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INTRODUCTION
• What is scholarly writing?
• What was your path to becoming a scholarly writer?

WHAT ARE BARRIERS TO SCHOLARLY WRITING?
• Texting/electronic language 😶

RATIONALE FOR TEACHING SCHOLARLY WRITING
• Ability to write effectively critical element of doctoral study
• Gap between scholarly writing expectations and students’ scholarly writing performance

DECIDING WHAT STUDENTS NEED
• What gaps need to be addressed?
• When should the student’s writing ability be assessed?
• Is there a disconnect between the student’s self-perception of writing ability and the faculty member’s assessment?
• Are faculty consistent with expectations/evaluation of student writing?

SCAFFOLDING
• Scaffolded instruction is the “systematic sequencing of prompted content, materials, tasks and teacher and peer support to optimize learning”

SCAFFOLDING AS A WAY OF TEACHING

- Teacher provides support
  - Modeling
  - Prompts
  - Direct explanations
  - Targeted questions
- As student mastery is acquired, targeted objectives and direct supports reduced
- Learning becomes student-guided

(O’Malley & Valdez-Pierce, 1996, p.240)

ELEMENTS OF SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION

- Pre-engagement
- Establishing shared goal
- Actively diagnosing the understanding and needs of the learners
- Providing tailored assistance
- Maintaining pursuit of the goal
- Giving feedback
- Controlling for frustration and risk
- Assisting internalization
- Independence
- Generalization to other contexts

Hogan & Pressley, 1997

RHETORICAL MOVES

3 RHETORICAL MOVES

- “They say” – the received view
  - What others are saying about the issue
- Destabilization – identification of a problem
- “I Say” – restabilization
  - Disagreeing
    - “I disagree, because___.”
  - Agreeing
    - “I agree, because___.”
  - Combination of both
    - “I agree___, but I cannot agree that___.”

SETTING UP AN ARGUMENT IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING

- Presenting prevailing theories/hypotheses
  - “They say”
- The Problem
  - Explaining methodologies
    - Quality of data depends on how collected
  - Summarizing data/findings
- Developing own arguments
  - “I say”

THINK, PAIR, SHARE
Tooth brushing is a common activity for health promotion and disease prevention that is performed daily by most people. Therefore, it would seem logical that patients who are critically ill and cannot brush their own teeth would have this intervention performed by the nurse who is caring for them. However, strong evidence supporting the benefit of tooth brushing in intubated, critically ill patients is lacking. Conversely, tooth brushing may allow bacteria to enter the bloodstream because of potential breakdown of mucosal and gingival tissue, especially in patients with poor dental health. In addition, in a recent review of the association between oral care and bloodstream infections in patients receiving mechanical ventilation, researchers concluded that additional research is needed in order to explore this association.

PULLING IT ALL TOGETHER: ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

- Analysis
- Summary
- Synthesis

ORGANIZING YOUR SOURCES: LIT REVIEW SOURCE GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Sources</th>
<th>Major Scholars/Studies</th>
<th>Support main arguments</th>
<th>Counterarguments against arguments</th>
<th>Your Thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical &amp; Technical Issues</td>
<td>Carrel-vascular anastomosis, General anesthesia</td>
<td>Need to sew blood vessels together, Pts need to be unconscious</td>
<td>No evidence existed, Tx not possible</td>
<td>Technical and anesthesia issues resolved to make organ transplant possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Issues</td>
<td>Brain death criteria, Living donor, Organ preservation</td>
<td>Only death criteria, cardiac death, Poor organ survival</td>
<td>Unethical to take organs from dead people, Cardiac death vs. brain death</td>
<td>Brain death legal, Organ retrieval and preservation OK outside body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunology</td>
<td>Landsteiner-ABO, Medawar-WBCs linked to rejection</td>
<td>Tx organs died for unknown cause, Immune system culprit in rejection</td>
<td>No evidence available</td>
<td>Understanding immunity makes immunosuppression possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTEGRATION

- Writing assignment integrated into required course
- Assignment designed to implement writing skills learned in workshop using "They Say/I Say"
- Students provided with significant faculty feedback about how well own writing encompassed rhetorical moves expected in scholarly writing
- Dissemination of writing
  - Publications
  - Presentations
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