking, among other questions, "How do we engage instructors in teaching this

more explicit and content-driven course?" (147). Coming from a program in which many instructors are strongly committed to teaching writing courses with a particular theme, I was less than sure how my fellow GTAs with concentrations in literature or creative writing would feel about teaching the content of composition in the way that a TFT course does and how they would equip themselves to do so. However, the threshold concepts in *Naming* offer a framework that could help acquaint new teachers with writing studies in a way that is accessible in a limited time frame. Further, introducing teachers to these concepts not simply as key concepts, as the TFT course does, but as *threshold* concepts, could prompt them to think about student learning as Estrem described it, like "scrambling over rocky terrain." In their chapter in *Naming*, Adler-Kassner and Majewski articulate the benefit of the threshold concepts framework in working with other faculty as helping those faculty to think about the threshold concepts of their own discipline, the many forms of writing across the university, and how students learn to write in different disciplines (186). Their suggestion for using the threshold concepts with faculty from across the university strike me as appropriate within composition programs as well, particularly those drawing teachers from different areas of study within English. The threshold concepts framework is one potential means of helping new teachers think about teaching for transfer in a writing classroom.

My second question stemmed from a small point made by Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak about prior knowledge that is often absent from first-year students' previous experience. They identify one key area of absent prior knowledge as the reading of nonfiction texts. Though students are often asked to read fiction and maybe poetry in their high school English courses, few are asked to read nonfiction, particularly research-driven articles, in their high school curricula. But reading nonfiction texts, including research articles, is a key part of many college composition courses. How then, does a TFT course—or any course that takes writing studies as its content—help students learn to read effectively for their work in that course and in their later studies? Reading Carillo's *Securing a Place for Reading in Composition* convinced me that because reading is important to

writing, to the act of composing meaning, a first-year composition course should make reading part of the content of composition. Carillo points out that reading has dropped out of composition scholarship for some time and so also out of professional development opportunities for composition instructors, making it especially difficult for first-year composition teachers to confidently teach reading. Her book points to how including frameworks for reading alongside or as part of frameworks for writing in FYC can help address the gap students face in their prior knowledge of reading.

## Frameworks for Composition: Mindful Reading, TFT, and Threshold Concepts

In *Securing a Place for Reading in Composition*, Ellen Carillo argues for a renewed conversation about reading in composition by reviewing the history of reading studies within composition and reporting the results of a national survey of first-year composition teachers regarding the role of reading in their curricula. Carillo's argument is based on the idea that reading and writing are connected in that "both practices of writing and reading involve the construction—or *composition*—of meaning" (5, emphasis in original). She defines reading not as an act of decoding or scanning the words on the page but as an active, "deliberate intellectual practice that helps us make sense of—interpret—that which surrounds us" (6). Carillo shows us, however, that although reading and writing are counterparts in the construction of meaning, reading is no longer an explicit focus of our scholarship and our curricula. Her book takes on the challenge of returning to composition's history of reading scholarship, the problems of composition's engagement with reading, particularly in scholarship of the 1980s and1990s, and the valuable ideas that might be drawn from this scholarship to renew attention to reading in composition. Carillo's argument prompted me to look for places where *Naming What We Know* and *Writing Across Contexts* address reading explicitly or implicitly and to think about how the field's knowledge of writing

also includes knowledge of reading. Reading is present in both texts, but Carillo points to the importance of making it an explicit part of the content of first-year composition.

In her second chapter, Carillo reports on a national survey of first-year composition instructors about the role of reading in their composition courses. She found that many of them did teach some form of reading to their classes, particularly "rhetorical analysis" or "rhetorical reading" which asks students to read model texts and analyze their features in order to imitate them in their own writing (Carillo 34). Carillo also reports that of the students she surveyed, many indicated that their motivation to read increased because of the relationship they understood between their reading of models and their writing tasks (38). For these teachers and students, imitation and models are a bridge between reading and writing. At the same time, many instructors felt unsure about teaching reading. This is unsurprising, Carillo argues, because compositionists have not made reading a focus of scholarship or teaching since the 1980s and '90s.

In chapters 3 and 4, Carillo examines the history of reading in composition, with an eye toward understanding how reading dropped out of focus in the field and instead became relegated to high school or remedial education. Chapter 3 focuses on the historical contexts for composition's current relationship with reading—teachers feel unprepared to teach reading—beginning in the nineteenth century. Chapter 4 delves more deeply into reading in composition scholarship from the 1980s and 1990s. In doing so, Carillo points to the limitations in the scholarship that may have played a part in the shift away from reading. She finds that these lay in slippages between "reading" as a verb and "readings" as a noun. The focus of scholarship tended to be not on *how* students read but *what* students were to read. As composition distanced itself from literature, it also distanced itself from reading, which was relegated either to K-12 education or literature, in part, Carillo argues, because of these slippages in the scholarship.

We can see at some points in *Naming* and *Writing Across Contexts*, as well, that attention to how students read has become less of a focus, with more emphasis devoted to what students should be

reading. For example, Downs and Robertson advocate for students reading accessible, research-based composition scholarship in first-year composition. But, as *Writing Across Contexts* points out, many students have little to no experience reading such articles. This is not to say, however, that reading doesn't appear at all as part of the content of FYC in either of these texts. One of Downs' learning goals for students is that they "build [their] ability to collaborate in communities of writers and readers," a goal grounded in the threshold concept that Genre is Enacted by Writers and Readers (Downs and Robertson 114). Making sure that students are explicitly theorizing reading and writing together, encountering them as connected practices, seems to be the important point for extending the approaches to FYC outlined in *Naming* and *Writing Across Contexts*.

