

## **G Session Abstracts**

### ***G1. Chinese-speakers' experiences with university writing in English***

#### **Chinese EFL learners' awareness in rhetorical strategy use in English writing: A case study in Taiwan**

Shih-Chieh Chien  
*University of Cambridge, UK*  
[scc47@cam.ac.uk](mailto:scc47@cam.ac.uk)

Second language (L2) writing teachers have to address the types of challenges students face when they write in the L2. One significant challenge that has been pointed out in contrastive rhetoric studies revolves around the notion of culturally constructed rhetorical traditions and patterns. It is claimed that L2 writers may have implicit frames or culturally-driven assumptions and values about academic writing in the first language (L1) that may transfer straightforwardly to academic writing in English (e.g., Connor, 1996, 2002; Panetta, 2001). While some cultural rhetorical differences have been accepted, some contrastive rhetoric researchers who have adopted theoretical frameworks consistent with a post-colonial stance argue that assuming that members of a cultural group write in the same prescribed manner is fraught with dangers. The present study, which looks at Chinese EFL learners' rhetorical strategy use in English writing at a university in Taipei, Taiwan, is situated in the backdrop of globalization when the Taiwan Ministry of Education advocates a more liberal way to teach English to students so as to meet the social demands of a global culture. The study is explored through the following questions: 1) What rhetorical strategies do students adopt in the English writing tasks? 2) Is there any difference in rhetorical strategy use between the high- and low-achieving students? 3) What are the teachers' writing instructions in terms of teaching rhetorical strategies? The findings suggest that while cultural differences do in fact exist, Chinese writers' English rhetorical strategy use were intertwined with their writing experiences and teachers' writing instructions. The results also suggest how problematic the Othering of EFL writers tends to discount factors like the heterogeneity of writers and multiplicity of writing experiences within a cultural group. Theoretical and educational implications resulting from the study are then discussed.

#### **Applying contemporary western composition pedagogical approaches in Chinese EFL university writing classes**

Jiajia He  
*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*  
[J.He@iup.edu](mailto:J.He@iup.edu) & [heyanjia@yahoo.com](mailto:heyanjia@yahoo.com)

This dissertation project explores the possibilities of applying certain aspects of contemporary Western composition pedagogical approaches in university-level advanced EFL writing classes at a Chinese university. The researcher conducted a series of writing workshops outside of the regular English curriculum, and the research focus is on students' attitudes toward their writing workshop experience. The research design is to apply principles of qualitative method and naturalistic inquiry in the classroom setting. Through prolonged engagement in a collective case study, multiple data sources were collected and triangulated for the better understanding and interpretation of the phenomenon.

Contemporary Western composition pedagogy applied in this research project addresses the roles of EFL writer, the native English reader, EFL written text, and the social context of EFL writing, as well as the interaction of these factors throughout the composing process. Applying this Western approach to writing instruction in Chinese universities provides scaffolding for students as they go through writing processes, and also helps them develop some appropriate social, cultural, and situational language awareness in English writing. This Western-style writing pedagogy encourages student self-expression yet also emphasizes writing for real purposes, audiences, and contexts. By attending a series of workshops where students were exposed to various aspects of an incorporated writing pedagogy, Chinese students reported significant improvement in their confidence in writing and in the acquisition and use of Western writing strategies.

Incorporating aspects of Western pedagogy in EFL writing classes would help students become aware of the interaction between EFL writer and writing context, and help develop demonstrable language competence and confidence to express their thoughts within appropriate contextual awareness. This study also has important implications for how best to teach writing for an increasing ESL/EFL student population at universities in the United States.

### **Writing across differences: Chinese-speaking students and college English writing**

Kai-lin Wu

*Tunghai University, Taiwan*

[kailinwu@thu.edu.tw](mailto:kailinwu@thu.edu.tw)

This paper describes a contrastive-rhetoric-based pedagogy and examines its effects on a college English writing class in Taiwan. The participants were 16 Chinese-speaking students from the freshman English Composition course the researcher taught in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature at a university in central Taiwan. The teacher-researcher invited students to investigate writing from a contrastive rhetoric perspective. She raised their cultural awareness of rhetorical differences and similarities through discussions of contrastive rhetoric issues that regarded the rhetorical features of Chinese-speaking students' expository writing and the responses of their English-speaking teachers. These students then conducted a writing project that required them to compare/contrast their expository essays in Chinese and English. The researcher

collected and analyzed the following types of data sources: (1) pre-tests and post-tests on the same English expository writing topic, 2) field notes of the classroom discussions, 3) students' writing projects on contrastive rhetoric, and (4) questionnaires on students' perceptions of the effects of awareness raising. A comparison of the pre-tests and post-tests showed that students improved their expository writing in terms of organization. The results of the questionnaires suggested that awareness raising has positive effects on students' English expository writing and that most students held positive attitudes toward the contrastive rhetoric-based pedagogy.

## **G2. Cancelled**

## **G3. Systems that augment writing processes**

### **Observing writing and analyzing revisions with Inputlog**

Luuk Van Waes  
*University of Antwerp, Belgium*  
[luuk.vanwaes@ua.ac.be](mailto:luuk.vanwaes@ua.ac.be)

Mariëlle Leijten  
*University of Antwerp, Belgium*

Nico Verlinden  
*Karel de Grote Hogeschool Antwerpen, Belgium*

The use of computers as writing instruments has not only had a profound effect on the writing practice and the attitudes towards writing, it has also created new possibilities for writing research. In the field of cognitive writing research especially, keystroke logging programs have become very popular. In this presentation we describe a logging program, called Inputlog (downloadable as freeware for researchers from: [www.inputlog.net](http://www.inputlog.net)).

