FALSE FRIENDS AND TRUE:
AN ANNOTATED CROSS-CULTURAL
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CHRISTIANE DONAHUE

University of Maine-Farmington, USA

Abstract. The currency of writing research includes terms with which we believe we are all familiar. But frustration can quickly dominate cross-cultural exchange when the meanings of these apparently obvious terms seem to be just beyond our collective reach. The contribution uses translation theory, linguistic analysis, and educational theory to present key terms apparently shared by academic writing researchers and teachers in France and the United States, but in fact serving as obstacles to understanding because of their culture-specific, discipline-specific or institution-specific uses.

Keywords: discourse community, argument, literacy, genre, social construction, (student) writer.

French
[Translation Christiane Donahue]
Resumé. Les recherches autour de l'écrit et de son enseignement/apprentissage s'appuient sur une termi-nologie que nous pensons partager à travers différents contextes. Mais la frustration domine rapidement les échanges transculturels quand les sens des mots-clés, supposés être clairs, restent en dehors d'un par-tage collectif. Cette contribution utilise la théorie de la traduction, l'analyse linguistique, et des théories en sciences de l'éducation afin de présenter des mots-clés qui semblent être partagés par les chercheurs et les enseignants en France et aux Etats-Unis, mais qui, en réalité, sont des obstacles à une compréhension partagée en raison de leurs spécificités culturelles, disciplinaires ou institutionnelles.

Italian
[Translated by Francesco Caviglia]
Abstract. La prassi consolidata della ricerca sulla scrittura comprende l'uso di termini che noi tutti cre-diamo familiari. Ma la frustrazione può rapidamente dominare gli scambi interculturali nel momento in cui i significati di questi termini apparentemente ovvi appaiono appena fuori della portata collettiva. Questo contributo utilizza la teoria della traduzione, l'analisi linguistica e la teoria dell'educazione per presentare alcuni termini chiave, che sono apparentemente condivisi da accademici che fanno ricerca sulla scrittura e da insegnanti in Francia e negli Stati Uniti, ma che costituiscono in realtà un ostacolo alla comprensione a causa dei loro usi specifici nelle culture, nelle discipline o nelle istituzioni.

Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Christiane Donahue, Christiane Donahue, University of Maine-Farmington, Farmington, ME 04938 USA.
Electronic mail: tdonahue@maine.edu.

Parole chiave: comunità di discorso, argomentazione, literacy (alfabetizzazione), genere testuale, costrutto sociale, studente di scrittura.

Polish
[translated by Elżbieta Awramiuk]
Streszczenie. Popularne badania nad pisaniem zawierają terminy, o których myślimy, że je znamy. Frustracja jednak szybko może zdominować wymianę międzykulturową, kiedy znaczenia tych z pozoru oczywistych terminów okazują się poza naszym wspólnym zasięgiem. Autorzy wykorzystują teorię tłumaczenia, analizę lingwistyczną i teorię edukacyjną, aby zaprezentować kluczowe terminy z pozoru wspólne badaczom dyskursu akademickiego i nauczycielom we Francji i w Stanach Zjednoczonych, ale faktycznie stanowiące przeszkodę w rozumieniu z powodu ich rozmaitych użyć, specyficznych w sensie kulturowym, przedmiotowym lub instytucjonalnym.
Słowa-klucze: społeczność dyskursu, polemika, umiejętność czytania i pisania, gatunek, konstrukcja społeczna, (student) piszący

Portuguese
[Translation Paulo Feytor Pinto]
Resumo. O desenvolvimento de investigação sobre a escrita inclui termos com que todos acreditamos estar familiarizados. Mas a frustração pode rapidamente dominar as trocas interculturais quando o significado aparentemente óbvio destes termos parece, afinal, escapar-nos. Neste texto, recorremos à teoria da tradução, à análise linguística e à teoria educacional para apresentar termos-chave aparentemente partilhados por investigadores em escrita académica e por professores, em França e nos Estados Unidos, mas que, na realidade, constituem obstáculos à compreensão devido ao facto de terem usos marcados pelas diferentes culturas, disciplinas e instituições.
Palavras-chave: comunidade discursiva, argumentação, literacia, género, construção social, (estudante) escrevente.

Spanish
[Translation Ingrid Marquez]
Abstract. La actual investigación de la escritura incluye términos que todos pensamos conocer. Pero surge la frustración cuando, durante un intercambio trans-cultural, aparece algún término cuya definición es diferente para cada quien, a pesar de parecer obvia para los interlocutores. Esta contribución ocupa la teoría de la traducción, el análisis lingüístico y la teoría educativa para presentar los términos clave que pretendemos compartir los investigadores de la escritura académica con maestros en Francia y los Estados Unidos – términos que en realidad obstaculizan la comprensión debido a usos que son específicos para cierta cultura, disciplina o institución.
Palabras clave: comunidad de discurso, argumento, capacidad de leer y escribir, género, construcción social, escritor (estudiante).

1. INTRODUCTION

Any effort to generate conversation across cultures about teaching and researching writing, an essential cultural and social activity, involves terminology specific to each context. As a bilingual researcher seeking to publish work in France and the United States, I originally thought that my command of French was sufficient for such work. I expected, of course, to confront some differences in thought and expression, in discursive conventions and theoretical grounding. But I expected that the technical terms of the field would be shared, given the shared focus on theorizing the teaching and learning of writing. As I attended various conferences, participated in debates, and read work in each country, I became acutely aware of what I am calling here "writing studies' false friends," words and concepts that can obstruct useful communication. Most of the definitions proposed here have evolved during

my reading, listening, and speaking experiences, but these have been supplemented by specific research into some of the terms, their history and their presence and impact.[1]

Discussion focused on these false friends can help us to better understand the theoretical ground out of which they grow in order to exchange ideas more fully – or, even better, to confront our ways of working based on a relatively clear grasp of the different concepts and notions in play. I am, of course, not trying to offer a thorough exploration of these terms, nor to identify the multiple meanings each might have for each of us as individual researchers. There is no definitive meaning for each term, nor even a generalized agreement, in any research field or country. On the contrary, the work around these keywords is part of the very research activity of each field. They are thus of course open to debate. My principle objective is to push us beyond superficial preliminary understandings. I hope to modify this text as ever-wider circles of researchers and teachers explore the concepts. The glossary is intended for readers of this special issue, first, but also to support both readers and writers of French and United States writing scholarship.

BRIEF THEORETICAL FRAME

> "The dictionary is based on the hypothesis – clearly unproven – that languages constitute equivalent synonyms." – Jorge Luis Borges

For researchers in the theory of teaching writing, teachers, and composition theorists, translation theory is a relevant frame. The act of translating puts into play questions and problems that are quite similar to the questions posed about writing in and of itself. The act of writing was traditionally seen as an act of transparent transmission of thought (see J. Brereton and B. Daunay, this issue). Seeking the words for saying thoughts should thus be as faithful as possible to the meaning in question. But of course, and we see this in the work of contributors to this special issue, writing does not function this way. Thought is created in and by writing (without claiming, of course, that writing is the only way to do this…); language is not limited to the communicative function of information transfer. Even more interesting is the dependence on a negotiating process for arriving at a translation. Here too we see that, just as for the writing process, we are not faced with a "literal translation," mechanical, but an active interpretation of our own ways of seeing, unfurled through the text's evolution. In addition, this same process directs the diverse ways we read.

From a translation perspective, we begin here to explore the meanings of the terms in the glossary, terms that sometimes represent very specific objects and sometimes represent a vast social and cultural domain, both current and historic. But we will specifically focus on the part of translation that creates a certain kind of obstacle: the "false friend." In this case, the literal translation equation of "A=A" (already a debated assumption) gets stuck in phonetic and orthographic appearances

---

[1] *The definitions presented here have been nourished through conversations with Elisabeth Bautier, Frédéric François, Bertrand Daunay, Sylvie Plane, Isabelle Delcambre, and Rich Haswell.*

(the term "argument" or "paraphrase" for example), while the meaning has evolved differently, sometimes even towards an opposing meaning.

