

2 A Historical and Theoretical Review of the Literature: Reading and Writing Connections

Allison L. Harl

Literature concerning reading-writing relations centers around a history of debates about what English Studies should be and what the teaching of first year college composition courses should look like. This review works to inform several underlying questions: In what directions have the theory and praxis of reading-writing relations evolved over the past few centuries? What new understandings of reading-writing relations have emerged over the past decade in an era contextualized by information literacy practices and technology in general? As Jackson (2009) has noted,

How scholars have gone about researching the connections between reading and writing is based on whether they view reading and writing as consumption versus production, as constructing meaning from a text and constructing a text to convey meaning, or both as creating a conversation. (p. 154)

While many scholars of reading and writing relationships do not align themselves with one exclusive perspective, these three broad models of inquiry are useful in defining current theoretical approaches to reading and writing practices.

The first model of inquiry, consumption versus production, assumes that reading is a practice exclusively defined by the passive absorption of meaning from a text. On the other hand, writing is a practice specifically defined as a creative process where meaning is actively produced. The consumption versus production model per-

ceives reading and writing connections extrinsically and dualistically through an either/or paradigm. The second model of inquiry assumes that both reading and writing have the potential to produce: either by constructing meaning from a text or by constructing a text to convey meaning. Through this perspective, reading and writing connections are examined in the context of their shared generative characteristics. Finally, the third model of inquiry views reading and writing as both consumption and production. This conversational model emphasizes the inherent reciprocal relationships between the two practices, in which meaning-making is defined through both reflexive and active processes.

Using these three broad models of inquiry, this chapter begins with eighteenth and nineteenth century mimetic approaches to reading and writing. In the era of *belles lettres*, English Studies limited connections between reading and writing to the first model of inquiry: consumption versus production. The second and third models of inquiry are demonstrated in a review of the literature and theory in subsequent sections. In a section titled, "Twentieth Century: Literacy Studies and New Criticism," the writing process and cognitive and expressivist approaches are detailed concerning debates about how reading and writing relate to one another. Next, the literature and theory at the turn of the century examines the social turn in English Studies, exploring new perspectives about reading and writing connections by examining socio-cultural contexts. The final section, devoted to the literature of the twenty-first century, considers how technology and new media in the past decade have created new contexts for examining how reading and writing practices interrelate. The chapter concludes with the prevailing argument that reading and writing need to be reconnected in first year college composition. However, lingering questions remain in the literature and theory of what these connections are exactly and how they should inform the way composition should be taught. Whether reading and writing are defined as based on consumption and/or production will continue to have broad implications for English programs in the twenty-first century.

ENGLISH STUDIES IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES: BELLES LETTRES

Nelson and Calfee's (1998) exhaustive study of the history of English Studies in the United States shows us that when, historically, connec-

tions between reading and writing were made, they centered around mimetic approaches. This history could be traced back centuries to fourth century Greece and the practice of progymnasmata, or oratory exercises developed by Aphthonius. Students read the Great Works and wrote to imitate their forms. In Roman rhetoric, however, reading and writing practices were conflated with the oratory skills of listening and speaking (Jackson, 2009, p. 146).

British and Scottish new rhetoricians Joseph Priestley, Adam Smith, Hugh Blair, and George Campbell, among others, reconceived Classical principles in light of new developments in science and psychology in the eighteenth century enlightenment era. These principles were ultimately referred to as the new belletristic rhetoric, a study of the common ground shared by classical rhetoric and *belles lettres*, emphasizing taste, style, criticism, and forms of discourse, typically studied through works of literature. George (1998) explains that Priestley revolutionized rhetoric with his famous *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism* in 1762. Priestley was hailed as an innovator of a new rhetorical theory of structure that ultimately influenced the form of the Declaration of Independence. Carter (1988) argues that the combination of *belles lettres* and rhetoric, initiated by Smith and popularized later by his student, Blair, has profoundly influenced what is taught in English departments today.

By the mid-nineteenth century, rhetoric had more or less come to mean composition. This re-conception largely affected the ways reading and writing was understood. When Blair published *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783), it served as a guide in composition and language theory, combining, for the first time, classical modes of oration with modern modes of written discourse. This text served as one of the first whole language guides (as it is referred to even today), focusing on making meaning in reading and expressing that meaning in writing. Blair, like his contemporaries, viewed the relationship between reading and writing through the model of consumption versus production. Meaning was found through reading texts, and created by producing them.

Though not as popular at the time, George Campbell's *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* addressed comprehensive principles of eloquence in speech and literary topics. William Riley Parker's (1967) and Ronald F. Reid's (1990) historical studies of English instruction suggest that the influence of Smith and Blair culminated in an emphasis on literary

criticism and literary history in popular English program curricula. Such classical traditions of imitation were valued as “consumption” of valuable knowledge. Generating meaning through composing was not as central to the *belles lettres* tradition. Overall, Smith and Priestley hold a broader view of the relevance of reading—one reduced to the literary by Blair and Campbell.

In addition, belletristic rhetoric provided the roots of current-traditional rhetoric, defined by an emphasis on imitation through formal correctness and style. The current-traditionalist approach emerged from belletristic rhetoric primarily because it emphasized style in the form of the modes of discourse. Belletristic rhetoric overlooked the role of invention as a generative process that characterized the then new current-traditionalist approach. Smith transformed a focus on the matter of a topic to its arrangement:

Thus, we see in [Smith’s] lectures evidence of a shift from a rhetorical concept of arrangement as *dispositio* to a belletristic concept of arrangement as mode of organization, a shift which later turned into the methods of exposition found in many contemporary composition textbooks and handbooks, including definition, classification and division, contrast, comparison, and cause and effect, which are still taught as a means of structuring whole texts. (Carter, 1988, p. 10)

The current-traditionalist approach emerged in the late nineteenth century and remained popular through the 1960s.

Many scholars blame this approach for limiting composition studies to a reading-and-writing-to-imitate model focused on rhetorical patterns. This mimetic approach views reading and writing connections through the first model of inquiry—through the lens of consumption versus production. With such a reading-to-imitate model, reading connects to writing only in terms of a passive imitative process that emphasizes consumption. Reading does not function as a generative process linked to the invention of writing. Much attention has been given to the debate over the use of the “reading-to-imitate-development” function in the classroom. Prose (2006) argues that “not only does reducing writing into prose structures oversimplify the complexity of writing, as writers often employ multiple genres in their writing, but it assumes transfer between reading and writing will occur by ‘osmosis’” (p. 3).