Inputlog 2.0 consists of four modules:

- (1) a data collection module that registers digital writing processes on a very detailed level and registers the input of keyboard, mouse and speech recognition programs (i.c. Dragon Naturally Speaking);
- (2) a data analysis module that offers basic and more advanced statistical analyses: text, pause and revision analysis;
- (3) an integrate module that allows merging with other process data;
- (4) a play module that enables researchers to review the writing session.

In the presentation we focus on the automatic analysis of online revisions. In the validation process of this module we observed writers while they were writing texts related to different tasks. The revisions were both analyzed automatically and coded manually (using online video observation). We present the different perspectives from which the revisions were analyzed (e.g. level, operation, spread, clustering and distance) and we critically compare the results of these automatic analyses with the results of the

human coding. In the final part of the paper problems of identification and interpretation of online revision behavior will be discussed.

### **A proactive recommendation system for writing: Helping without disrupting**

Mari Carmen Puerta Melguizo  
*Radboud University, Netherlands*  
[puerta@cs.uu.nl](mailto:puerta@cs.uu.nl)

Lou Boves  
*Radboud University, Netherlands*  
[L.Boves@let.ru.nl](mailto:L.Boves@let.ru.nl)

Olga Muñoz Ramos  
*Campus de Cartuja, Granada, Spain*  
[olgamramos@gmail.com](mailto:olgamramos@gmail.com)

Finding appropriate information while writing a scientific paper is essential, but also difficult and time consuming. The main goal of the project *A Propos* is to develop a Proactive Recommender System (PRS) that retrieves information relevant to the text being written, and presents it automatically. However, it is necessary not to overlook that writing is a complex cognitive task that can be seriously affected by interruptions. In a series of experiments we are currently exploring the effects of writing with a PRS during the different stages of writing: planning, translating and reviewing. We look for those moments during writing where finding information is important and where proactive presentation interrupts least in order to develop a PRS for professional writers that presents information non-intrusively and timely so as to minimize disturbing the writing process. Our results so far show that a PRS speeds up writing and improve the quality of the text compared to situations where writers have to look for information actively.

### **Verbal reporting as an instrument of research into reading and writing processes: The case of the process log**

Rachel Segev-Miller  
*Kibbutzim College of Education, Tel Aviv, Israel*  
[aki\\_seg@smkb.ac.il](mailto:aki_seg@smkb.ac.il)

Verbal reporting, either *retrospective* interviews or *concurrent* think-alouds, has become an acceptable instrument of research into reading and writing processes. However, Pressley and Afflerbach's (1995) hypothesis, which postulated the existence of significant differences between retrospective and concurrent data, has not been supported by previous research (e.g., McCarthy, 1987). The purpose of the present study<sup>1</sup> was to

---

<sup>1</sup> which was carried out within the framework of a more comprehensive one (Segev-Miller, 2007).

further investigate this hypothesis with a different retrospective instrument – the process log (Segev-Miller, 2005).

Although the process log has become a standard component of writing instruction programs at many US colleges, very few studies (e.g., Nelson, 1988; Sternglass, 1988; Greene, 1993) have used it as a research instrument. The subjects were 12 college education majors required to perform an authentic reading-writing task (a literature review) in their 3<sup>rd</sup> year teaching methodology course. The subjects volunteered at the request of the researcher to document their performance of the task in the course of the academic year by means of a process log. The subjects submitted their logs once a week, and met with the researcher individually for an interview to clarify process log data. Six of them also elicited think-aloud protocols at various stages of their performance of the task.

Both logs and think-aloud protocols were analyzed for the strategies and for the "successful" strategies<sup>2</sup> used by each of the six subjects. A t-test for the average differences between the subjects' rates of success<sup>3</sup> in their log and think-aloud processes indicated no significant differences. Another t-test for the average differences between the relative frequencies of the strategies used by the subjects in their log and think-aloud processes indicated very few significant differences, which will be accounted for in terms of the different contexts, in which the data were elicited, and the inherently different nature of the verbal reporting methods used.

#### ***G4. Writing in multimedia: Art and design education***

##### **Research and reimagination: Shaping writing pedagogy in an undergraduate art and design university**

Jane Milton

Nova Scotia College of Art & Design University, Canada

[jmilton@nscad.ca](mailto:jmilton@nscad.ca)

Christina Halliday

Ontario College of Art & Design, Canada

[challiday@ocad.ca](mailto:challiday@ocad.ca)

Research into the impact of new digital technologies and the ubiquity of visual images to practices of communication is proliferating in academic contexts and influencing undergraduate writing curricula and teaching approaches. Unheard of twenty years ago,

---

<sup>2</sup> defined as such whether they contributed to the overall success of the task performance rather than deterred it by taking a wrong move or abstaining from taking one which was called for under the circumstances (Segev-Miller, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> calculated for each subject as the ratio between the absolute frequency of the successful strategies and the total number of strategies she used.

courses like "Multimedia First-Year Composition" are now being offered. Purdue University's Online Writing Lab provides a handout called "Visual Rhetoric for Student Writers." A number of recently published undergraduate, composition textbooks attempt to guide students in the composition and interpretation of multi-modal texts (Convergences, 2005; Writing in a Visual Age, 2006).

"Research and Reimagination" brings research into the relationships between composing visually, textually, and digitally into new territory by locating this research within the undergraduate, specialized, art and design university. In this two part presentation, Halliday and Milton summarize individual research projects that examine what art and design university students, faculty, and curricula can teach us about how writing pedagogy could be re-imagined in a visual and digital age. Drawing on a comparative analysis of upper year writing curricula and samples of student writing in art and design with recently published multimodal composition textbooks, Halliday's research uncovers conceptualizations of the relationships between text and image, text and practice, and text and design across these writing pedagogies. Her aim is to develop insight into new pedagogies for undergraduate writing instruction in an art and design context. Milton's research examines the goals of first-year writing programs in light of new scholarship on brain development in teens and the explosion of technologically mediated communication which has changed the way young people receive and create knowledge. Collaged images, mtv-type video, and hyperlinked texts emphasize communication as experience, making traditional analysis difficult.