The discussion presented here can only happen if we take into account the different evolutions of terms in the two fields of research: French and United States higher education writing research. The frames and methods differ. We find, for example, on one side a strong cognitive and linguistic influence, and on the other, a strong influence from literary criticism (including French criticism) and from poststructuralist theory. There exists as well a high-stakes horizon of competition and domination, in particular in the tensions between French and United States educational systems, ways of working, and even language expectations.

The two fields of reference have in any case 1) evolved differently – in the United States, in a post-secondary context, and in France, in a primary-secondary context; 2) taken as point of departure different frames of theoretical reference. The local practices and configurations thus influence the terminology this glossary will explore.

The proposed frames also refer us to differences among different school or university disciplines. That is, we sometimes think a difference is cultural, only to find out that it is based in a difference between disciplines, which we might thus consider as different cultures rather than strictly different bodies of knowledge. And finally, the terms treated here become, in one context or another, more central or more marginal – which means that we can better understand the field in each context by paying attention to the way these aspects have evolved.

GLOSSARY

The glossary is in alphabetical order by principal terms as they are used in French. I present first a table of all the terms. Then for each entry, my definition for the field of French theory of teaching and writing appears first, with the term in French italicized, followed by my definition for United States composition theory or teaching practice. This way of organizing the entries sometimes gives the impression that we are looking at a list of opposing terms, but that is not always the case. The overlaps in meaning and use are just as important. On the whole, the definitions offered here are only useful in the context of trying to understand each other: our concerns, our interests, our approaches. Rather than just comparing, I think we benefit from considering them in relation to each other.

Académie
"Académie" in French refers to a specific geographic region in the national organization of school departments, from pre-K through university studies. It also refers to *l'Académie française*, the elite educational institute by that name.

Academy
In United States composition theory (see "composition," this glossary) this term, widely used, refers to the more generalized abstract concept of that which is intellectual academic work, or institutes of higher education and all they stand for, the mental construction of the place where university work is done. This abstraction is physically represented by the concrete space that is the university, but is not limited to a strict equivalence to "university" as such.

Argument
Current French definitions of argument for students focus more on what it is not than on what it is: it is not a polemic, not an argument between experts, etc. Nor is it a personal perspective, an "opinion": "…French academic essays are less subject to an "I think that…" than to a formula like 'what might one think…,' as much as we seem to require students to produce responses dominated by sincerity, good will, frankness…" (Delforce cited in Delcambre 1997: 24).

Argument, Persuasion
United States writing teachers (except those whose scholarship and field are rhetoric) tend to use the term "persuasive" more often than "argumentative" when discussing this particular form of writing. There has not been a recent renewal of interest in classical argumentation for the writing classroom (although there have been some great collections like "Teaching Argument in the Composition Classroom").[2] There has not been, of course, in the United States

---

[2] *The annual conference of composition theorists presented only a handful of sessions on argument in the past few years, among the hundreds of sessions available. A quick bibliographic search turns up few articles in the past ten years specifically dedicated to writing pedagogy and argumentation or persuasion. With the general displacement of composition discussions in the United States, towards metaphors of community and social aspects of writing development (persuasive or not), we have seen a clear decrease in discussions about this writing in itself.*

The most widespread definition is founded on the traditional definition of "argument": argumentation as the presentation of two opposed theses or points, what N. Cordoray calls a "discursive confrontation." The "good argument" is: the writer's ability to manage this confrontation between two theses; the will to convince readers demonstrated by the progression the writer chooses (from a questionable thesis to a defended thesis); the structure organized by two distinct theses; the arguments founded on and grounded in examples; the disqualification of one thesis in light of the other, etc. (Boissinot, 1994: 36-37). These large-scale movements are supported by micro-developments: connectors (transition words), formatting, modifiers that indicate the writer's degree of adherence to a given point, are analyzed in order to study the features of argumentative discourse and are taught as argumentative strategies.

C. Garcia-Debanc (1994) links the ability to argue to the development, in young students, of the ability to justify a response. Among the components of younger students' arguments, she cites opinions, representations of scientific phenomena, and justification. But she is not talking about "justification" in its extrascholastic sense. Justifying can appear to be an act carried out by someone inferior in position to the person listening to the justification – justifying taken as "justifying oneself," with the possibility that the justification will be contested. When a student writes (in general or in order to show that he or she knows how to write, or reason, or argue…), this posture seems reasonable. Garcia-Debanc suggests that this justification is not spe-

the change in national curricular standards to foster such a renewed interest, as seen in France.

Teaching persuasion strategies is part of the high school curriculum in many states and part of some college first-year writing programs as well. The persuasion essay, for example, has kept its status as a central form of school writing over the years. "Expository writing" class, often essentialized into a course in persuasion, remains key for college-bound students in many situations, although the way it is taught is far from uniform. A division between persuasion and narration is well established in secondary school: each form has its own rules and values, its own development, with the underlying belief that it is easier to write-narrate than to write-argue/persuade (we see this belief in France as well).

The key to United States school versions of argumentative or persuasive writing is that students are taught systematically to put their thesis statements up front (see, in this glossary, "thesis"). The very nature of a persuasive essay is thus deductive and not deliberative, although students are encouraged in earlier drafts to be deliberative, to "discover" their stance.

The idea of "audience" took a central role in US composition instruction early on. If in France the role of the audience is mentioned but rarely fully developed, in the United States any teaching of persuasive writing (and often even of writing in general) focuses on detailed analysis of the recipient of the text the student is writing. These analyses highlight the needs, the knowledge and the beliefs of the recipient as imag-

---

[3] *For more on this issue, see Peter Elbow, "Closing My Eyes as I Speak," or Walter Ong, "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction".*

cific to L1 French class: "in most or all of their school subjects, students are asked to justify their answers…" (1994: 5). B. Delforce, cited in Delcambre (1997), develops a similar distinction between arguing (putting a thesis out there and supporting it) and deliberating (discovering one's thesis as one writes), in order to suggest that what is proposed to students in France is in fact a form of deliberation, although the students are supposed to know their conclusion before they begin writing (they write an outline, for example) but to not uncover the conclusion to the reader until the end of an essay's written conclusion.

In addition, this response is generally already dictated by the assignment, which announces a thesis that the student is to support or to refute: the student does not have free reign to choose a perspective, a motivated point of view to "argue."

ined (or researched) by the student writer, who is then to construct his or her text in response to these perceptions. The argumentative structure of the enthymeme is at the heart of this strategy, but the reductive (even caricatural) version taught is more like marketing than global awareness of the eventual reception of an essay.[3] In this model, the student writer is supposed to be demonstrating a superior degree of maturity because he is able to take into account his audience. Certain composition theorists have wondered, however, whether the student who moves from writer-focused to reader-focused prose is actually making progress.

The phenomenon of rhetoric reduced to simple manipulation is, of course, not unique to the United States. But in France, the influence of new rhetoric helped to balance the discussion, while in the United States the new rhetoricians had little influence on composition instruction, other than with S. Toulmin's work. In both cases, however, we are not seeing student essays constructed for Perelman's universal reader, nor for an entirely individual reader. Pedagogical perspectives on teaching argument are often pedagogies of situational or expressive issues related to the student subject's relationship with the theme in question. This means that these perspectives often connect to an explicit use of "I" or to the introduction of a student's experience or point of view into the text.

Communauté discursive	Discourse community

This is a complicated term indeed. At first glance, French and American scholars are discussing the same thing: the discourse community, a notion introduced to composition theory in the 1980s in the United States and to *didacticiens de l'écrit* recently in France. But a closer look shows deep differences. Two other terms, constructivism and knowledge construction (both developed in this glossary), complicate the

situation further, introducing other related aspects. The essential distinction in their uses is rooted in the social bent of United States composition theory and the research focus on post-secondary questions there, as opposed to the comprehensive view taken by French scholarship, compounded by the language distinction between discourse and *discours/discursive* (the literal translation of *communauté discursive* is discursive community, not discourse community).