Carillo points to several threads in earlier composition scholarship valuable for students and teachers attempting this work. First, reading is an "active, dynamic practice of constructing meaning" (Carillo 92). Second, reading and writing are connected practices and so must both be theorized, investigated, and explored. Third, reading is a complex practice, and so different theories of reading lead to different approaches to reading and the teaching of it. These definitions of reading lead Carillo to argue for a revival of reading scholarship as a connected practice to writing. Having established the history of reading in composition, Carillo turns to an argument for re-animating discussions of reading, particularly in light of recent scholarship on transfer. She reviews interdisciplinary work on transfer of learning, drawing special attention to the role that metacognition plays in supporting students as they transfer. In her initial survey of writing instructors, Carillo found that many of them hoped that the "rhetorical reading" they asked of their students would prepare students to read effectively in other classes. However, not many of them explicitly foregrounded for students how rhetorical reading is useful beyond FYC. Carillo advocates giving students a "mindful reading framework" (117), not unlike the threshold concepts and key words frameworks, that would give them a language to recognize and name abstract or general reading principles and so transfer reading knowledge and practice along with writing.

Chapter 6 outlines Carillo's mindful reading framework, meant to help students "create knowledge about reading and about themselves as readers" (110). Mindful reading is not another type of reading (like "close reading" or "rhetorical reading"), but instead is framework with which students can recognize when they are reading in a particular way and when that strategy may not be working for them. Ultimately, Carillo argues that FYC courses should introduce students to a range of reading types within this metacognitive framework of mindful reading. One of the limitations of Carillo's argument for mindful reading as a means of teaching for transfer is that it is fairly untested, particularly in comparison to the extensive research on the TFT course in Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak. In her Epilogue, Carillo calls for further study of transfer of reading knowledge. Studying student transfer of reading knowledge through a similar methodology to Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's would help continue to develop and refine the mindful reading framework Carillo proposes. Further, attending to students' prior knowledge of reading and its role in their development of a mindful reading framework—or perhaps a framework for composition—would further refine our understanding of student transfer in composition.

Both Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak and Carillo argue effectively that we cannot just expect transfer of reading and writing practices to happen; we must actively teach for transfer by designing curricula that foster transfer. Carillo's "mindful reading" framework—although less fully developed in her final chapters than the TFT curriculum in Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak—offers students a "guide" or "passport" by helping them to understand why they are reading in particular situations. We are left with the question then, of how to incorporate reading more explicitly in a TFT writing course. What keywords would serve this end with reading? What threshold concepts are invoked in a "mindful reading" framework?

Because reading and writing are connected processes, we can see reading bound up, sometimes explicitly sometimes implicitly, in such threshold concepts as Concepts 1.0 Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity, 1.2 Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences, 1.3 Writing Expresses and Shares Meaning to Be

Reconstructed by the Reader, 1.4 Words Get Their Meanings from Other Words, 2.2 Genres are Enacted by Writers and Readers, 4.1 Text is An Object Outside of Oneself That Can Be Improved and Developed, among others. In helping students recognize that, just as with writing, different kinds of reading are required of different texts and purposes, we are helping them become better composers of meaning. If we are teaching writing studies, we are also teaching reading studies. That is, the processes are connected, and helping students to see those connections will help them be motivated in learning. For Carillo, the content of composition ought to include reading alongside writing, particularly as we begin to define what we know and what we can offer to discussions about writing and writers, using frameworks like threshold concepts.

At the outset of this essay, I articulated several questions about how I could develop my teaching in the composition classroom and the writing center to better support students' and tutors' learning, particularly as they moved into other writing contexts. If the instructors who were interviewed and surveyed in *Writing Across Contexts* and *Securing a Place for Reading* are any indication, I'm not alone in asking these questions. The instructors appearing in both texts expressed hope that students would successfully transfer writing and reading knowledge gained in FYC to their later coursework, but their curricula did not necessarily aid in this goal. What these texts indicate is that teaching for transfer is possible if we help students develop frameworks for composing using the fields' knowledge about writing and reading. Building such a framework is made easier by explicitly naming key concepts and asking students to grapple with them, even as they experience them. *Naming What We Know* offers teachers and tutors a place to start in articulating for ourselves the threshold concepts of composition and in working with students to help them develop theories of reading and writing that they can carry with them beyond the composition classroom.

**Works Cited**

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle, eds. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2015. Print.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and John Majewski. "Extending the Invitation: Threshold Concepts, Professional Development, and Outreach." Adler-Kassner and Wardle 186-202.

Downs, Doug, and Liane Robertson. "Threshold Concepts in First-Year Composition." Adler-Kassner and Wardle 105-121.

Estrem, Heidi. "Threshold Concepts and Student Learning Outcomes." Adler-Kassner and Wardle 89-104.

Nowacek, Rebecca S., and Bradley Hughes. "Threshold Concepts in the Writing Center: Scaffolding the Development of Tutor Expertise." Adler-Kassner and Wardle 171-185.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Introduction: Coming To Terms: Composition/ Rhetoric, Threshold Concepts, and a Disciplinary Core." Adler-Kassner and Wardle xvii-xxxi.