However, Christianson (2003) argues that teachers have largely misunderstood the uses of imitation in classical declamation. Imitation, she argues, is a highly effective form of instruction, providing models and precepts for beginning readers and writers. She says:

Leaving students to describe their own analytical processes without introducing them to already known features of text and context asks them to continually rediscover the wheel, a slow and chancy endeavor, when by showing them the wheel, we can then enable them to invent the turbine. (p. 81)

In this view, reading-to-imitate, while initially ignoring more generative connections between reading and writing, eventually leads to stronger interplay between reading and writing practices.

How have these eighteenth and nineteenth century traditions continued to impact reading and writing relationships in modern and contemporary English Studies programs? As Janna M. Jackson (2009) explains, despite the early university's focus on oratory skills—or perhaps because of this emphasis—eighteenth and nineteenth century rhetorics held some promise in connecting reading and writing in that it studied the “relation between producing and understanding texts” (as cited in Nelson & Calfee, 1998, p. 5) However, over the course of the eighteenth century, a divorce between reading and writing occurred that has been central to pedagogical tensions ever since. In 1884, Thomas Hunt advocated for the inclusion of literary studies at the college level, with the caveat that “the writing one does about literary studies is different from literature”; thus, “the segregation between literature and writing . . . [was] born” (as cited in Yood, 2003, p. 527). As speech-making fell out of practice, and a focus on writing instruction took its place, literature and writing were divorced. Any relationships between reading and writing continued to be seen as an extrinsic connection, reflecting a consumption (reading) versus production (writing) model of inquiry.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Literacy Studies and New Criticism. Nelson and Calfee (1998) explain that by the close of the nineteenth century, and as rhetoric shifted from a focus on oral expression to an emphasis on written expression,

according to Scholes (1998), rhetoric transformed into literacy studies in English departments:

With reading, writing, and speaking orations no longer the center of study when, at the end of the century, rhetoric met its demise as a formal course of study, the reading of literature and writing of criticism that Hunt advocated took its place, resulting in “transform[ing] the students from producers of work comparable to what they studied into passive consumers of texts they could never hope to emulate. (as cited in Jackson, 2009, p. 147)

New Criticism became the dominant literary approach, replacing earlier mimetic ideas about the relationship between reader and text. Nelson and Calfee (1998) explain: “New Criticism did bring together reading and writing at the college level, as professors used writing as a means to assess the readers’ ability to derive the meaning of a literary work” (as cited in Jackson, 2009, p. 172). New Critics adopted the close reading practices that emerged from religious studies of sacred texts during the late eighteenth century. In the close reading practices of the New Critics, careful, sustained interpretation of a brief passage of text emphasized the particular over the general. The relationship between reading and writing was studied as a process of consumption. Readers paid close attention to individual words, syntax, and the order in which ideas unfolded as they were read. The role and intention of the writer was highly under-played, as the reading process was brought to the foreground. What ties remained between composition (writing) and literature (reading) further dissolved as progressives attacked New Criticism, arguing that students should value their own interpretations above those of experts.

The Writing Process

In the 1960s, as scholars began focusing once again on rhetoric, a new approach centering on the writing process emerged. Through writing process approaches, researchers focused on how writers draft, revise, and edit texts. Irwin and Doyle (1992) comment on the shift in research conducted by educators to that conducted by psychologists, as the cognitive approach became the popular mode of inquiry in the early 1970s and into the 1990s.

Scholars such as Janet Emig (1971), Maxine Hairston (1982), Linda Flower, and John Hayes (1981/2003) investigated the recursive process of reading and writing, suggesting that these practices are largely non-linear. Flower (1990) argues that “the process of reading-to-write guides the way readers interact with a text, forcing them to ‘manipulate . . . and transform’ the information for their own needs” (p. 6). Just as thinking and writing processes involve jumping around with stops and starts, so does the reading process (Jackson, 2009, p. 149).

Tierney and Leys (1986) acknowledge research that addresses the theoretical links between reading and writing processes, particularly how reading influences revision, how readers use writing during studying, and how writers use reading in preparing a critical essay. They question the benefits of learning outcomes that arise from connecting reading and writing in the classroom.

The authors cite a strategy study by Spivey (1983), in which college students read three articles on the same topic and then wrote an essay: “She found that the essays written by the more able comprehenders were better organized, more connected, and of higher content quality than those written by the less able comprehender” (p. 18). However, Tierney and Leys (1986) declare that do not suggest that reading and writing are largely linear operations that follow from one to the other: “On the contrary, we hold that writers use reading in a more integrated fashion. For as writers write, they are constantly involved in reading their own writing, reading other material, and using understandings they have acquired from past readings” (p. 19).

Considering studies that observe elementary grade school students, Tierney and Leys (1986) explore whether gains in overall reading performance contribute to gains in overall writing performance, and vice versa. They also ask how reading and writing influence one another. Their study revealed that while some students maintain a high or a low value for both reading and writing, others vary in their performances in reading and writing. They suggest that before we conclude that there is a weak relationship of reading and writing for some students, we should consider a more detailed examination of when and how reading and writing interact. They find that reading does influence writing, as students use their reading as a rich resource for considering possible topics, ideas, and stylistic options. In addition, readers also learned about the author’s craft and developed vocabulary. Tierney and Leys conclude their study with four findings:

1. Depending upon the measures employed to assess overall reading and writing achievement and attitude, the general correlation between reading and writing is moderate and fluctuates with age, schooling, and other factors.
2. Selected reading experiences definitely contribute to writing performance; likewise, selected writing experiences contribute to reading performance.
3. Writers acquire certain values and behaviors from reading, and vice versa.
4. Successful writers integrate reading into their writing experience, and successful readers integrate writing into their reading experience. (p. 23)

These studies found that reading and writing work together in myriad ways as tools for information storage and retrieval, discovery and logical thought, communication, and self-indulgence.

In another study published the same year, Birnbaum (1986) concludes that reflective thinking is central to proficiency in written language, and explains why so many researchers find that subjects tend to be at comparable levels in reading and writing. She proposes to understand the components of the reflective thinking process, how it manifests in observed reading and writing behaviors, and most importantly, how we can foster its growth. In her study of college-level basic and experienced readers and writers, she found that the more reflection, the better the reader and writer. In addition, the more reflective students often demonstrated a deeper level of planning for different rhetorical purposes and audiences. Birnbaum suggests that instructors rejoin the teaching of reading and writing, viewing one as the mechanism for developing the other. In addition, she argues, educators need to emphasize higher-level reasoning and predicting strategies over recall strategies.