Definitions that appear parallel:

For French "didacticiens" the discourse community references:

- social frames in which modes of thinking, saying, acting are ratified by a social group in which they make sense (Chanfrault-Duchet, 2003).
- a notion that permits us to introduce the social and discursive aspects of knowledge construction and to highlight that language is a way to semiotize disciplinary activity. This replaces the traditional version of knowledge as material facts that come to us fully formed, in order to recognize disciplines as ways of acting-thinking-speaking and not as "contents". These modes of action come from the agreements made by a group. Each discipline has its discourse community and its language practices; the study of disciplinary languages, habits, and behaviors should thus be the natural domain of the members of these disciplines (Bernié, 2004).[4]

For composition theory, the term references:

• a group of individuals who share language practices, stylistic practices (that help to manage social interactions) and epistemic practices (canonical knowledge that manages points of view, beliefs, modes of interpretation of experience) (Bizzell, 1992).[5]

• a community that must have work in common that cannot be accomplished individually. The language of the community becomes, according to Bizzell, a function of the group's social behavior, a function of the maintenance and transmission of the group's knowledge, and an epistemic function – language is constitutive of group knowledge and in fact <u>constructs</u> this knowledge (Herzberg cited in Bizzell, 1992: 223). In the academic community, one is "written by" its content, by all of the already-said in the community's history, its tropes, its commonplaces, its genres, the developments produced by its members as they collaborate, etc.

The notion of discourse community is, however, clearly a false friend when we take a closer look. The differences include the institutional level at which the term has evolved, the understanding of "disciplines" as scholarly groupings in the United States or school subjects in France, and the sense of the community's construction and the inherent power relations it invokes.

Uses in la didactique: Particularly linked   Uses in the United States: Here "dis-

---

[4] *The way was prepared for these diverse proposals by scholars like E. Bautier or D. Bucheton, F. François, F. Rastier in the 1980s and 90s. We cannot ignore the central influence of Bakhtin on these discussions.*

[5] *This article was published in 1992 but was constructed on ideas that Bizzell spoke of in 1982, a decade earlier. In 1992, having established that the fields of research of rhetoric and composition theory had used the concept of discourse community for a while without having clearly defined it, she set about creating the definition in her seminal text on the subject, "What is a Discourse Community?"*

to schooling as a community endeavor, a co-constructing of the classroom community, and thus a co-construction of school knowledge (in my interpretation of what I have read about the discourse community idea in France), the concept offers a way to understand how a class builds community and how students appropriate and construct for themselves the knowledge in various subjects in their courses. That appropriation is understood as a cognitive construction in the Vygotskian sense (see "constructivism").[6] Of course, based on this definition, we must accept the language choices and the modes of acting-thinking-speaking in question as put into place by the various participants in the world of school (teachers, Official Instructions, school-discipline knowledge, students…) while still of course related to the scholarly knowledge of reference.

For Jaubert, Rebière, and Bernié (2003), the discourse community is a space "Defined by the subject's representation of the social space, the interlocutors possessing recognized means of expression (genres), cognitive values, deontic values, practical and/or intellectual procedures, recognized as relevant…" (p. 55). Notice in this perspective the student's role as the representation he or she creates of the school space, and the implicit support for the reproduction of existing school values and proce-

course community" is a concept specifically linked to the university and to composition courses, both in general and in terms of individual disciplines and their discourses. It is directly linked to scholarly knowledge, to the work of the discipline or the academy, to the construction and deconstruction of knowledge in a field by its members, as described by B. Latour, C. Bazerman and others. This concept has been used to explore spheres of professional activity, intercultural interactions, etc. It is, today, one of the most deeply entrenched concepts in composition theory and teaching, in spite of the fact that it has been contested since its inception for a variety of reasons.[7] For P. Bizzell, the relationship between the individual and the social was central. The individual is capable of learning language and forming thoughts that interpret and organize experience. The use of this thinking occurs in social situations, in interaction with others. This interaction modifies the logico-discursive abilities of the individual. Groups can become used to modifying in certain ways the logico-discursive activities of all those involved; these familiarities can become conventions that create a discourse community, whose purpose is to accomplish a certain kind of work in the material world (1992: 76).

The discourse community is thus a

---

[6] *The concept of "didactic transposition" can, I believe, help us to understand this use. If, in the school situation, the focus is on transmitting knowledge that, through didactic transposition, is differentiated from expert knowledge, then the discursive community of the classroom is a space that operates with its school-based conventions, ways of seeing and thinking. In any case the link is not always very clear.*

[7] *The purpose of this glossary is not to treat this question. For a history of the notion and its evolution in U.S. composition theory, there are multiple references available, including J. Harris, A Teaching Subject.*

[8] *We do not have space to fully develop this question here, but we can quickly note that the work of Paolo Freier influenced this line of critical thinking enormously.*

dures (such as the value of an integration or an acculturation into the school community).

The construction made possible by the interaction in the discourse community of the classroom is founded, among other things, on the possibility for a student to evolve in a proximal zone of development (as proposed by Vygotsky). We are here still in the frame of individual and cognitive development, although in interaction with the social. Unlike the social-constructivists (see below) in the United States, French scholars linking themselves to this line of thinking do not appear to be trying to identify or to classify the features of a community and its role in the evolution of a student's writing. In this perspective, according to Bernié, the student must create him or herself as "school Subject" (or construct enunciative positions for each school subject [Jaubert & Rebière, 2004]), and the epistemological status of language is actually a condition of knowledge construction.

We could imagine that the description of a discipline offered by M. Foucault in 1971, cited in *le Français à l'Ecole* (Hatier 1999) would lend itself to the concept of discourse community, but this definition does not appear to include school subjects:

A discipline presents itself as "one of the principles of limitation, of frontier between discourses admitted as true in a given field of knowledge". These "discourses admitted as true" are valid for a while. They constitute systems of formulation and of reformulation of rules, definitions, instruments, methods, objects in relation to acquired knowledge, advances and questionings of knowledge under construction. That is to say, a discipline is a network of discourses constantly being reconsidered as a domain community with norms, rules, conventions, ways of being, thinking, even living, in common and its knowledge is (entirely) discursive, socially constructed and unstable. The concept of discourse community enabled scholars to frame and to model the way writing courses work for students in the context of the institution of higher education – to imagine and to analyze this world in a way that, in the 1980s, was original. It allowed composition theorists and teachers to better understand the socio-discursive relationship between the teacher and the student, to oppose teaching writing as a simple transmission of competencies, and to question the underlying approaches and ideologies.

All analysis of such a community needed thus to lend itself to elucidating and understanding these practices and ways of being: the adoption or creation, by the participants, of shared stylistic conventions, preferred syntaxes, commonplaces, acceptable evidence, common stocks of words, even argumentative rites and ethos specific to a discourse (Bizzell 1992: 36, 225). The ethnographic-sociologic methodology for studying the life of different spheres of activity (to borrow Bakhtin's term, and taking as example B. Latour's analysis of science laboratory life) was particularly useful.

But fairly quickly, this acculturating version was replaced by a version resisting the effort to render students' acculturation fluid and smooth, and instead focused on examining students' integration process, to explore what is gained or lost and to study and even encourage or affirm students' resistance to the ideologies inherent in higher education and in the writing course.[8] M.L. Pratt's "contact zone" concept appeared and was widely adopted as an alternative to

of knowledge creates itself (cited in Collinet & Mazière, 1999).

The "discursive community" concept is currently evolving in France, and is frequently referenced in discussions and articles, but its future is not clear, as not all research groups accept its value. Bourdieu's "habitus" and Bakhtin's "spheres of activity" are among the concepts being proposed as alternatives.

the "community" model. At the same time, many scholars and teachers came to understand that writing could not be taught in isolation, without accounting for the university-level disciplinary aspects of writing instruction's content and – woven in – its ways of being expressed. In addition, perhaps most importantly, scholars began exploring the interaction between those "entering" the community and the community's construction, suggesting that each influenced the other in an ongoing dynamic process.