### **Researching across disciplinary borders: What writers can learn in the architecture studio**

Elizabeth G. Allan  
*Temple University*  
[egallan@temple.edu](mailto:egallan@temple.edu)

At the 2007 Conference on College Composition and Communication, composition/rhetoric scholars such as Kathleen Yancey and Cynthia Selfe called for a new approach to writing instruction which makes room for multimodal textual production and recognizes the complexities of our students' literacy practices beyond traditional academic notions of reading and writing using alphabetic literacy. Their recent research suggests new possibilities for writing, particularly as the writing process intersects with digital technologies. My own ongoing research investigates a well-established tradition, beyond the borders of typical academic discourse, which has a rich history of combining multimodality, rhetorics, and composition (in its broader sense of design): the discipline of architecture.

Peter Medway in the UK and John Ackerman in the US have both investigated the intersections of writing, rhetoric, and architecture. Building on their foundational work, which foregrounds semiotics (Medway) and the rhetoric of place (Ackerman), my own research centers on architecture studio pedagogy and the emerging multimodal literacies of architecture students in a five-year professional program. The architecture studio is a

site of collaborative, problem-posing pedagogy, a site of high-stakes rhetorical interactions among students and professional critics, and a site of iterative, materially mediated, multimodal production of knowledge and texts. Drawing on the results of my research-in-progress across disciplinary borders, I will focus on the phenomenon of studio ethos, a defining feature of successful architects at all levels. My work so far has explored how studio ethos is inculcated in first-year students and how advanced students deploy specific characteristics associated with studio ethos as they prepare to transition from student to professional status.

## ***G5. Research and analysis among modern users and communities***

### **How do you research an online community of writers?**

Matthew Pearson  
*University of Wisconsin*  
*Man on the Street*  
mdpearson@wisc.edu

From the advent of the ARAPNET in the 1960s and 70s as a way for researchers and military strategists to share information, to Reingold's (1993) work on online "virtual" community, to the current fascination with social networking sites like MySpace and Facebook, connecting people across space and time has been considered one of the revolutionary aspects of the Internet. But how does the Internet facilitate these connections? Historically, and even today with the growth of technologies like YouTube and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), written communication has been the primary discursive modality on the Internet. Communities on the Internet form around all sorts of foci, including politics, computers, television, hobbies, and sports, and when they do, most use some sort of software interface that places written text as the primary—if not only—tool for transacting meaning among community members. As Hine (2000) argues, the Internet is textual in two ways, as "discursively performed culture and...a cultural artifact" (p. 39). I'm completing a dissertation seeking to understand more about online writing and writers by looking at the artifacts of a community of writers (a group of sports fans) to address one central question concerning the current explosion in mass writing on the Internet: How do writers learn how to write in and for an online community? While insights into online writing are compelling and necessary for writing researchers, this paper instead responds to the UCSB conference's invitation to address methodology, given how relatively new this kind of writing research is.

This paper focuses on the methodological issues that come when trying to understand how writing works in an online community. It provides my own preliminary answers to, or reflections on, the following questions:

- How useful are ethnographic, particular accounts of online writing?
- How do researchers of publicly available online writing handle issues of anonymity and ownership when writing up their research?

- How can one examine the learning and teaching of community-specific discursive conventions in online communities?
- How do researchers usefully “sample” online writing, given how much writing some online communities produce?
- How do different software interfaces for online writing—message boards, blogs, wikis, and so on—affect the kinds of methods researchers might use?
- What are the best tools and methods for archiving online writing, given both (a) the hyperlinked nature of the Internet, and (b) the potential ephemerality of this writing?

As researchers of writing, we have a lot to say about online writing, and a lot of work yet to do. In *Composition and Rhetoric*, much of the focus on “computers and writing” has been only on the pedagogical uses of computers (Inman, 2004). Many social science researchers of non-pedagogical online writing by and large have made invisible the fact that this communication takes places almost entirely via writing, choosing instead to treat it as speech-like. I hope this paper can both encourage more research of online written communication, and begin conversations around the challenges inherent to researching a relatively unprecedented mode of written discourse.

### **Writing in technological systems: The debate over “scientific” research**

Olivia Walling

*U.C. Santa Barbara*

[owalling@writing.ucsb.edu](mailto:owalling@writing.ucsb.edu)

Composition researchers have asked whether the methods normally associated with the social and natural sciences have a legitimate place within the field of composition studies. Richard Haswell (2005) and others have recently renewed the debate about the status and desirability of “scientific” research methods, variously described as “replicable, aggregable, and data supported” (Haswell, 2005), quantitative, or empirical.

The debate is not a discreet disagreement over the status of identifiable research methods but a disagreement concerning the methods implicated in the debate, the ideological entailments of particular methods, the meaning of research results, and the legitimate aims of research. I seek to provide a theoretical basis for understanding what conclusions derived qualitatively and quantitatively may mean.

My research reframes the problem from the standpoint of history of technology. Writing, across the disciplines, exists within diverse technological systems—sequences of implements that are linked in order to function properly and that acquire meaning by virtue of their interdependencies (Cowan, 1983). A written proposal for research, in other words, does not make sense without peer review procedures, research sites, systems for recording data, and journals for publication. Knowledge and data, therefore, are constituted and conveyed in writings that serve as implements and as links in the systems by which people seek to achieve defined goals. I will also use my previous research concerning experimental physicists’ writings to show that “scientific” research results

may be meaningfully representative for limited purposes without distorting the values of the social actors who rely on those results.