Finally, in their study on how pre-writing affects writing performance, Rohman and Wlecke (1964) argue the importance of the discovery process in pre-writing techniques, such as journal writing, brainstorming, and freewriting. They conclude that thinking is a separate function than writing, that thinking processes precede writing processes. Therefore, to improve writing, instructors should encourage stronger thinking skills in early pre-writing stages. In addition, they argue that writers may learn to form concepts as young readers;

however, they can and should be instructed to focus instead on “concept transference” that includes a preliminary stage of thinking before writing begins. Emig (1971) questioned Rohman and Wlecke’s linear approach, suggesting instead that thinking, reading, and writing occurs more naturally in a recursive process.

Cognitive Approach

Psychologist L.S. Vygotsky (1934/1978, 1962/1986) conducted early studies on thought and language that were of primary interest to literacy scholars who explored the connections between reading and writing in the latter part of the century. His theories proposed that thought and language are highly interrelated, and that once learned, language transforms thought. His theory of cultural mediation suggests that a child’s knowledge is defined by, and limited to, his or her inherited cultural language practices. In his book, *Thought and Language*, Vygotsky establishes a clear connection between speech, mental concepts, and cognitive awareness. These studies provided the foundation for twentieth-century scholars interested in language in the form of literacy acquisition and practices. They asked the questions: How does language function in the mental acts of reading and writing? What, if any, are the connections between reading and writing? This model of inquiry shifted from a consumption versus production method to a more conversational approach.

While Vygotsky understood cognition as arising within social interaction using cultural tools, those who studied cognitive information processing tended to look at closed box computer models, attempting to model fixed processing programs. The cognitive-development approach shifts the emphasis from the *what* of composing (the product) to the *how* of composing (the process). Jackson (2009) explains that

scholars operating from the cognitive information processing arena use the metaphor of the computer as their lens for analyzing reading and writing. As such, they see reading and writing as processes composed of subprocesses, or to use computer lingo, routines and subroutines (p. 155)

Subprocesses include activities such as planning, comprehension, and metacognition (p. 155). McCarthy and Raphael (1992) explain

three underlying assumptions of what they call “cognitive information processing theories”:

- (1) reading and writing consist of a number of subprocesses used to perform specialized tasks, (2) readers and writers have limited capacity for attention so that trade-offs occur across the subprocesses, and (3) competence in reading and writing is determined by the degree of attention needed to operate subprocesses; thus, the less memory needed, the more efficient the operation. (p. 4)

Popular cognitive studies connecting reading and writing began with correlational studies originating in the 1960s. The cognitive approach became well-known through theorists such as Flower and Hayes (1981), who applied think-aloud protocols to study the thinking patterns of writers. They argued that composition studies should be more focused on the creative process of the writer. In relation to this creative process of the writer is the notion of audience awareness. Rubin (1984) argues that under all circumstances, writers are “actively engaged in constructing representations of their readers” (p. 238). Analyzing the transcripts of four proficient and four less-proficient writers as they composed aloud, Flower and Hayes concluded that proficient writers generated new ideas in response to the rhetorical problem of communicating with others, while less proficient writers focused on just ideas. Considering audience awareness, Tierney and Shanahan (1991) conclude that

undoubtedly, readers read with a view to authorship, no matter what their own role as authors. Likewise, writers write with a view to readership in which they are their own audience, at least initially. In other words, successful writers not only consider the transactions their readers are likely to be engaged in, but they are also their own readers. (p. 265)

Similarly, Barritt and Kroll (1978) asked the question, “What guides the decisions writers make as they write?” (p. 365). The relationships between the kinds of thinking processes occurring during the act of composing were compared to those in the act of reading as well. Glenn (2007) cites an early study by Tierney, Soter, O’Flahavan, and McGinley (1984), concluding that “when taught together, reading and writing engage students in a greater use and variety of cognitive

strategies than when taught separately” (p. 10). Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000) report that many subsequent studies (Aydelott, 1998; Birnbaum, 1986; Kennedy, 1985; Spivey & King, 1989) also revealed correlations between reading and writing scores at the college level. Overall, most studies found that strong writers are also strong readers, and poor readers are also poor writers. However, some meta-analyses of these correlational studies are criticized for, among other concerns, using inconsistent types of measures to test reading and writing, having small sample groups, and not considering outside variables (Stotsky, 1983).

Tierney and Shanahan’s (1991) comprehensive review of research on the reading-writing relationship is organized by three main questions: What do reading and writing share? How do readers and writers transact with one another? And what do readers and writers learn when reading and writing are connected? Tierney and Shanahan examine the degree to which reading and writing share “overlapping linguistic, cognitive, or social resources” (p. 247). They cite performance-based correlational studies that examine writing for specific reading outcomes (such as comprehension of a series of passages) as “external manifestations of literacy knowledge or process” (p. 247). They refer to Loban (1963, 1964), who completed one of the most notable studies to date of the reading-writing relationship in an extensive longitudinal study of the reading and writing abilities of 220 students progressing through twelve grade levels. Loban argues that the reading-writing relationship was “so striking to be beyond question” (p. 212). Specifically, the research suggested that superior writers read above their reading age, while writers performing at an illiterate level read below their reading age (p. 208).

Shanahan (1984) and Shanahan and Lomax (1986, 1988) conducted correlational studies following Loban, attempting to be more detailed with examining the *types* of knowledge associated with reading-writing relations. They looked more closely at variances of proficiency based on grade level. The researchers studied 256 second and fifth graders, measuring lexical, phonemic, syntactic, and organizational-structural information. The study found that correlations between reading and writing measures accounted for 43% of the differences in these literacy skills.