Composition (French)

In French, "composition" refers to a specific form of writing, a constructed argument: "The action (the art) of forming a coherent whole by assembling discursive elements that are presented as an organic unit" (*Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, p. 202). The mastery of French discourse and of the "*composition française*" as literary exercises dominated the 1800s (Collinot & Mazière, 1999).

Composition (English)

This key component in university writing defines the field: composition theory. The field treats the theorizing of teaching and learning to write in higher education, at first in the first-year composition course but then across the university experience, in all disciplines, as linked with professional writing, or with socio-cultural situations outside of the university, in relation to writing in secondary education, and so on. The meaning of "composing" is very specific, founded simultaneously on the nature of the act of creation, and on the meaning of the opposition between written product and the act of production. The influence of cognitive studies on the acquisition of writing is also a factor in this perspective that poses composition as the principal and complex act of writing – social, cognitive, and intellectual – to study and to theorize.

Construction des savoirs

The discussion of this term can be read in tandem with the discussion of discourse communities (above) and con-

Social construction of knowledge

For composition theorists, poststructuralism imposes itself here. Knowledge is a "construct," a mental construction

structivism (below), without going so far as to say they are equivalent. In French theory, this construction is Vygotskian, a co-construction between teacher and student; for real learning, knowledge is not "transmitted" but constructed actively by students with the teacher (and with each other). This construction occurs, as Vygotsky proposed, through confronting problems that must be resolved and through the social interaction that occurs during this process of resolution.

invented during social interaction.[9] Knowledge does not pre-exist its discursive-situated construction, and all knowledge is in fact discursive. The co-construction of knowledge in university settings is thus seen as entirely discursive, a language-mediated act.

Constructivisme (French)

Constructivism (sometimes, in French, "social constructivism," but this is rare) takes quite different forms in *la didactique du français* and composition theory. But this difference is more disciplinary than cultural. Education theorists in the United States share with French researchers a definition of constructivism founded on Piaget and then Vygotsky in order to explain how individuals learn. This perspective takes into account the active role of the learner, through his or her interaction in learning situations. The student constructs a response during this interaction, which permits a construction of the knowledge in question.

Constructivism (social)

In the 1980s, at the heart of the social constructivist movement, scholars in composition theory adopted poststructuralist perspectives grounded in literary criticism. This had the effect of highlighting a group of social and political questions related to writing, its instruction, its production, and its role in education (Harris, 1997: 17). British author R. Ivanic proposes, based on K. Bruffee's work, that "reality, knowledge, thoughts, facts, texts, people, etc. are all constructs generated by communities of peers who share ways of thinking; they are thus linguistic entities generated and maintained by the community in question…but they define and 'constitute' for themselves the communities that generate them" (1998: 12). For the social constructivists, reality and knowledge do not pre-exist their creation, their social "invention." It is not by accident that the discourse community concept held great sway at this same time period.

Composition theorists were quite interested by this general and fairly abstract importance of culture and context

---

[9] For example, "childhood" is not a concrete reality but a construct that is recreated differently with each era, culture, etc.: child as miniature adult, as innocent, as worker…

in the interpretation and construction of knowledge, less in individual learning as such (even though this individual learning is made possible by social interaction). Social constructionism rejected: models of cognitive deficiency, apparently scientific research results, a focus on the individual student independent of context, the search for a common essence of writing process. It took into account the political-ethical dimensions of the student's situation. This model turned attention to the role of the institution, of the socio-political context, of implicit ideologies, and of the "subject positions" of student writers in the working of university texts (see "subject/subject position" below).

Scholars in this domain became very interested in the relationship between academic language and social-political power, in the status of the student as a progressive participant in the academic world, initiating him or herself in all of the stakes (positive and negative) such participation presupposes. This perspective engendered a perception of writing as the primary activity in knowledge co-construction.

Dialogique/dialogisme

It is not dialogism in and of itself that has evolved differently in each country's field of research, but the specific aspect of "enunciative polyphony." The influence of linguistics in France has allowed a more important role for linguistic analysis and, specifically, analysis of this polyphony, sometimes uncovering quite clearly the enunciative modes linked to multiple voices in a student's text (see for example the issue of *LIDIL*, "*Apprendre à Citer le Discours d'Autrui*" (Learning to Cite Others' Discourses), and the numerous presentations focused

Dialogics

This term is clearly more inspired by literary criticism than by linguistics in the United States version of composition theory. Heteroglossia is linked to the heterogeneous multivocality of texts, but appears more related to intertextuality and the study of the diverse subject positions and points of view that develop in the course of a text's unfolding.

on enunciative polyphony (referred to in the United States as heteroglossia) at the 2002 Brussels conference, "Writing in Higher Education."

Didactique

"*La didactique*" is the theory of teaching, a "space of theories and research focused on teaching and learning" (of French, of writing, of another discipline…) (Reuter, Chiss & David, 1995: 15). This field, focused on the study of the processes of teaching and learning, is divided by the *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation* in three sub-areas: practitioners' didactics, normative didactics, and critical-prospective didactics. The third area is most relevant here. The research effected in writing didactics serves to improve our understanding of learning and to make decisions about teaching (without presuming any "application" of research results directly in the classroom!). At the heart of the domain of didactics is the exploration of learning not as the transmission of knowledge but as reconstruction and appropriation of knowledge, a movement in which writing plays a vital role.

Didactic(s)

A way of being pedagogical that is simultaneously too authority-driven and very moral; pedantic teaching.

Discipline (scolaire, universitaire, de référence)

"Discipline" in French refers to at least three domains:

- the scholarly discipline is the one in which disciplinary knowledge is produced, the domain in which experts work (biologists, mathematicians, engineers, psychologists, historians, anthropologists…);
- the university discipline, close to the first, which includes the work of students and teacher-mentors;
- the school discipline which is, on the contrary, the results (according

Discipline, school subject

- the school subject is the discipline in its pre-higher education form;
- the discipline is the scholarly/university discipline of reference. There are frequently debates between practitioners and professors in higher education about the "Ivory Tower" nature of university knowledge or disciplines.

Composition theorists have expressed little interest in the relationship between scholarly knowledge and school subjects. On the other hand, they have pursued vigorously the links be-

to some researchers) of "didactic transposition" or the transformation of scholarly and university knowledge into school subjects (with all this includes in terms of triage, rendering knowledge in lay terms, and sequencing knowledge into smaller units for acquisition by students in learning situations).

The relationship between high school and college disciplines is less clearly articulated.

Dissertation, thèse-antithèse-synthèse
The "dissertation" is a text form, a way to develop and link ideas using both a formal structure and formal conventions that are generally recognized:

- an introduction (present the subject to be treated and outline the main points);
- the development ("methodically constructed: divided in three parts, thesis-antithesis-synthesis, while respecting an overall unity);
- the conclusion (bring back the subject and at the same time create an opening towards other possible questions). (*Dictionnaire ency-clopédique de l'éducation et de la Formation*).

The rules and conventions are equally well known: do not use "I", divide the ideas clearly into paragraphs, develop them one at a time, create transitions between paragraphs, use a style that is neither too familiar nor too embellished.

The dissertation, object of many research studies, special journal issues, analyses, etc. takes its most typified form for the French end-of-secondary bacca-lauréat exam.

tween writing in first-year courses, writing in the disciplines, the role of writing in the construction and appropriation of expert knowledge, the possibility or not of "transferring" writing knowledge from general learning to writing knowledge in a disciplinary context, and the status of the student with respect to the "community" of experts in a discipline (see "discourse community").

Dissertation, academic essay, school essay, five-paragraph-essay
Dissertation: Doctoral thesis.
Academic essay, school essay, five-paragraph-essay:
This is the conceptual equivalent of the French dissertation in the United States. It is a form of persuasive writing that is equally structured and canonic. The "academic" essay can be in response to texts read in class, texts that are explicitly or implicitly approved, texts and discussions from class, from the exterior world or the school institution, general conversations, and so on. Students are often expected to cite, paraphrase, summarize; in this case the essay might be called a "documented essay."