An understanding of writing as part of a technological society is essential for the meaningful accommodation of scientific methods in composition research. My presentation will show that methods that seek to predict reliably how people will act and write within these systems are productive and may be free of undesirable social effects. Considered as part of existing technologies, writing research methods may be evaluated in terms of their ability to affect these systems, and social values may become matters of broad social concern to all actors within the system.

## **G6. Evolving genres and evolving communities**

### **Flat CHAT? Reassembling literate activity**

Paul Prior

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*  
[pprior@uiuc.edu](mailto:pprior@uiuc.edu)

Since the 1980s, theories and research on genre and on literacy learning/development have, in various ways, been converging on the need to locate writing within some kind of social context (e.g., discourse communities, communities of practice) and on some flavor of a Vygotsky-inspired account of learning. Recent versions of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT; see, for example, Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1987; Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström, 2003; Wertsch, del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995) appear to offer both a social unit (durable activity systems) and an expanded notion of learning/socialization as distributed among people, artifacts, and environments. Known best for his work on the sociology of science and technology, Latour (2005) has offered a general critique of sociological thinking for its reliance on predetermined social groupings and has reasserted the principles behind a flat rhizomatic ontology (actor-network theory). This talk will explore ways of articulating Latour's call for a flat sociology with CHAT, whose durable activity systems are often anchored in well-established institutions. Extending earlier work on the laminated, chronotopic character of literate activity (Prior, 1998; Prior & Shipka, 2003) and on semiotic remediation practices (Prior, Hengst, Roozen, & Shipka, 2006), the talk will sketch a possible flat CHAT framework for writing research. It will consider how such an approach might meld with recent turns to the multimodal/semiotic and recent developments in genre theory, particularly the emergence of genre system approaches (Bazerman 1994, 2004; Devitt, 1991; 2004; Swales, 2004). The talk will conclude by suggesting how reassembling literate activity along these lines challenges both dominant constructions of writing and disciplinary borders of writing research.

### **Written discourse construction in the academic environment: A dynamic vision of learning discursive genres**

Anna Camps  
UAB  
[anna.camps@uab.es](mailto:anna.camps@uab.es)

Patricia Uribe  
*U. Tarapacá, Chile*

The conceptualization of discursive genres as an activity implies considering the situations of academic writing as complex activities where the participants propose different goals and where different issues are put at stake.

The research that we present offers a vision of the complexity of academic writing situations. This complexity is viewed through two theoretical approaches that converge: 1) the diversity of activity systems that shape the situation of learning academic genres (based on Leontiev, 1981; Engeström, 1987; and on the researches carried out, among others, by Russell and Yañez, 2002); and 2) the concept of discursive genres as dynamic constructions that constitute verbal activity systems (based on Bakhtin, 1982 and Miller, 1984; later developed by Bazerman, 1994; Berkenkotter and Hutchin, 1997, among others).

The research data come from the analysis of interaction occurring in the process of writing two texts by university students following the subject “Origin and diversity on human societies”, and from two interviews made to a group of these students and to the teacher giving the course.

The data analysis and interpretation reveal that we cannot simply talk about teaching and learning genres but that it is necessary to take into account “the writing situations in academic environments.” This approach allows:

- a) considering the diversity of genres that converge in the mentioned environments,
- b) taking into account the dynamic aspects of the academic texts construction and overcoming a purely normative and imitative vision of its learning,
- c) developing an interpretive framework that allows to study thoroughly and better understand the learning processes of academic discourses and the difficulties students are faced with.

### **Genres as boundary objects: Transforming knowledge between communities of practice**

Catherine F. Schryer  
*University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada*  
[cschryer@watarts.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:cschryer@watarts.uwaterloo.ca)

This paper brings together research in genre theory (Miller; Hyland; Schryer), classical rhetoric (Atwill), sociocultural literacy (Gee) and learning theory (Lave & Wenger; Wenger) to explore two issues: the discursive construction of expertise; and the

negotiation of expertise across fields of practice. The paper reports on research that investigates how some genres function as “boundary objects” or objects “that both inhabit several communities of practice and satisfy their informational requirements (Bowker & Star, p.297).” In particular, I focus on the work that consultation letters do as boundary objects or “brokers” (Wenger, p. 105) between different healthcare professions. The research combines two sources of data--a discourse analysis of sets of letters between optometrist clinicians and physician ophthalmologists as well as interviews with both the readers and writers. The results suggest that members of both fields use specific strategies to evoke the recognition of their expertise (or techne) and thus their professional forms of identities (boundaries) while at the same they use other strategies to negotiate knowledge across fields and to create ongoing relationships. The results suggests ways that professional communication researchers can make this work of boundary negotiating less tacit and thus function themselves as “brokers” between different fields of practice.

## ***G7. Rhetorical inquiry in times of change: Why feminist methods matter***

Katrina M. Powell  
*Virginia Tech*  
[kmpowell@vt.edu](mailto:kmpowell@vt.edu)

Carolyn Rude  
*Virginia Tech*

Kelly Belanger  
*Virginia Tech*

Paul Heilker  
*Virginia Tech*

In April 2007, twenty scholars representing more than 10 institutions met at Virginia Tech for a symposium to discuss the status of feminist research methodologies in Rhetoric and Writing Studies. During the three day event, scholars from across the country discussed the ways that rhetorical inquiry and research might contribute to larger concerns about world peace, international and interdisciplinary understanding, and healing in times of crisis. One guiding question focused on the extent to which feminist approaches to rhetorical inquiry—with their analyses of the dynamics of power—suggest strategies for healing and peace. In addition to attending workshops to discuss works-in-progress, the scholars discussed whether the term “feminist” is still the most useful label for the projects and methods that this group of scholars find most compelling. The group also explored how we see future directions of feminist rhetorical inquiry affecting and being affected by current national and international events and policies.