Unlike performance-based correlational studies, process-based correlational studies do not typically examine reading or writing based on

the *products* of reading and writing assessments. Instead, process-based studies consider the parallels of the cognitive *processes* underlying reading and writing. These studies typically use think-aloud protocols, interviews, and observations to gather data. Tierney and Shanahan (1991) reviewed several process-based studies in the mid-1980s. For example, Wittrock (1984) found that reading and writing are generative cognitive processes in which readers and writers “create meanings by building relations between the text and what they know, believe, and experience” (p. 77). Similarly, Squire (1984) argues “both comprehending and composing are basic reflections of the same cognitive processes” (p. 24). Likewise, in a proposed composing model of reading, Tierney and Pearson (1983) suggest reading and writing are acts of composing that share similar underlying processes: goal setting, knowledge mobilization, projection perspective-taking, refinement, review, self-correction, and self-assessment. Taking a somewhat different approach, Kucer (1985) developed a model of “text world” production, a conception emanating from his suggestion that readers and writers participate in various strategies of “generating and integrating propositions through which the internal structure of meaning known as the text world is built” (p. 331).

Theorists advocating process-based correlational studies generally define reading and writing in terms of cognitive processes such as gathering ideas, questioning, and hypothesizing. In relation to these studies, Tierney and Shanahan (1991) observe

Where reading and writing appear to differ is in the extent to which these strategies are enlisted by students, or by what features of the reading or writing act lead them to instantiate a particular strategy. It should be noted that different students enlist different strategies in accordance with the idiosyncratic approach and overall abilities as readers or writers. (pp. 252–53)

Finally, experimental, or instructional, studies investigate whether information and/or processes are shared across reading and writing. Generally, this research is founded on writing instruction and then examines potential reading outcomes, or vice versa. In one such study, Raphael, Kirschner, and Englert (1988) compared the processes of fifteen students who made substantial improvements in understanding and writing expository text to fifteen students who made little improvement, if any. Specifically, Raphael et al. explored the degree of

success associated with attempts to use writing as a means of enhancing students' understanding of the strategies used by authors of expository texts. The scholars concluded that students who made little or no improvement demonstrated that they were unable to relate new elements to an overall goal or framework in reading or writing. However, those who did show improvement did so because they were able to tie ideas together. Tierney and Shanahan (1991) suggested that there was a need at the turn of the century for more experimental studies like those of Raphael et al.: "Studies have shown that instruction can have joint benefits for reading and writing achievement, but studies have generally lacked the detailed description necessary to allow such findings to be applied to instructional practice" (p. 258).

In the past decade, cognitive approaches continue to inform research on reading and writing connections. Valeri-Gold and Deming (2000) explain that higher-order thinking processes are characteristic of strong college readers and writers who integrate reasoning, recognizing patterns of organization, and synthesizing the author's ideas. While some scholars found that proficient readers and writers use the same cognitive skills for both reading and writing, other recent psychological studies suggest limits to the brain's ability to juggle too much information at once. One such study, conducted by James and Gauthier (2009), investigated the effect of writing on the concurrent visual perception of letters. Among other findings, their research suggests a strong connection between the perception of letters and the neural substrates engaged during writing. While connections between reading and writing may exist in a variety of ways, the brain does not necessarily wholly process the functions of reading and writing in similarly.

Psycholinguist Frank Smith (2004) is an essential contributor to reading theory and to research on the nature of the reading process, particularly in developing the whole language movement. Whole language takes a constructivist approach to knowledge, focusing on knowledge creation. As such, this approach reflects the second model of inquiry, viewing both reading and writing as generative processes of production—making meaning in reading and expressing meaning in writing. Together, Smith and Kenneth S. Goodman developed the single reading process that comprises an interaction between reader, text, and language. On the other hand, French neuroscientist Dehaene (2009) studied how the brain developed, biologically, the surprising

and unlikely ability to read. Based on his findings, he criticizes the Piagetian whole language approach to teaching reading, arguing that the brain is constructed to better comprehend how pairs or groups of letters correspond to speech sounds. Dehaene cites research suggesting that teaching methods incorporating multiple senses and motor gestures, such as tracing the outline of letters, helps students learn to read. Cognitive psychologists interested in brain function have found evidence suggesting exactly how reading and writing are connected. They continue to question whether these connections are correlational or causal.

What have cognitive theorists told us about the processes of reading and writing? Should we conclude that reading and writing development go hand in hand? Are the foundational abilities of reading and writing governed by the same underlying processes? Petrosky (1982) believes that a further examination of these processes will help us become more informed about human understanding:

One of the most interesting results of connecting reading, literacy, and composition theory and pedagogy is that they yield similar explanations of human understanding as a process rooted in the individual's knowledge and feelings and characterized by the fundamental act of making meaning, whether it be through reading, responding, or writing. When we read, we comprehend by putting together impressions of the text with our personal, cultural, and contextual models of reality. When we write, we compose by making meaning from available information, our personal knowledge, and the cultural and contextual frames we happen to find ourselves in. Our theoretical understandings of these processes are convergent . . . around the central role of human understanding—be it of texts or the world—as a process of composing. (p. 34)

Petrosky's view of reading and writing connections suggests a conversational model where we construct meaning from a text while we construct a text to convey meaning.

Expressivist Approaches

Within expressivist approaches in composition studies, reading and writing connect by allowing students to take ownership of their ideas

through self-expression. Instead of working to locate pre-existing meaning in prescribed texts written by others, readers actively participate in creating meaning, either in the language communities through which they define themselves (as progressivists argued), or by tapping into their own creative imaginations (as expressivists argued). Adler-Kassner (1998) explains that early progressive compositionists such as Fred Newton Scott, along with his students and colleagues like Gertrude Buck and Joseph Villiers Denney, “created the foundation for much contemporary composition pedagogy as they worked to move the field away from essays focused on literary texts and the repetition of elite knowledge” (p. 209). Later, notable scholars like Donald Murray, Peter Elbow, Donald Stewart, and others developed their own expressivist pedagogies from the 1960s to today: “Where progressivists like Scott argued that composition would bring students into the values of participatory democracy, expressivists implied that writing would help students unearth their genuine selves” (Adler-Kassner p. 218).

Also referred to as Piagetian/naturalist approaches, expressivist approaches primarily consider learners’ innate cognitive structures. Unlike cognitive approaches, these theories emphasize the natural development of reading and writing through a whole language approach. Though Piaget’s theory integrates cognitive approaches, it is, in theory and in practice, defined primarily as expressivist. Researchers taking this approach believe that learning to read and write is not a mastering of sub-skills, but an organic process of self-expression originating from oral language.

Reflexive writing is motivated by the writer’s needs or desires, as opposed to a more school-based, teacher-controlled model (Emig, 1971). Because the Piagetian approach stresses the importance of self in finding meaning when reading and writing, students are free to imagine alternatives to their own and others’ cultural hierarchies and status quo (Emig, 1983).