For the "social constructivists" in particular, the academic essay is a key genre because it is the currency of the academic discourse community (without suggesting here that there are homogeneous definitions of this genre, in particular since it is seen quite differently by theorists vs. practitioners.

The "school essay" appears before university studies, but influences the structure of university essays. The particular form most often taught is the five-paragraph-essay, made up of:

- the introduction (presents the thesis,

announces three supporting arguments);

- three supporting paragraphs, one per point;
- the conclusion (recalls the main point and reminds us of the support).

Note that there is considerable tension between the expectations in secondary education (and the need to teach the five-paragraph-essay) and post-secondary education (with its tendency to reject the five-paragraph-essay).

Ecrit-écrire-écriture

L'écriture (writing) is the product of the writerly act. *L'écrit* (writing) is the abstraction of the writer's product, except when used as an adjective, as in "written text." *L'«écrire»* (writing, to write) is the action of writing.

Writing, to write

In English these distinctions are contextual, rather than tied to word forms. "Writing" can be product, concept, or action.

Ecrire pour apprendre

"Writing to learn" has become an area of great interest in France in the past few years, in particular because of its usefulness in terms of writing across different disciplines and writing as transversal discipline (see for example the pluridisciplinary Bordeaux conference in 2003, "Constructing Knowledge," and the theme of the 2005 *Association Internationale de Recherches en Didactique du Français* conference, "French: singular, plural, or transversal discipline?" The principal question for this transversality is about the very nature of French (and thus of writing) in relation to other disciplines: "the mastery of language develops through a diversified usage of language in different specific disciplinary contexts," which calls us to treat French not in an universal way but in a variational way" (Fisher & Simard, 2004).

Write to learn, writing across the curriculum

This domain took shape in particular in terms of teacher development, in higher education and then in secondary education. That is, WAC is carried out for students through working with faculty. Writing specialists, in particular teacher-researchers, in composition theory began to work with faculty in other domains in order to encourage them to have students write as a way to learn. (see also writing in the disciplines, WID). WAC activities can include, as the Brereton article suggests, working on paraphrase, note-taking, reading assignments, learning the writing process, one-minute essays, personal journals, reader-response journals, and a multitude of similar activities.

Ecrivain

This word carries the strong traditional literary meaning for writer, and is thus rarely used in didactics discussions except as attached to other words (like *étudiant-écrivain*) or when discussing creative writing (in the sense, for example, used to describe encouraging young children to become writers). See also scripteur.[10]

Writer (student)

The student is a writer in the sense of "someone who produces text." Composition theorists seem to use "writer" and "student writer" relatively interchangeably.

Essai

An essay in French context is often described in a tradition that has Montaigne at its source. This form of writing is supposed to treat a subject or theme of general interest without trying to discuss it exhaustively and without trying to come to strong or definitive conclusions. The essential difference between an *essai* and a *dissertation* is in the personal or subjective nature of the first and the argumentative-academic nature of the second.

Essay (personal)

The personal essay in the United States tradition is a reference to a school form that is also called a "narration" or a narrative essay. The personal essay calls for the student to tell a story that has happened to him or her in a way that makes it come to life for a reader and to show or imply a lesson learned from the experience. For the expressivists (see expression-expressivist) the personal essay is at the heart of initiating students into the critical and intellectual work of the university. It is founded on the text of experience as well as the generic and linguistic history of the individual writer: stories read, heard, rules and structures learned or absorbed, words, commonplaces, tropes, all work together as the student turns his or her experience into a crafted story.

Expressivists suggest that confidence in oneself and one's voice is the best preparation for writing in the university. This should help in avoiding the traditional problem of the essays made up of pasted quotes that frustrate teachers so much. The student constructs his or her writerly identity (and student identity) linked with his or her lived experience and level of engagement in the world.

---

[10] In French, C. Donahue has proposed the term "étudiants-écrivains".

Expression (pédagogie de l')
This term is linked, according to the *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, to the new pedagogies of self-expression in learning contexts. The term covers modes of expression beyond just writing, but writing is a major component: freewriting, personal journals, correspondence, writing workshops, project-based learning, all the different ways to help a student construct knowledge and know-how based on personal experience and to "socialize individual desires to express" (p. 445).

Expressivism
This term is used in composition theory to designate a focus on writing in both research and teaching practice pushed towards "the individual, by teachers wanting students to find their 'real voices' and by researchers hoping to study the mental processes during the act of writing" (Harris, 1997: 17).

The expressivism of the 1960s-70s was constructed based on pedagogical needs; this research strand engendered a debate (that continues today) on the nature of "self" in writing (p. 41). This debate took the shape of an entrenched dichotomy: does the "self" exist outside of its social or linguistic construction, or is it entirely socially constructed? (see constructivism/social constructivism).

The expressivist option is founded partly on a politics of resistance to institutions, the possibility of learning without being taught, the exploration of a discursive certainty created by self-confidence and personal language mastery. L. Faigley (1989), in his analysis of 25 student essays chosen by composition theorists deemed the most representative of "good student writing" observed at the time that almost all of the essays chosen were commented by their presenters as "sincere," with "strong presence" and a clear ability to present a "meta-" perspective built on self-reflection.

Evaluation
The French term "evaluation" includes the activities named in both evaluation and assessment in the United States.

Evaluation, Assessment
Evaluation is the name for the activity carried out on end-stage projects in school situations: grading or other evaluative processes. Assessment encompasses the processes of formative and evaluative activity of students, courses, curricula, and institutions, with

the specific purpose of improving instruction through study of assessment results.

Genre (disciplinaire, rhétorique, de l'écrit, typologies, au lycée, comme outil, genre v. activité, premier/second)

Genre (mode, rhetorical, and activity theory, Bakhtinian)

I do not imagine I can present in a few lines the whole body of thought about genre in the French and U.S. theoretical fields. I just offer here a few thoughts concerning some of the specific framing differences between the *didactique* of L1 French and composition theory.

Literary genre definitions are essentially shared between the two fields, as are understandings gleaned from narrative theory and from the linguistic traditions of modes classifications. Let us just consider a few of the other uses and conceptualizations of the term "genre" in the French and then the United States contexts.

Genres du discours: (Discourse genres)
Jakobson, Benveniste, and Bakhtin all heavily influenced the understandings of genre that have developed at various points in France. Jakobson's underlined functions of written texts (emotive, conative, referential, phatic, metalinguistic and poetic) have remained influential without being called genres. Benveniste's division of discourse into "récit" and "discours" depending on whether it is in the moment or distanced, separated from the moment, is heavily developed in French theory. Bakhtin's heterogeneous genres of discourse in relation to an open range of spheres of human activity has been key in more recent discussions.

Genres rhétoriques: (Rhetorical genres)
The rhetorical genres influenced a great deal the discussions of teaching and analyzing texts, based at first on the five major genres inherited from the rhetorical tradition and found in all classic textbooks: argument, description, explication, narration, and conversation (Adam, 1992: 5), text classifications identified primarily through their shared formal

Rhetorical genres:
Rhetoric has been more interested in the relationship between the text and its producer (Devitt, 2000: 699). For rhetorical theorists at this period, genres were founded in the pragmatic action they accomplished: "how we do things with language". Rhetoricians had a tendency to consider individual texts as examples of generic expectations rather than as texts with individual qualities (p. 711).

The role of similarity-difference between texts, explored principally by Beebee, was presented as essential to any understanding of genre. A genre is not recognizable, he claimed, except through its difference with surrounding genres, and this led Beebee to support the idea that all texts are heterogeneous (cited in Devitt, p. 700). This textual heterogeneity did not become a theme in composition and communication studies until much later, partly inspired by Bakhtinian thought.

Modes:
These genres were introduced by J. Kin-

characteristics.