This interactive poster session/roundtable will present the major conclusions of the Blue Ridge Collective. Participants in the collective included Dale Bauer, Patricia Bizzell,

Ellen Cushman, Gesa Kirsch, Min-zhan Lu, Bruce Horner, Gail Hawisher, Pamela Takayoshi, Diane Shoos, Shirley Logan, Beverly Moss, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Marilyn Cooper, Cindy Selfe, Susan Jarratt, Eileen Schell, John Trimbur, Peter Mortensen, Katrina Powell, Kelly Belanger, Diana George, Marie Paretti, and Kelly Rawson

The roundtable discussion will be organized in five parts. Katy Powell will begin by describing the formation and initial work of the collective during its founding series of meetings. Kelly Belanger will then present the group's position statement, which includes a hypertext document with links to individual projects, bibliographies, collaborative projects, and other initiatives coming out of the Symposium. Paul Heilker will discuss implications of the position statement for future research in composition studies, and Carolyn Rude will point to implications for studies in professional and technical communication. We will conclude the session by inviting Writing Research Across Borders attendees to respond to the collective's findings and to generate further dialogue about the ways in which feminist rhetorical inquiry has, and may continue to, influence research practices in Rhetoric and Writing.

## ***G8. Directions in University writing instruction***

### **Reconceptualizing writing across disciplines in higher education**

Anne Beaufort  
*University of Washington Tacoma*  
[beaufort@u.washington.edu](mailto:beaufort@u.washington.edu)

How do novices learn the practices of disciplinary writing? What is the developmental process for acquiring writing expertise in a specific discourse community and how can we implement curricula that support that developmental process? To begin to answer these questions, I will present a synopsis of the research reported in *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction* (Utah State Press, 2007). The book reports on a six-year case study of a college writer who double-majored in history and engineering and proposes and the implications for curriculum development in courses across the disciplines, as well as implications for training teachers of writing. This case study takes a comprehensive look at the writing this writer produced from his freshman through senior years and also in his first professional engineering job. The analysis of his work and his development as a writer over a six-year period considers five areas of knowledge that expert writers draw upon for writing tasks.

### **Truth or tale?: The efficacy of teacher-student writing conferences**

Nicole M. Martin  
*Michigan State University*  
[marti968@msu.edu](mailto:marti968@msu.edu)

Janine L. Certo

*Michigan State University*

In *The Handbook of Writing Research*, Beach and Friedrich's (2006) 12-page chapter on teacher responses to students' writing, seven paragraphs are devoted to teacher-student conferences, with 17 anecdotal and empirical studies cited. Yet, writing conferences are commonly used in the classroom (Black, 1998), presumably because the feedback permits writers to achieve at higher levels. While books (e.g., Anderson, 2000; Calkins, 1986) and articles (e.g., Glasswell, Parr, & McNaughton, 2003; Nickel, 2001) abound with pedagogical strategies, deciding to use conferencing requires answering two questions. Do writing conferences significantly affect writing achievement? If so, what factors influence conferencing success?

To address these questions, I conducted a literature review. Relatively little empirical research has been published on the efficacy of writing conferences, but results suggest they can positively influence students' revisions. However, student characteristics (e.g., cultural backgrounds, initial writing achievement, personal agendas, etc.) and teacher behaviors (e.g., assumed roles, linguistic practices, beliefs about students, etc.) appear to affect conference outcomes (Fitzgerald & Stamm, 1990; Freedman & Sperling, 1985; Glasswell et al., 2003; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; McCarthey, 1994; Newkirk, 1995; Nickel, 2001; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Young & Miller, 2004). For example, teachers who frequently use writing conferences, adopt certain roles (e.g., "interested reader," "overhearer," etc.), negotiate jointly with students, and use specific criteria for success seem to hold more effective writing conferences (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Larson & Maier, 2000; McCarthey, 1994; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Sperling, 1996; Walker & Elias, 1987).

Using a limited number of methodologies (e.g., discourse analyses, case studies, surveys), these studies primarily examined student attitudes, conference pacing, and immediate draft revisions. Future researchers could track student growth longitudinally, design experimental studies, and compare conferencing to other strategies. They could also investigate variations among teachers who conduct effective conferences; changes in teacher behaviors and conferences over time; the impact of gender and socioeconomic status on conferences and outcomes; and the interplay between genre knowledge and conferences.

## ***G9. French didactic tradition***

### **Defining writing in a "didactic" framework**

Yves Reuter

*Université Charles de Gaulle, France*

[yreuter@wanadoo.fr](mailto:yreuter@wanadoo.fr)

My talk will be organized around the presentation of three claims arising out of the multiple theoretical and empirical research projects that I have carried out in France over the past thirty years in the domain of the "didactics" of French. The term "didactics"

should be understood as the *research discipline* that analyzes content (knowledge and know-how) in its status as the object of teaching and learning, here with reference to the *school discipline* that is French (which includes teaching writing).

The first claim can be formulated as follows. Although there are numerous models of writing activity, variable in relation to research disciplines, it is still possible to position them along a continuum between two extremes: the first, more grounded in philosophy or in some branches of psychology, is that of the *abstraction* that unifies *writing* around certain structural traits; the second, more grounded in sociology and ethnography, underscores instead the *contextualization* and the resulting diversity of *writing practices*. I will try to show why, in didactics, we can only try to articulate these antagonistic conceptions.