Adler-Kassner (1998) cites an expressivist description of the complex interaction of reading and writing:

In “The Interior View,” Murray described the process of making the transition from writer to reader as one where a writer ceases communicating with him- or herself and begins communicating with readers. This process was effective, he said, only if the writer owned the experience at the center of the

writing, “if the words on the writer’s page reveal the writer’s meaning to himself through language.” If this ownership of voice and representation was achieved, the product would “reveal what he has discovered to others . . . He doesn’t want the reader to read language, he wants the reader to pass through the writer’s own experience of discovery.” (as cited in Adler-Kassner, 1998, p. 223)

The reader-response critical approach emerges from an expressivist approach, treating the reader as creator. The primary focus falls on the reader and the process of reading rather than on the author or the text.

Kathleen McCormick (1994) classifies reader-response theorists as promoting an “expressive” model of reading, a model wherein reading is perceived “primarily as an activity in which readers create their own ‘personal’ or ‘subjective’ meanings from the texts they read” (p. 30). According to Elbow (1968), the roles of both the writer and reader are defined through an expressive process of ownership. Writing is connected to reading because the writer has to imagine the role of reader in the act of composing: “The student’s best language skills are brought out and developed when writing is considered as words on paper designed to produce a specific effect in a specific reader” (p. 119). That “effect,” he said, should be to have the reader share the writer’s “quality of experience.” When reading good writing, he argued, “meanings jump immediately and automatically into the reader’s head.” The reader should “[feel] the writer in the words . . . [and believe] that the writer believes it” (pp. 119–22).

One popular instructional tool deriving from the reader-response approach in first year composition is the writing workshop model where peer readers respond to peer writers. Favored within expressivist approaches, this model also embraces the important connections between reading and writing because both acts are perceived as knowledge-making. Although reader-response theory and the writing workshop model both concern themselves with reading and writing interactions, each emphasizes one over the other. Jackson (2009) notes “Based on Rosenblatt’s 1938 idea of meaning occurring as a transaction between the reader and text, the reader-response method expanded on the cognitive perspective by bringing attention to what the reader brings to a text” (p. 149).

The writer, then, becomes much more decentralized in reader-response theories. On the other hand, while the workshop model

acknowledges the role of the reader and of audience awareness in a collaborative writing process, the approach still emphasizes the role of the writer over the reader in a community context.

According to Tompkins (1980), reader-response theories provide “a way of conceiving texts and readers that reorganizes the distinctions between them” so that, basically, “[r]eading and writing join hands, change places, and finally become distinguishable only as two names for the same activity” (p. x). Nelson and Calfee (1998) suggest the reader-response approach resulted in more expressive forms of writing, such as journaling and response papers, instead of the more analytical critiques of texts. According to Harkin (2005) and Nelson and Calfee (1998), at the primary and secondary education levels, reader-response “still holds sway,” but at the college level, it has been replaced by “newer models of critical theory such as feminism, queer theory, and cultural studies, which use identity as a lens for analysis” (as cited in Jackson, 2009, p. 149).

As the twentieth century came to a close, disagreements about the connections of reading and writing continued to hold sway. At the 1991 CCCC, Peter Elbow and David Bartholomae engaged in a famous public debate about the authority of the writer and the role of literature in writing courses. They presented alternate perspectives of first year composition goals in speeches that were later published in *College Composition and Communication* in 1995. The debate centered on personal versus academic writing, reflecting the historical clash between expressivism and constructivism. The former approach situates writing as a product of the mind, while the latter situates writing as an external discourse. Each reflects different conceptions about the ways in which reading and writing are connected.

Elbow (2000) privileges writing-to-read methods in which the text produced through the generative act of composing is then used as the central classroom text to be read. He argues that student writers should produce the texts they work with and that they should not rely on reading textbooks written by others as they learn to write. In short, Elbow challenges the assumption that the role of writing is to serve reading. He argues that the act of writing inherently requires greater levels of action and agency than reading. Adopting the first model of inquiry of consumption versus production, he contends that writing and studying literature are indeed two separate “territories.” Interested in questioning the authority of literary writers, he insists on putting

imaginative student writing first, before reading. He justifies this approach by claiming it is important to “dispel the myth that texts are magically produced” (p. 363).

In their groundbreaking textbook, *Ways of Reading*, David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky (2005) ask students to engage as “strong readers” by assimilating themselves into the conversation of texts. According to Jolliffe (2007), the authors send a clear message about what they believe is the definition and function of reading:

Reading is an active, constructive process that calls for the reader to juggle nimbly the following tasks: accepting a text’s emergent meaning, resisting any pat formulation of the central idea, and assimilating the text’s ideas in one’s own view of the world. (pp. 474–75)

Gleason (2001) reduces the Elbow- Bartholomae debate to one central question: “Should first year college writing courses immerse students in academic writing, or should these courses encourage students to become writers?” (p. 1).

In support of academic writing as the goal, Bartholomae (1995) contends that students are embedded in a “linguistic present” that they should know about and work within as writers. Bartholomae argues for classes that entail critical reading, writing, and “struggling with the problems of quotation, citation, and paraphrase” (p. 66). Taking issue with this initial emphasis on academic reading and writing, Elbow argues that becoming an academic is different from becoming a writer; i.e., many “academics” are not confident or effective writers, and many “writers” are not academics at all. Elbow (1995) explains, “I see specific conflicts in how to design and teach my first year writing course. And since I feel forced to choose—I choose the goal of writer over that of academic” (p. 73).

Bartholomae and other critics of the expressivist approach often point to the lack of attention to the influences of both cultural contexts and the role of the instructor on reading and writing practices. Those embracing a social-cultural approach, for instance, believe reading and writing connections can be explored best by considering social contexts. As readers write and writers read, scholars embracing this approach examine the social interactions of these language practices. In sum, as Bartholomae and Petrosky (1996) contend, “you make your mark on a book and it makes its mark on you” (p. 1).

Expressivist approaches to reading and writing connections eventually gave way to a socio-constructivist approach, embraced by scholars such as Bartholomae. Concerns of how the reader and the writer are situated in influential social and cultural language contexts now dominated discussions about the connections between reading and writing.