Genres de l'écrit et typologie de textes:
(Written genres and text types)
In *la didactique du français et de l'écrit*,
key work emerged around the question
of genres and text types in the 1980s and
1990s. This work was essential to French
research and teaching. The 1970s had
already seen strong attention given to
teaching writing, influenced theoretically
by textual linguistics, literary semiotics,
and questions of textuality and discourse
analysis (Plane 2002, Dabène 1995).

Plane reminds us of the importance
of …the definition of textual or discur-
sive objects imagined through the lens of
teaching and learning, with two key
hinges around which the research has
gathered, the narrative text […] and the
argumentative text. We can see the evo-
lution of these as objects of research un-
folding through the special issues of the
journal *Pratiques* (Masseron, 1992,
1997, and Schnedecker 1994). On the
fringes of these major themes, other
relevant themes concerning more limited
objects became the object of specific
research projects of their own in *la di-
dactique de l'écriture*, such as the sum-
mary (Charolles & Petitjean 1992) or the
explicative text (Petitjean 1986, Garcia-
Debanc 1990, *Repères* 69, *72*, *77*) or the
descriptive text (Petitjean 1987, Reuter
1998). (Plane 2002)

One of the strongest influences on
textual typology in French writing class-
rooms and French writing research was
the "genre-type-component" system pro-
posed by J.M. Adam, which made it pos-
sible to analyze diverse texts in units of

neavy in the 1970s, and have had a con-
siderable influence on the United States
views of teaching and studying college
writing. Kinneavy echoed Jakobson,
proposing that text modes can be deter-
mined by identifying the speaker, the
audience, the text-message, and a world
to which the text refers. But the purpose
or aim of the text determines its type:
"the aim of a discourse is primary; it
acts on other features; it determines the
acceptable forms of evidence and of
development" (Kinneavy, 1971: 21).
When the speaker's aim is towards him-
self, the discourse is expressive; when
towards an audience, the discourse is
persuasive; when towards the subject
matter, the discourse is referential; when
towards the media, it is aesthetic.
Genres and activity theory:
This perspective has roots in reader-
response literary theory that explores the
interaction among reader, writer, con-
text, and text. In the social-community
models presented here, students' texts
are considered "an acquired response to
discursive preferences of a given com-
munity in order to create and communi-
cate knowledge" (Russell, 1997). This
"activity theory" in which genres are
born entirely outside of any set of for-
mally shared characteristics and strictly
within the expectations shared by a par-
ticular group, a "collective," represents
one extreme of the community versions
of discourse.[11]

Genres serve, in this model, as me-
diator of actions between individuals
and as temporary stabilizer of the struc-
tures of exchange. The conventions of
the exchange are born out of the needs
of the group and the discursive activity

---

[11] *I have modified a bit Russell's perspective because he leaves aside the role of language,*
specifically, in order to focus on the idea that genres are not necessarily language acts. But I
am applying his perspective here to the specific situation of university writing.

generic sequences and to thus emphasize textual heterogeneity. This notion of heterogeneity was taken up and developed further by other researchers (see, for example, the THEODILE research group's work on descriptive texts).

Genre au lycée (Instructions Officielles): (School genres)

Another current understanding of "genre" is inherited from Aristotelian rhetoric (see Aristotle's Poetics, 1447a, 1448b) but stultified in the school tradition, which recognizes four basic genres: novels, drama, poetry, and essays. The French high school curriculum developed in 2002 under the direction of Viala (and influenced by Petitjean) is based on this understanding of four basic genres mixed with a Bakhtinian frame, in particular the frame of primary and secondary genres (Plane, interview). A review of the *Instructions Officielles* gives a clear sense of the degree to which various ways of thinking about genre are mixed.

Genre comme outil: (Genre as tool)

The genre as presented by B. Schneuwly in the 1990s was primarily a psychological tool, a material and symbolic mediator between the student subject who integrates the schema of use of the genre, and the situation. The idea of "situation" seems to suggest a relationship to the reader, but this relationship was not explored at the time. J.P. Bronckart presents a different dynamic: speakers realize language actions by reproducing, imitating, and/or deforming available genres (1996: 44). He proposed that textual genres are "sociolinguistic formations, organized according to heterogeneous modalities related to heterogeneous determinations" (45). Discourses and

in play. Russell (1997) proposes the notion of generic routines, patterns of communication that, successful a first time, are used again by speakers in a future situation seen as recurrent. Participants in a given situation do not recognize a genre by its features but by the discursive actions it operationalizes.

For composition theorists, the reciprocal interaction of genre-context created a different perspective:

- speakers use genres to do things in the world;
- these ways of doing things become typified, regularized by their repeated occurrence;
- once the genre has formed, it accumulates formalized conventions that also accomplish rhetorical objectives (Devitt, 2000: 698).

Each domain has its own systems of genres that interact with each other (Slevin, 2001). This activity theory raised other questions, including: do we master genres or are we mastered by them? How are genres ideological representations? How do we appropriate genres if we do not belong to the domain in question?

texts are thus, for him, socially motivated and oriented (Bucheton, 1997: 39). This evolution highlights that there is not "a" language competence – an idea equally central to Bakhtinian descriptions of discourse genres; it became possible to imagine a diversity of forms, an open inventory, to recognize and eventually learn or acquire.

Genre ou activité: (Genre or activity)
The question of genre as activity or as product in school situations has become a key current question. When are we looking at a genre? When an activity? What are the practical or theoretical consequences of each?

Genre premier, genre second: (Primary/secondary genre)
Bakhtin's influence is manifest in the discussions about primary genres, immediately experienced, vs. secondary genres, distanced from their point of initial production. This exploration led to extensive work focused on the value of reflexive writing and the meta-activity it can enable, called *secondarisation*.

Littéracie (litéracie)
The term *littéracie*, recently introduced in France, is an adaptation of the anglosaxon concept. It is in some cases a term used to cover diverse aspects of writing instruction (Barré-deMiniac, 2003: 6). Grossmann has carried out the most thorough research about *littéracie* in this sense. But the field of the *didactique du français* remains by and large unconvinced about its research benefits. Reuter suggests in 2003 that the term should be adopted only if it will fill a theoretical gap (20). He does highlight, however,

Literacy (critical)
The slippery word "literacy" in English includes activities of reading, writing, critical thinking as well as related historico-cultural knowledge. We can for example talk of a "scientific literacy" to evoke the domain of knowledge and know-how in science. This word is part of at least three other domains of reflection: cultural literacy (the knowledge a cultural group maintains), critical literacy (everything related to the critical consciousness of one's own literacy and of the socio-cultural and ideological

the ways the term allows us to reframe the activity of reading in a larger group of linguistic-cultural competencies, and to draw on a large number of fields of reference (14), including among others linguistics, sociology, psychology, and literary criticism.[12] For others, litéracie with just one "t" relates to the graphic and orthographic aspects of writing, including the scriptural practices linked to technology (see for example work by Jaffré and David).

implications of this literacy), and "literacy wars" (related to questions about the (over-)valuing of writing in cognitive development – does it have primacy over other forms of communication or expression, is a culture without writing at a disadvantage and incapable of thinking in certain ways.

Paraphrase

Known in France primarily through the fact that it is highly and officially discouraged in terms of literary analysis and rarely mentioned in terms of other written forms, paraphrase is defined as "simple repetition" or "reduplication." Samoyault (2004) offers a treatise about intertextuality that does not mention paraphrase a single time. School textbooks vigorously insist on the importance of avoiding paraphrase. Note that these diverse proclamations target in particular literary analysis or literary commentary. In other disciplines, paraphrase is more expected, although it is not officially accepted. At the same time, the exercise of summary actually calls on language activity that closely resembles paraphrase.

B. Daunay (2002) reminds us that paraphrase is a necessary discursive activity, and was a legitimate school activity until the 1960s. He highlights the contradiction between the legitimacy of the language activity of reformulation and the illegitimacy of paraphrase, even as these acts target the same objective.