The second claim exposes the way in which, in didactics, contextualization of writerly practices can be thought only in its school- and discipline-specific dimensions, in contrast with extra-scholastic practices. This brings us, as a consequence, to think about many difficulties as not so much writing problems (in general) but as tributary problems related to disciplinary modes of writing practice, these modes linking back to the specific ways of seeing the world, to particular concepts in play, to situations, to the exercises used...

The third claim, founded on multiple research projects about learners' difficulties, from primary school to the university, poses the value of the notion of *tensions* in order to think about writing practices and problems encountered in exercising those practices. Writing is thus conceived of as the management of tensions, in diverse forms, as related to different situations and written genres. This carries with it, however, the key consequence of isolating ourselves from current dominant theories in order to privilege an approach to texts and writings that emphasizes the forms of stability (or instability) they institute.

### **University writing: A synthesis of French research in didactics studies**

Isabelle Delcambre

*Université Charles-de-Gaulle-Lille 3, France*

[isabelle.delcambre-derville@univ-lille3.fr](mailto:isabelle.delcambre-derville@univ-lille3.fr)

In France, many studies focused on students' learning at the university have been carried out in the domain of educational sociology. Very few have brought attention to the role of writing in this context. In the field of the *didactique* (research and theorizing) of writing, studies have recently begun to focus on analyzing students' difficulties with university writing, but this research rarely takes systematically into account the disciplinary dimension of the question. Most of the time the research consists of isolated studies about writing in a given discipline, in which the discipline becomes the frame for gathering data rather than a variable in the study. In addition, these sociological or didactic studies analyze students' difficulties at the point of entry into the university, leaving aside the problems students might encounter further along in their programs, in particular when they must produce the specific form called "research writing". A three-year project

funded by the *National Agency for Research (ANR)* seeks to clarify two dimensions of university writing: identifying the writing norms linked to disciplines, and deepening our understanding of the features of research writing.

In this presentation, I'll present a bibliographic review of French didactic research, organizing the available literature according to the following axes: the disciplines in which student writing has already been studied; the university levels studied; established genres of writing in higher education; studies of students' writing; analysis of students' discourse about the role of writing in the learning experiences at university; work/university connections in writing research, and so on. One of the purposes of this bibliographic work is to compare side-by-side the syntheses of French research with syntheses of anglo-saxon work in order to identify the possible relations between different points of view or questions of research and to provide the foundations for future research collaboration.

## ***G10. Testing the borders: Researching writing in post-Soviet spaces***

**Footprints in the classroom: How foreign partners mediate and deploy western-style methods**

**Gil Harootunian**

[gharootunian@mcdaniel.edu](mailto:gharootunian@mcdaniel.edu)

My work directing Department of State educational exchange for five years between Syracuse University (SU) and Yerevan State Linguistic University (YSLU), Armenia, afforded a rare on-site opportunity to study the reception of Western-style methods into a non-Western culture. To my knowledge, I administered the first longitudinal study (Fall 2004-2006) of student writing in a post-Soviet university. Of the multiple outcomes, I will address the onset of a Western-style university student-writer's cognizance, which is fundamental to our work. When this becomes a challenge in foreign venues, it is a critical one. This onset occurred in the third semester, in the fourth or fifth sample, and it was a distinctly Armenian student-writer's identity. This suggested that Armenian students were actively mediating Western-style writing methods as they developed the cognizance (Hall 1976; Luria 1976; Maalouf 2003; Nisbett 2003; Ong 1982; Rogoff 1995; Ross 2004). This insight led me to re-examine my work with Armenian teachers, discovering that they were independently but in parallel actively mediating Western-style methods to change the culture in their YSLU classrooms. This contrasted to interactions with mature Armenian administrators that demonstrated they were also actively mediating Western-style methods to maintain the culture at YSLU (a lingering Soviet-style educational system). In sum, all Armenian participants mediated their reception of Western-style methods, but their mode of mediation was influenced by three factors: [1] ethnic culture (Armenian); [2] status within that culture (student, teacher, administrator); and [3] experience within a political culture (newly democratic or post-Soviet totalitarian). Mapping out the extent and forms of this mediation should better prepare U.S. teachers to

anticipate and devise mediation strategies and, if necessary, on-site critical interventions in foreign venues.

### **Interpreting transformational teaching practices in Armenian writing classes: Methodological considerations in a cross-cultural observation**

**Louise Wetherbee Phelps**

My study reports on cross-cultural observation of classroom teaching at Yerevan State Linguistic University, where Armenian teachers working with American co-participants, mentors, and models have pioneered a writing-intensive curriculum and an explicitly "democratic" pedagogy designed to prepare students for civic life and leadership during a national transition to democracy. My presentation will offer a partial interpretive account of their reflective pedagogy-in-action, based on week-long close observation of classrooms (in both the experimental program and the old Soviet model). This often dialogic observation will be supplemented by further exchanges with teachers, along with other materials documenting the three-year project. I will use this account to develop a richer understanding of the method it represents, which Elliot Eisner calls "educational criticism," and to consider the implications and complications of applying this method cross-culturally. Eisner proposed this method as a form of qualitative empirical study for educational activity that is modeled on criticism in the arts. It combines "knowledgeable perception" of educational events and teachers' artistry, with criticism as an art of disclosing meanings (through writing). Potentially, sources in art criticism (Marcus Hester) and practitioners of phenomenological description (Patricia Carini) can enhance Eisner's characterization of observation itself and its relationship to verbal accounts. Appreciating significance in educational events and making judgments about them also requires theories (e.g., Anthony Cohen's work on the symbolic construction of reality and Donald Schoen's studies of reflective practitioners) and conceptual analysis, a philosophical method. So, for example, I'll analyze the concept of reasoning that Armenian teachers and students invoke as a fundamental principle for democratic rhetorics. Finally, I'll consider the methodological and ethical complexities of applying educational criticism in this expanded sense in a cross-cultural setting where what is being observed is already the product of a "contact zone" between Armenian and American worlds, both material and symbolic.