THE TURN OF THE CENTURY: THE SOCIAL TURN

At the turn of the century, researchers continued their interest in writing and reading as distinct but interdependent acts, while an interest in literacy grew. New definitions of literacy emphasized socio-cultural and political approaches. Multiliteracy practices, critical pedagogy, and the discourse community movements have challenged many educators to re-examine, among other practices, the role of reading instruction in the writing classroom. Innovative definitions of the term “literacy” emerged in the 1990s, providing new dimensions for thinking about reading and writing connections. Literacy no longer simply meant the ability to read and write; a much broader cultural definitions of the term brought new political concerns to college English. In 1994, the New London Group, a group of ten scholars in the field of literacy studies, coined the term “multiliteracies” to capture both the expanding nature of literacy studies and the dynamic nature of language as it is shaped by culture (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

James Paul Gee (2010) explains that new literacy studies is different from the cognitive approach taken by psychologists, who typically examine reading and writing relationships exclusively in the realm of mental processes. Gee argues that literacy is instead an external process, not done inside people’s heads but in society, that literacy is about “ways of participating in social and cultural groups” (p. 166). This distinction calls for the need to understand relationships between writing and reading in all their contexts: “not just cognitive, but also social, cultural, historical, and institutional” (p. 166).

Practices of critical literacy, also referred to as resistant readings or reading against texts, grew out of Marxist ideologies and the social justice pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1968/2007). Reading and writing connections made within a framework of Freirean critical literacy examine the ways in which literacy can be used to balance social inequities and address societal problems caused by abuse of power: “Critical literacy

views readers as active participants in the reading process; it invites them to move beyond passively reading texts to question, examine and evaluate the relations between readers and authors. It promotes reflection, transformation and action” (Freire, 1970, p. 36). Freire advocated for agency in adult education programs in Brazil, teaching reading and writing as interdependent skills focusing on the examination, analysis, and deconstruction of texts (Hagood, 2002). Resistant readings like Freire’s foreground issues of power, asking readers to consider the connections between self and text. This approach questions whose text and whose agency are being considered, along with what assumptions are being made about the reader’s knowledge and experiences.

Falk-Ross (2001) examined reading and writing connections in a critical literacy study focused on improving critical reading at the college level. She followed four first-generation college students in a course entitled “College Reading,” where they were taught reading comprehension through a reading-writing-research connection model that included independent and shared reading events. The data sources for this study included field notes of class activities, participant observations, taped discussions, and student journal entries. Falk-Ross says the findings of the study suggested that students struggled with writing about their reading, but she concludes that reading-writing connections did, in effect, produce better writing.

In addition to difficulties with reading comprehension, several students in the class had problems with writing organization, quality, and quantity. As a result, they were still having trouble writing their thoughts about how they approached reading assignments as the semester ended. (p. 284)

However, she does “notice progress in their thinking about reading and in their critical stances” (p. 284).

Another direction of new literacy, the discourse community movement, turned the conversation of reading and writing transactions to the topic of public forums and to how language is used by certain groups—defined by geography, socioeconomics, professions, age, race, or any other number of social factors. Bizzell (1992) suggests that “discourse community” definitions need to be further expanded by “acknowledging that discourse community membership implicates people in *interpretative* activities” (p. 222). For Bizzell, relationships between reading and writing need to be examined in the context of the

cultural politics of literacy. Bizzell refers to linguist John Swales, who believes discourse communities should accomplish work as a “public goal” in the social world to which they belong. To do so, members of a discourse community must establish a discursive “forum” available to all participants: “Oral, visual, and/or print media may be involved,” and “the group must use its forum to work toward its goal by “providing information and feedback (as cited in Bizzell, 1992, p. 225). For Bizzell, since discourse communities “implicate people in interpretative activities,” the relationship between reading and writing foregrounds as an awareness of how a text is read within a community, and how a writer then responds to that reading within a community. Swales (1987) explains: “The discourse community has developed and continues to develop discursal expectations. These may involve appropriacy of topics, the form, function and positioning of discursal elements, and the role texts play in the operation of the discourse community” (p. 5).

Brandt (1986) and Gee (1999) were among many scholars who turned their attention specifically toward the socio-cultural and political contexts of reading and writing practices. Their inquiries questioned earlier assumptions about reading and writing connections that failed to consider historical and cultural contexts.

Brandt (2001) examines “sponsors of literacy,” defined as “any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstracts, who enable, support, teach, and model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way” (p. 19). Brandt (1986) suggests that “discourse communities enact the internal conversations” that take place “between the reader and the author and blur the distinctions between the writer as participant and the reader as spectator” (p. 2). Reading and writing connections, in Brandt’s view of literacy, should be considered insofar as how they work as a “valuable—and volatile property” (p. 2) that can potentially help individuals gain “power or pleasure, [accrue] information, civil rights, education, spirituality, status, [and] money” (p. 7). Kathleen McCormick (2003) agrees that composition courses should teach reading practices that help students challenge dominant ideological discourses: “We need to think critically about some of the ways in which our students have been situated as reading subjects within our culture—well before we meet them in college” (p. 28).

Not to be confused with expressivist versions of reader-response discussed earlier, social constructivist versions of reader response consider an individual's social experience to inform his or her understanding of a text. For instance, Stanley Fish (1980) analyzed what he called "interpretive communities," examining how the interpretation of a text is determined by each reader's distinctive subjective experience within one or more communities defined by their own, unique epistemologies. While many social constructivists like Fish take a basic reader-response approach, examining what readers and writers bring to a text from the lens of their individual cultural backgrounds, Cope and Kalantzis (2000) examine the flip-side, exploring how reading and writing particular texts influences and shapes students. Popular in the 1970s and 1980s, reception theory subscribes to the tenets of reader-response theory. Reception theorists believe meaning in a text occurs when a group of readers who have a shared cultural background interpret the text in a similar way. The assumption is that the less shared heritage a reader has with the author, the less he or she will recognize the author's intended meaning. Moreover, if two readers have widely divergent cultural and personal experiences, their reading of a text varies to a large degree.

Reception theory investigates how reading and writing texts influences what Harkin (2005) calls "specific classes of readers" (p. 411). Specifically, Gee (2003) argues that reading and writing are often perceived simply as "mental achievements" going on in people's minds, but literary practices are social and cultural practices, and as such, should really be perceived more for their "economic, historical, and political implications" (p. 8). Wallace (2006) addresses the need to examine assumptions of commonality and shared experience and focus instead on the cultural differences between individual's reading and writing practices. Many courses that implement a service learning or community writing partnership component were born from this approach. For instance, Deans (2000) combines reading-to-write and writing-to-read instruction with community action in his service learning approach. Deans discusses how service learning is important not only to first year, upper-division, and technical writing courses, but also to critical pedagogy, writing across the curriculum, ethics, and literacy in general.