Paraphrase

This activity is the point of departure for analytic activity, both literary and otherwise. Its value as a didactic activity and as an activity respecting social practices in reading, cited by Daunay, are accepted. Paraphrase is presented in textbooks, explicitly taught, valued in particular for the way it enables the work of textual understanding (belonging thus to the domain of "writing to learn" and of the acquisition of university discourses). It is also understood as a key activity in the act of intertextual interpretation and "enunciative polyphony"; it is thus the object of theoretical discussion.

---

[12] It is interesting to note that these are some of the very fields on which composition theory draws.

Plagiat

The word "plagiarism" designates approximately the same thing in French and in English, stealing from others' works by presenting texts, parts of texts, or ideas without giving credit. But what counts as plagiarism appears to be quite different. Students in high school, for example, write essays without receiving any negative feedback on the borrowing they often do from texts they've read, without citing or quoting.

Plagiarism

The direct theft (for example, buying one's paper from an Internet service) aside, plagiarism consists of any integration into one's essay of a piece of text, a sentence, part of a sentence, a paraphrase, or an idea, without specific attribution. For some, the act of paraphrase by modeling one's text on the style, syntactic structure, or organization of a text, even with explicit citation, is also plagiarism (sometimes called "close paraphrase"). This fairly severe understanding of plagiarism is criticized by, among others, translation theorists, for whom "copying" is part of literary acts and tradition. Barnstone suggests, for example, that who we define as "author" can be quite traditional or quite intertextual.

Problématique

In French research methodology, the *problématique* is the question that a research project will try to answer, the motivating question for a researcher. This term has been the subject of some debate. On the one hand, it is "the emblematic figure of intellectual activity" (Nonnon p. 31), the basis for research and the necessary piece of scientific inquiry. It is, in fact, borrowed from the sciences, as E. Nonnon reminds us (p. 31). A *problématique* can be based in theoretical readings or in actual experiences or experiments. F. Rinck describes it as key to research activity in *la didactique*, the point of intersection between a subjective point of view or personal interpretation of a problem and the questions asked in a discipline's paradigms, calling on shared disciplinary knowledge (p. 2). Its reflexive nature is what enables the construction of new knowledge. Both

Problematic (research question)

The term indicates simply an idea or an approach that does not work well. The English conceptual equivalent would be "research question." This term, however, appears far less often in U.S. composition scholarship. It carries with it all of the embedded relationship to science that the French version does, and given the lack of U.S. pursuit of "scientific research" in composition studies, it does not figure often.

Rinck and Nonnon suggest that the concept is not without its conflicted aspects, however. It is simultaneously a process and a formulation, and researchers and students alike are not always clear about its shape and purpose; Nonnon asks whether it is a simple rhetorical technique or a discursive movement leading to real reflection (p. 30).

Processus

The principle of the process approach is shared by composition theory and *la didactique de l'écrit* at least partly because of the shared reference to J. Hayes and L. Flower. Its focus on producing writing and on the identifiable, recursive, and teachable stages of writing production are shared as well, and shifted focus from the produced text to the activity of producing the text, as well as the personal and shaping value of this writing. But here too the evolution and uses of the process frame differ, in particular in terms of grade levels.

D. Bucheton suggests that Hayes and Flower's key contribution was to show that "the act of writing translates cognitively into a series of mental operations (planning, translation, and revision) permanently recursive interactive" (1997, p. 38). The practical effect of this influence was an increase in activity related to self-evaluation by students (already present in the French school system) based on metalinguistic and metatextual activity before, during, and after a student's text production (p. 38). These early influences are evolving currently in discussions about the "secondarizing" effect of certain activities on students' language competencies. This period of pedagogical and theoretical development is cited for its importance in the evolution of the research object of writing as its own area

Process (movement)

The process movement in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s is clearly described in the piece by J. Brereton in this issue. I will simply note here that the process approach has become so woven into the fabric of the discussion that it is a complete given and far less often a subject of study in the literature of the field. One key difference was in the rejection of the cognitive models of process, considered inadequate because they could not account for writing's heterogeneity and the contexts in which disciplinary textual practices and behaviors take place (Russell, 2004). They also did not provide for revision as a dialogic act between the student and his text. The main objective of the process, that is, was the product, rather than the reflexive questioning of the writer him or herself, his choices, objectives, historicity, or the effect he could have on the process (Harris, 1994: 68).

within the larger domain of L1 French didactics and as motivation for shifting from an emphasis on written texts to an emphasis on their production (Barré-deMiniac, 1995: 97).

According to Reuter, Chiss, and David (1995) and Plane (2002), the literary approach of studying the production of texts was also key to this shift. Well-known authors are studied, in this approach, in order to understand their processes, and this helps in understanding student writers' processes as well. In particular, for the first time, scratching-out, crossing-out, modifying and making other notes on one's text became an object of interest instead of a sign of weakness.

Scripteur

This term is close to meaning "writer" in the composition theory sense, the sense that emphasizes the student-as-writer, but carries with it a particular emphasis on the physical act of writing, the scripting gesture. See "writer, student."

Writer

See "writer, student" at *écrivain.*

Sujet (position, posture)

The notion of a "subject" as an identifiable person who produces a text is rooted at least partly in the linguistic and anthropologic traditions of French research (for example, R. Barthes and C. Lévi-Strauss). The subject in their work is conditioned by the linguistic, social, and anthropological codes of the period and cultural location (Clifford, 1991: 40). In linguistic analysis, the subject might be seen as specific (the student who speaks about experiences and bases his written or spoken text on this: "I am from a rough neighborhood and I hate school"), or voice of general truths ("Students from rough neighborhoods are part of a marginalized group and cannot do well

Subject (position)

The social constructivist frame includes attention to "subject positions" in a heavily social understanding inspired by the work of L. Althusser, among others, and used to designate and theorize the student writer and his or her explicit or implicit integration into a text. According to Clifford (1991), Althusser proposed that individuals are constructed in and by discursive networks: we "permit" ourselves, not necessarily consciously, to be interpellated by the discourses that surround us. For Althusser, the "subject" is neither the person/personality of the text's writer, nor the rhetorical persona, but "a composite of subject positions, simultaneously

in school"), or still again as the French third person generic "on" that simultaneously can include the speaker and permit him or her to speak for everyone.

E. Bautier and D. Bucheton (1997) offer the notion of "postures" to study the complex question of student-subjects and their discursive positions in both their written texts and their classroom participation. The term "posture" might seem to carry negative implications, but in their use, it is simply a way of framing the variety of subject positions students adopt. The posture in question (and of course it is generally a question of more than one posture in a given language situation) is temporary, always displacing itself in new instances (whether situations or tasks). New postures are being invented regularly. Nor are these postures immediately «readable» moments; they are rather ways to bring together and name the various movements of subjectivation which present themselves (and construct themselves) in a written or spoken text.

active in the reproduction of positions" (cited in Faigley, 1989: 403). The traditional conception of a unified self and its place in the social order are thus always imaginary. The student writer in learning situations is vulnerable because he does not see himself as "textual subject," subject for whom the institution of education has prepared a place (as opposed to the student choosing that place) (Brodkey, 1989).

Althusser's thinking also dominated understanding of our relationship with dominant discourses and ideologies, always naming and positioning us even as we believe we are free agents acting by choice (Kavanaugh, 1995: 310), including the texts we write or say in which we claim to present our authentic selves.

Thèse

The final product of a doctoral program (dissertation); also, the controlling idea of an essay which will be challenged by other ideas in the traditional and fully entrenched organization of «thèse-antithèse-synthèse».

Thesis

The controlling idea of an essay, to be developed and supported by the essay.