#### **“Education for democracy: A case study in Armenia”**

Sophia Kananyan

Post-Soviet Armenia is a young democracy experiencing an urgent need for independent citizens capable of questioning familiar thought patterns, making decisions, and taking responsibility for their actions. The previous political system did not allow for practicing independent thinking. Introducing Western-style writing-intensive and democratic methods into courses piloted for an exchange project between Syracuse University and Yerevan State Linguistic University has been crucial to reviving and cultivating such values as freedom, critical thought, and moral reasoning. The project aimed to enable

students to become competitive members of the worldwide academic community and active members of the society at large by developing their analytical and argumentative thinking and writing. I taught *News Writing and Ethics* and *Writing for Mass Communication* to International Journalism students, and these students produced the first student-run Western-style newspaper that covered current issues in Armenian mass media and society. Producing this newspaper requires that students make critical choices about what information is important, why readers should care, how to work with facts, how to verify the validity of assumptions, and how to tackle ethical issues. Students had to newly learn to observe, collect sufficient evidence, and form opinions while keeping an open mind. I will discuss the various methods and approaches—ranging from social constructivism (Airasian and Walsh 1997) to cooperative learning (Slavin 1990)—that I combined and deployed to prompt Armenian students to realize these goals. For example, the courses emphasize learner reflection because return-and-reflect assignments foster meta-cognitive thinking and “increase the degree to which students transfer their learning to new settings and events” (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000, 12). The presentation may be of interest to all who are involved in introducing writing into institutional environments where it has previously played little or no role.

## **G11. New directions in writing programs**

### **'The things they carried': A synthesis of research on transfer in college composition**

Kathleen Blake Yancey  
Florida State University  
[kyancey@english.fsu.edu](mailto:kyancey@english.fsu.edu)

Across the U. S. post-secondary landscape, the idea of transfer as an institutional mechanism is becoming increasingly common, as we see in state-wide institutional articulation in states like Arizona and Florida. For compositionists, however, another, more fundamental sense of transfer is as intellectual practice: the ability of students to take what is *learned*—about composing processes, about texts and ways to create them, about rhetorical situations and framing--and use it to good effect in other writing situations—in other classes, in other programs, in other institutions, in the workplace, and in other parts of life itself. And more recently, with the proliferation of electronic genres like text-messaging and instant messaging, we have evidence of the effects of writing practices that students transfer *into* school.

A preliminary review of the research on transfer as intellectual practice suggests that we can make claims about what students do and do not “transfer” from one composing site to the next. A search of the database Compile, for example, yields 211 studies employing a diverse methodological set and rhetorical settings ranging from the classroom to sites of workplace literacy. Likewise, an informal review of more recently published scholarship (Compile ends at 1999) suggests that the “question” of transfer is motivating an increasing number of both theoretical and empirical studies, although they do not speak in unison on its efficacy. In *The End to Composition Studies*, for example, David Smit

argues that there is no evidence that students transfer what they learn from one setting to the next, while Nancy Sommers and Laura Saltz, citing the findings of the Harvard Study of Writing in a recent *CCC* article, claim that students transfer rhetorical understandings (e.g., their role as novices) as well as practices that facilitate their development as composers. Hilgers et al. document considerable student transfer of practice if not of conceptual schemata in their writing across the curriculum program, while Michael Carter and Anne Beaufort, respectively, propose new frameworks that might facilitate the transfer Smit claims is impossible.

Despite this interest in transfer and despite its significance as a disciplinary matter, there has been to date no synthesis of research on the “transfer” question in composition. In this talk, I'll begin to address this absence, first by defining transfer and then sharing findings from a CCCC-sponsored study of research on the efficacy of transfer in college composition. In addition, I'll identify questions intended to focus a new generation of research on the topic.

### **What do students take with them? A longitudinal study of a liberal arts college WAC program**

Michael Sinowitz  
*University of Miami*  
[msinowitz@depauw.edu](mailto:msinowitz@depauw.edu)

Susan Hahn  
*DePauw University*

At the 4Cs in 2005, we attended a panel that focused on studies of what the panelists referred to as transference of knowledge: in other words, what if anything, do students take from one course—here particularly writing courses—to other courses. After attending this session, we began to believe that such a study at DePauw would be beneficial from two standpoints: there is a relative scarcity of such work at liberal arts colleges, and it would hopefully allow us to make decisions about the teaching of writing at DePauw from a much more informed position. Our study and discussion will address a writing program designed to cross interdisciplinary boundaries. We administered three preliminary surveys (two for ENG 130 and one for W-courses) in the fall of 2006 to almost every College Writing course and every writing intensive course taught, and presented our preliminary findings at the 4Cs in New York. We have been given administrative approval to launch a longitudinal study of writing at DePauw starting August 2007.

We propose discussing the results from the first semester of our longitudinal study, admittedly a work-in-progress, as well as discussing the institutional issues and procedures that went into the crafting of this study. We have decided to approach this study with two complementary methodologies. We will follow as much of the entering class as possible (including students who take College Writing and those who do not), and to chart their experiences through surveys and other forms of response that do not

identify students individually. We will also include a group of students who will be studied through interviews, providing the study more of a narrative account of their experiences at DePauw. Such a methodology has been used previously in other studies, but we will be conducting this part of the survey without as much compromise of the subjects as sometimes occurred (for example, having students participate who are not in our own classes).