On the other hand, scholars such as Himley (2007) make the case that instructors should move beyond the idea that it is their respon-

sibility to “invoke social justice” in the classrooms (p. 452). Critics of the social constructivist approach point out the difficulty of testing the complex relationships among individuals, contexts, and texts. Some claim the role of the learner is overlooked (McCarthy & Raphael, 1992, p. 20). Moreover, Elbow (2002) finds that this approach does not often easily achieve its purported goal of grounding students in cultural contexts:

Teachers in the newer and powerful tradition of cultural studies usually *do* try to help students use texts for making sense of their lives (and often seek texts that students feel as part of their lives already—such as popular music or TV). But even here, I often sense the tradition of distancing. The goal in cultural studies tends to be to help students read with more critical detachment—to separate themselves from felt involvement in these texts. (p. 538)

Elbow argues that good critical readers and writers can make cultural connections, “but most students need help achieving this kind of personal entanglement with texts” (p. 538).

THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: TECHNOLOGY AND NEW MEDIA

Because of the broad recognition that the connection of reading and writing plays an important role in student success, researchers in the twenty-first century have revisited a variety of theoretical approaches, re-examining the role of reading instruction in first year writing classrooms. Helmers (2003) suggests “researchers, teachers, and students should analyze . . . popular attitudes toward reading . . . to find out how they influence attitudes toward reading that appear later in the classroom” (p. 19). Making connections (and disconnections) between reading and writing needs to happen across disciplines and at all levels of education, including first year composition.

Near the turn of the twenty-first century, the technology revolution brought to the table discussions about how computers and other electronic media affect reading, writing, communication, and their interactions. Reading and writing research has focused increasingly on literacy practices that consider electronic contexts, such as the use of computers, the Internet, cell phones, and other popular, hand-held communication devices. A distinct definition of media literacy has

proven to be a moving target, determined largely through multiple theoretical and interdisciplinary approaches. For instance, taking a cognitive approach, scholars explored brain function in relation to reading and writing on computers. Neuroscientists find that the ways our brains process language have profound implications for how we read and write. Expressivist theorists examined how readers and writers are more or less able to articulate ideas in the new electronic arena, and socio-cultural theorists considered how technological contexts affect the construction of cultural identities.

Hawisher, Selfe, Moraski, and Pearson (2004) argue for the importance of situating technology literacies within a defined “cultural ecology,” or specific cultural, material, educational, and familial contexts that influence, and are influenced by, the acquisition, development, and interplay of reading and writing skills. Certainly, contexts have become a central concern as investigations into the connections of reading and writing in the new media age have expanded to include not just texts, but moving images and their multimodal interrelations. Similarly, Dewitt’s (2001) cognitive study suggests that using hypertext on the Web creates more integrated active reading and writing practices, increasing students’ metacognition. Electronic forums provide more agency for readers to write on blog walls or in comment forums. Conversely, writers are constantly being transformed as they read, with multiple “windows” influencing their composing process.

Fleckenstein (2004) defines the interaction of images and words as a “polymorphic literacy,” or “reading and writing that draw on verbal and nonverbal ways of shaping meaning” (p. 613). This kind of literacy emphasizes the concept of place in learning environments. Fleckenstein suggests that instructors help their students attain a more polymorphic literacy by first increasing awareness of place by writing about their environments. Instructors can then invite critique through graphic design, analyzing the constraints of place on speaking, reading, and writing. Finally, she argues, through connecting graphic, verbal, and mental imagery with language, students can better understand visual-kinesthetic maps.

Hill (2003) stresses the importance of bridging the generational gap between instructors fluent in textual literacy versus students steeped in visual literacy. Teachers can bridge this gap, he suggests, through teaching writing in response to reading visual rhetoric. Definitions of

“reading” have often been expanded to include not just printed texts, but also various images on digital screens.

However, Jackson (2009) points out problematic challenges hypertext presents. She says readers must sift through an enormous amount of hypertext documents on the Internet, forcing them “to reconcile contradictions, disconnects, and slippages they run across as they encounter multiple perspectives. Because there is no vetting process on the Internet, readers need to call into question the authority of texts and to examine bias” (pp. 164–65). Jackson questions whether readers really employ these active reading strategies, or if they simply passively accept what they read on the Internet, contradictions and all. Because of the lack of a focused reading strategy on the Web, she suggests students’ writing performances typically also reflect weaker reading performances.

Ensslin (2007) also addresses the concern about how reading-writing relationships will be affected since he believes that students are not prepared for the critical task of sorting through reading material on the Web. He suggests helping readers navigate complex hypertexts, or “intelligent hyperdocuments,” creating more meaningful literacy experiences. In addition, Pugh, Pawan, and Antomarchi (2000) conclude that “Maneuvering hypertext may well define what it means to be literate in the next century” (p. 36). Overall, exactly how reading and writing are connected in hypertextual contexts requires much more exploration.

New media has shifted what was once perceived as classroom distractions to the center of learning. Personal blogs, podcasts, and even text-messages are becoming topics for discussing reading and writing connections in the Information Age. One particular innovation, the study of massively multiplayer online role-playing games (MMORPGs), situates reading and writing processes within specific communities, claiming their own unique socio-cultural discourses. Real-time interactions with author and audience are created, and the act of reading and writing narratives results in a socialized production of texts. In these electronic contexts, the relationships between reading and writing processes become multi-layered and highly interdependent. Ramey (2004) uses the term “mediatext” to define the combination of image and text; however, Jackson (2009) argues Ramey’s definition should also “describe the integration of the written word, pictures, graphics, video, and sound that mark the new literary products” (p. 166). Lewis and Fabos (2005) point out that even words themselves are shifting through their use in text messages and in IMs (instant messages), re-

quiring of readers and writers a new variety of audience awareness and code-shifting.

Kress (2003) recognizes the connection between reading and writing, examining these literacy practices in the new media age. He asks how we might incorporate old and new teaching paradigms to best teach reading and writing in college composition courses. He asks also how we might incorporate new electronic modes of literacy to teach the critical thinking and active, imaginative responses that he, like many others, associates with reading longer, printed texts and with writing essays.