Voix

Voice is, in the French understanding, primarily the actual physical voice of an individual, the mode of vocal production. But this term does also appear in multiple discussions about enunciative polyphony and dialogic heterogeneity: the "multivocal word" of Bakhtin. The term "voice" is also relevant to French discus-

Voice

The term "voice" is generally linked to expressivist perspectives in the United States, but also to questions of style and individual emphasis: a student must find his or her voice, make this voice heard in his or her text, a voice constructed through his or her history. Texts with recognizable voices are often set in op-

sions based in narratology, in particular as related to questions of the distinction between the voice of the author and the voice of the narrator.[13]

position to texts that are too dry or mechanical, too "academic." This perspective is a subject of debate among scholars in composition theory, but is frequently evoked among composition teachers.

REFERENCES

Adam, J.M. (1992). *Les textes: types et prototypes* [Texts: Types and prototypes]. Paris: Editions Nathan.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Esthétique de la création verbale.* Paris: Gallimard. (traduction de *Estetika slovesno-go tvorchestva*, édition originale 1979, Moscou).

Barnstone, W. (1993). *The poetics of translation.* New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Barré-deMiniac, C. (1995). La didactique de l'écriture: nouveaux éclairages pluridisciplinaires et état de la recherché [Didactics of writing: New pluridisciplinary clarifications and state of research]. *Revue française de pédagogie, 113,* 93-133.

Barré-deMiniac, C. (2003, July). « *La littéracie vers de nouvelles pistes de recherche didactique,* coord. par Christine Barré-De-Miniac, Présentation dans: Lidil, *27* ,Université Stendhal de Grenoble, LIDI-LEM.

Bautier, E., & Bucheton, D. (1997). L'hétérogénéité du texte, les postures d'écriture des élèves [Textual heterogeneity: Students' writing postures]. In D. Bucheton (Ed.), *Conduites d'écriture* (pp. 229-243). Versailles: CRDP de l'Académie de Versailles.

Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In G. Blalock (Ed.), *The Bedford handbook for writers* (pp. 14-26). Boston: St. Martin's Press.

Bazerman, C. (1994). *Constructing experience.* Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bernié, J.P. (2004). Débat à deux voix: La configuration de la discipline "français" [Debate: The configuration of the discipline called "French"] Symposium 9. In B. Schneuwly & J.P. Bernié, Colloque de l'AIRDF *Le français: discipline singulière, plurielle ou transversale?* August 26 to August 28 2004. Université de Laval. Québec, Canada. CD ROM.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Boissinot, A. (1994). *Argumenter au lycée* [Argument in high school]. Toulouse: Bertrand-Lacoste.

Brodkey, L. (1989). On the subject of class and gender in the literacy letters. *College English 51*(2), 125-141.

Bronckart, J.P. (1996). Genres de texte, types de discours et operations psycholinguistiques. *Enjeux, 37-38,* 31-48.

Bucheton, D. (1997). *Conduites d'écriture au collège et au lycée professionnelle.* Versailles: CRDP de l'académie de Versailles.

Chanfrault-Duchet, M.F. (2003). Nouveaux programmes de Français au lycée et communautés discursi-ves [New French curricula in high schools and discourse community]. In *Actes du Colloque Cons-truction des Connaissances et langage dans les disciplines d'enseignement,* Université de Bordeaux. CD ROM.

Clifford, J. (1991). The subject in discourse. In J. Schilb (Ed.), *Contending with words* (pp. 38-51)*.* New York: MLA.

Collinot, A. & Mazière, F. (1999). *Le français à l'école: un enjeu historique* [French at school: historic stakes]. Paris: Hatier.

Culler, J. (1997). *Literary theory: A very short introduction.* London: Oxford Press.

Dabène, M. (1995). Quelques étapes dans la construction des modèles In Y. Reuter, J.-L. Chiss, & J. David, *Didactique du français, état d'une discipline* (pp. 11-32) [Didactics of French, the state of the discipline.] Paris: Nathan.

Daunay, B. (2002). *Éloge de la paraphrase* [In praise of paraphrase]. Vincennes: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

---

[13] *I would like to thank B. Daunay for offering these distinctions.*

Delcambre, I. (1997). *L'exemplification dans la dissertation* [The use of example in student essays]. Paris: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

Devitt, A. (2000). Integrating rhetorical and literary theories of genre. *College English. 62,* 696-718.

Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation [Encyclopedic dictionary of education and formation]. (2002). Paris: Nathan.

Dufays, J.L. (2003). Lectures croisées et construction de métasavoirs en sciences et littérature [Crossed readings and construction of metaknowledge in science and literature]. In *Actes du Colloque Construction des Connaissances et langage dans les disciplines d'enseignement,* Université de Bordeaux. CD ROM.

Elbow, P. (1987). Closing my eyes as I speak: an argument for ignoring audience. *College English, 49,* 50-70.

Faigley, L. (1989). Judging writing, judging selves. *College composition and communication, 40,* 395-412.

Garcia-Debanc, C. (1994). Apprendre à justifier par écrit une réponse: analyses linguistiques et perspectives didactiques [Learning to justify an answer in writing: linguistic analyses and didactic perspectives]. *Pratiques, 84,* 5-40.

Harris, J. (1997). *A teaching subject: Composition since 1966.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hayes, J. & Flower, L. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *CCC, 32,* 365-87.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic contexts.* Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Jaubert, M., Rebière, M., & Bernié, J.P. (2003). L'hypothèse 'communauté discursive': d'où vient-elle? Où va-t-elle? [The "discursive community" hypothesis: Where is it from? Where is it heading?]. *Les Cahiers THEODILE, 4,* 51-80.

Kavanaugh, J. (1995). Ideology. In F. Lentricchia, & T. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Critical terms for literary study* (pp. 306-320). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kinneavy, J. (1971). *A theory of discourse.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Nonnon, E. (2002). Formulation de problématiques et mouvements de problématisation dans les texts réflexifs [Formulating problématiques and movements of problematization in reflexive texts]. *Spirale, 29,* 29-74.

Nystrand et al. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? *Written Communication, 10* (3), 267-333.

Ong, W.J. (1982). The writer's audience is always a fiction. *Publications of the Modern Language Association, 90,* 9-22.

Plane, S. (2003). La didactique du francais, temoin et acteur de l'evolution du questionnement sur l'ecriture et son apprentissage [French didactics, witness and agent in the evolution of questioning writing and learning to write]. *Repères, 28,*10.

Pratt, M.L. (1990). The arts of the contact zone. In D. Bartholomae and A. Petrosky (Eds.), *Ways of reading* (pp. 527-543). Boston: Bedford Books.

Reuter, Y., Chiss, J.-L., & David, J. (1995). *Didactique du français, état d'une discipline* [Didactics of French, the state of the discipline]. Paris: Nathan.

Reuter, Y. (2003). La littératie: Perspectives pour la didactique [Literacy: Perspectives for didactics]. *LIDIL, 27,* 11-23.

Reuter, Y. (2004, 27 August). Remarques suivant le débat à deux voix: La configuration de la discipline "français" [Remarks following the debate: The configuration of the discipline we call French]. In B. Schneuwly & J.P. Bernié, Colloque *Le français: discipline singulière, plurielle ou transversal?* Québec, Canada. CD ROM.

Rinck, F. (2004). Les difficultés d'étudiants dans la construction d'une problématique [Students' difficulties in constructing problématiques]. *Pratiques, 121-122,* 93 -110.

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society. *Written Communication, 14,* 504-555.

Russell, D. (2004). Apprentissage de l'écrit à travers les disciplines: Revue de recherches anglophones nord-américaines [Learning writing across the disciplines: Review of Anglophone North American research]. Association Internationale pour la Recherche en Didactique du Français (AIRDF) Conference, Quebec City, Canada.

Samoyault, T. (2004). *L'intertextualité: Mémoire de la littérature* [Intertextuality: Memory of literature]. Paris: Nathan Université.

Simard, C. & Fisher, C. (2004) Présentation des actes. *Actes de Deuxieme Colloque de l'AIRDF: Le Francais- Discipline singulière, plurielle, ou transversale?* August 26-28, Quebec. CD ROM.

Slevin, J. (2001). *Introducing English*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Sontag, S. (2001). *Against interpretation and other essays*. New York: Picador.