these students understood the courses to focus on the *how* of writing, not the *what* of writing. In such courses, students identify process as the central goal of the course, and that is what they carry forward and use in new situations, much like the students in the Hilgers, Hussey, and Stitt-Bergh (1999) and the Jarratt et al. (2005) studies. Put simply: (1) we teach process; (2) students develop a process, one that is often elaborated in FYC and abbreviated in other settings; and (3) they transfer process.

On the other hand, and as we saw in our studies, the students in the TFT class have *much* more to draw on. When learning a content of composition and practicing it, they create a knowledge of composing practices, knowledge they then draw upon in the TFT course and in other courses. They learn; they practice; they theorize; they transfer. In some ways, our TFT approach provides one model for adapting Beaufort's (2007) advice to teach students through making the five domains explicit. In other ways, it's a revised model: we identify and provide the content for composition, and prompt students to use reflection to synthesize learning for the purpose of theorizing. The subject matter is thus composition itself, which, when combined with practice and reflection, facilitates transfer. In the language of *How People Learn*, "our teaching of metacognitive activities [is] incorporated into the subject matter that students are learning" (19).

TEACHING FOR TRANSFER: GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS, SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS

Based on our TFT study, and the recommendations in *How People Learn* (Bransford, Pellegrino, and Donovan 2000), we can make six general suggestions for effective teaching for transfer.

1. Be explicit. Writing is a social practice; it's governed by conventions, so it changes over time. Writing requires both practice and knowledge, which is what a FYC course provides. These are very explicit lessons, and as the research on learning demonstrates, if we want students to learn them we do better to be straightforward in our teaching.

2. Build in expert practices. Describing practices is helpful; demonstrating them is better, in part because it shows what's expected, in part because it illustrates how what is expected can be accomplished.

3. Tap prior knowledge and concurrent knowledge. As explained in *HPL* and demonstrated by our students, prior knowledge is the base from which we all learn. Explaining what we think we know—moving from the tacit to the explicit—is a first step toward the remixing of prior knowledge engaged in by successful students. In addition, since students' learning isn't static, it's important to include learning that is occurring at the same time a student is in a given class.

4. Include processes and link them to key terms and a framework. The composition field, we think, takes considerable pride in its success improving teaching process (although we share some of the reservations expressed by Matsuda (2003) and DeJoy (2004)), but processes, and they are plural, need to be connected to a framework located in key terms, in our case rhetorical situation, genre, discourse community, and so on.

5. Consistently ask students to create their own frameworks using prior tack, and reiterative assignments support such tacking by inviting students to revisit what they have learned in light of new information and experience. However, the learning also has to be mapped onto a larger framework lest it function as an intellectual GPS device.

6. Build in metacognition, verbal and visual, balancing big picture and small practices. The field has recognized the value of reflection for some time (Belanoff 2001; Yancey 1998, 2009b), though often it is focused exclusively on process. Given the success we see in supporting the transfer of process, there is every reason to expand our use of reflection, especially if it is integrated into conceptual center and assignment design, as we do in the TFT course.

Despite these general maxims and our research telling us that teaching for transfer can be successful, our teaching experience with the TFT course also tells us that success doesn't come easily. For one thing, this approach is very different when compared to more conventional approaches to composition; it is much more disciplinary in nature, a point we return to below. For another, as we saw in chapter 4, barriers to transfer like the point of departure and absent prior knowledge help us understand the ambition of what all of us who teach composition are trying to achieve. And for yet another, some of the historically successful students, like Marta, resist both learning theoretically and theorizing writing in any sophisticated or knowledgeable way. At the same time, transfer *can* be successfully achieved for students who are willing to learn, with instructors who are interested in guiding them through the foreign land that is writing theory.

SITUATING A TFT COURSE

Our goal for first-year composition, like the field's collective goal, is to help writers develop and prepare students for the writing they will do