Gee (2003) suggests as well that new directions of literacy practices, such as computer gaming, can be used in the classroom to promote critical learning. Alexander (2009) explains that Gee's study identifies thirty-six different "learning principles" that computer gaming promotes, such as the "text principle," the "intertextual principle," and the "multimodal principle," in which participants learn how to read, understand, and manipulate a variety of texts in a variety of circumstances. According to Alexander,

[Gee] believes that gamers/learners will learn all the more effectively and powerfully as they not only master the skills necessary to game but also experiment with the rules of the games they play, creating new skills and literacies in the process. (p. 39)

As a result, reading and writing in the first year college classroom has the potential for much more participation and agency than its print-bound counterpart.

Hawisher and Selfe (2007) collected life histories of computer gamers, asking participants to reflect on how they believe gaming influenced their literacy skills. The authors raise questions concerning the social dimensions of community building and how definitions of the cultural identities of race, gender, sex, and age are influenced. Hawisher and Selfe (2006) explain that both local and global communities are continually expanding and redefining their literacy practices as computers bring people together from all over the world. They argue that "the relationships among digital technologies, language, literacy, and an array of opportunities are complexly structured and articulated within a constellation of existing social, cultural, economic, historical, and ideological factors that constitute a cultural ecology of literacy" (p.

619). These new, dynamic relationships continue to be investigated by theorists interested in exploring how technologies might help or hinder students as they engage in reading and writing practices.

Theory and research across the disciplines in the past decade call into question the ways we traditionally defined and taught reading and writing. The revolutionary technological contexts in which students practice these skills create many new implications for how to examine the relationships between reading and writing. Current literacy practices suggest that the meaning-making processes in reading and writing can influence each other in more dynamic ways than ever before imagined. Many new questions about computer literacy, including composing with computers in a variety of contexts, and the acquisition of literacy through popular trends such as gaming devices, have challenged educators to re-evaluate their resources and strategies to help students become better readers and writers in ever-shifting electronic environments.

CONCLUSION

While most scholars focus on investigations related to the similarities and connections between reading and writing, some emphasize the importance of examining their differences. Two decades ago, Tierney (1992) announced that he felt cautiously optimistic about future research concerning reading/writing relationships, adding he had “a small word of warning to offer”:

I encourage researchers and practitioners to pull back from their enamoredness with reading/writing connections to consider the drawbacks. Sometimes, writing and reading may stifle rather than empower. We should try to understand how and in what situations reading and writing contribute to didacticism versus dialogue, rigidity rather than flexibility, entrenchment rather than exploration, paraphrasing or plagiarism as opposed to new texts. (p. 258)

Many have answered this call for understanding differences, suggesting other variables that may be at play. Some conclude that certain correlations may have been too narrow or broad in their examinations. Others find that while, indeed, there are distinct similarities between reading and writing, the two are not the same, and should not be treated as such in composition classrooms.

For instance, while Emig (1983) defines both acts of reading and writing as generative, as acts of creation, she also differentiates between the two. The greatest difference, she argues, is “writing is originating,” and reading is not (p. 124). Elbow (2000) makes a similar point that the act of writing inherently requires greater levels of action and agency than reading. Based on a review of several earlier studies, Langer and Flihan (2000) conclude that we cannot assume strong readers are strong writers, nor are advanced writers necessarily good readers.

Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000) find similar disconnections in their research on reading-writing relations, arguing that they vary at different developmental stages. They argue that there are many elements of shared knowledge in reading and writing; however, “as connected as reading and writing are, they are also cognitively quite separate” (p. 42). As part of their investigation, Fitzgerald and Shanahan examined studies of various individuals who suffered a brain injury. Some patients were able to attain or to regain their reading skills only, while others could write, but not read. The fundamental difference between reading and writing, they say, is the ability to choose. Readers have less choice, limited by the writer’s words; whereas, writers have many options—they choose the words they use to compose.

Miller (1997) is concerned that writing courses rely too heavily on cultural studies critiques. She argues that textual interpretation, or “reading,” is *not* “writing” (p. 499). Her concern appears to stem from an assumption that current pedagogies drawn from a cultural studies ignore writing instruction by teaching students to interpret rather than to write.

While some research acknowledges differences between reading and writing, most scholarship, whether taking a cognitive, expressivist, or social constructivist approach, suggests a strong correlation between proficiency levels in reading and writing. In his presidential address at the 1982 MLA conference, Wayne Booth called for the coming together of composition and literature, providing one method for bridging the gap in the discipline by bringing together the divergent skills of reading and writing.

What is the importance of examining what we know and what we don’t know about the connections of reading and writing? Petrosky (1982) argued that “reading, responding, and composing are aspects of understanding, and theories that attempt to account for them outside

of their interactions with each other run the serious risk of building reductive modules of human understanding” (p. 20).

Traditionally, the theory, research, and praxis of reading and writing have been treated separately in higher education in the U.S. As a result, programs and curricula for each have evolved in separate disciplines without much dialogue. This divide continues to occur despite prevailing beliefs among educators that suggest an inherent relationship between reading and writing. Much literature has addressed the subject of reading and writing as psycholinguistic processes of reception and generation. However, due to the bifurcation of these topics, most scholars and educators have, historically, only indirectly addressed the deeper, inherent connections and relationships in their research and curricula. What Tierney and Leys (1986) argued in the 1980s still hold true today:

In the past, what seems to have limited our appreciation of reading-writing relationships has been our perspective. In particular, a sentiment that there exists a general single correlational answer to the question of how reading and writing are related has pervaded much of our thinking. We are convinced that the study of reading-writing connections involves appreciating how reading and writing work together as tools for information storage and retrieval, discovery and logical thought, communication, and self-indulgence. Literacy is at a premium when an individual uses reading and writing in concert for such purposes. Indeed, having to justify the integration of reading and writing is tantamount to having to validate the nature and role of literacy in society. (pp. 23–24)

Whether scholars view reading and writing connections as consumption, production, or a conversational model that includes both, it is important for researchers to continue closely examining reading and writing relationships. One important implication of the recent literature and theory suggests that we are all—as college administrators, textbook authors, librarians, and faculty—responsible for creating collaborative programs and curricula designed for teaching reading and writing skills to our students, regardless of discipline. As reading and writing connections are further explored by us all, our students will have better opportunities to become more effective critical thinkers in a variety of contexts and environments.