## ***G12. Shifting traditions: Writing instruction and research on three continents***

### **Transit Kathmandu: Writing instruction and research in Nepal's higher education**

Iswari Pandey  
*Syracuse University*  
[ippandey@syr.edu](mailto:ippandey@syr.edu)

Hom Lal Pandey  
*Tribhuvan University, Birendra Campus, Nepal*

While rhetoric and writing is often considered a US-based discipline, some of the major tenets of writing instruction and research are also practiced in college English classes in traditionally non-Anglophone countries. Scholarship in this area is only beginning to appear, and work such as Foster and Russell's (2002) and Foster's (2006) examine, from a comparative perspective, student writing in international contexts. While we need more work to learn how students write transnationally and how writing is produced, circulated, taught, and validated in those contexts—as we recognize that this cultural phenomenon is contingent upon local and national variables—we also need studies that take us outside of a two-country comparison model. Scholars such as Mignolo (1995) have also established connections between writing, social organization, territorial expansion and political control by the West following the European Renaissance. Then, what has been the role of colonization in teaching writing in colonial outposts and postcolonial nations? Or more recently, what is the cultural and political significance of teaching writing, and doing so in American English, as the world witnesses—and bears the consequence of—US ascendancy to a sole superpower nation? What of the neoliberal imperial impulses circulating through this English vis-à-vis its use in postcolonial contexts to mediate local conflicts as in post-independence India? Already, increasing use of English in global trade and new communications media, as well as inclusion of written component in standardized tests, such as TOEFL and GRE, and in education in non-Anglophone countries such as Nepal, albeit selectively, underlie a tension. How do local instructors, textbook writers, and students perceive and negotiate this conflict?

My project looks at the elevation of writing in Nepal's higher education in the aftermath of the 1990's democratic movement and analyzes it in the context of globalization. The increased prominence of writing in the new curriculum and locally prepared textbooks demonstrates the perceived need to make English education responsive to local contexts

while also connecting it to larger world as evident in the selection of reading materials and writing prompts. These materials and assignments also enact complex, even ambivalent, relationship with the British Empire whose politico-cultural controls reached Nepal via the British India Company and with free market ideology. For this research, I use in-depth interviews with textbook writers, curriculum designers, teachers, teacher trainers, and students and also examine textbooks, sample writing prompts, assignments, and student writing to identify central rhetorical strategies whose origins may lie locally or transnationally and whose explanations may come from disparate discursive repertoires such as the country's politics, culture, economy, and its complex relationship with the outer world. To this analysis, I bring the perspective of both an insider and an outsider. I was educated according to the older British literature-based curricula in use in Nepal until the early 1990s, but I was also involved in executing the revised curricular goals by training teachers and by teaching in the classroom, between 1994 and 2000. However, I have also been an outsider since 2000, when I began graduate work in the US, where I am currently an assistant professor of writing and rhetoric.

### **Strategies, policies and research on reading and writing in Colombian universities**

Alejandro Gordillo Rodríguez  
*Universidad Nacional de Colombia*  
[alejandrogr67@yahoo.es](mailto:alejandrogr67@yahoo.es)

Blanca Yaneth González Pinzón  
*Universidad Nacional de Colombia*  
[blaygon@gmail.com](mailto:blaygon@gmail.com)

The purpose of this paper is to show an outlook of what Colombian universities have been doing in terms of reading and writing in higher education.

To understand the nature of these difficulties, the general operation of the Colombian education will be explained: laws in force (Political Constitution, Law 115 of 1994, Law 30 of 1992, Law 29 of 1990, among others), the different levels of training (basic, intermediate and higher education), and the features of the reading and writing training processes on each of these levels. In particular, the specific problems of the students entering the universities as well as the purposes considered by the universities to this respect will be explained.

There are 276 higher education institutions (195 private and 81 official institutions) working in the country. These institutions are classified as 51 technical-professional institutions, 60 technological institutions, 91 university institutions, and 74 universities. This paper will present a state-of-art of research carried out by these institutions on field problems along the last 15 years[1]. Also, the institutional policies currently working in some of them will be presented.

On the other hand, the role currently performed by the Red Nacional de Discusión sobre Lectura y Escritura en Educación Superior (National Network for the Discussion of Reading and Writing in Higher Education), created by the Asociación Colombiana de Universidades, ASCUN[2] (Colombian University Association), and by 17 institutions in November 2006, will be displayed. The Network is now composed of 50 universities, and it has organized a first national congress on institutional policies for the development of reading and writing in April 2007 [3]. The Network entrusted the member universities in this meeting to establish a position with respect to the convenience or inconvenience to improve reading and writing training through institutional policies. The outcome of the actions aimed at complying with this task will be revealed by the Network's member universities on November 24, 2007. This paper will include the presentation of the outcome and commitments reached by the universities in this topic.

### **Shifting tradition: The past and future of writing research in Canada**

Jennifer Clary-Lemon  
*University of Winnipeg, Canada*  
[j.clary-lemon@uwinnipeg.ca](mailto:j.clary-lemon@uwinnipeg.ca)

It has been acknowledged that the development of rhetoric and composition as a discipline in Canada has had an entirely different set of exigencies and institutional outcomes than in the United States (Graves and Graves). Not only has higher education in Canada been peppered by suspicion and critique of American practices, a suspicion that includes composition as an American enterprise (Hubert and Garrett-Petts.65), but it also reflects a history with differing values and attitudes altogether about the research and teaching of writing. This talk considers Canadian writing research historically, contemplating both where Canada has come from (reflecting on the works of Johnson, Hubert 1994, and Brooks) and where the nation is going. Today, while Canada no longer wholeheartedly agrees with the philosophical idealism of Northrop Frye in the 1950's, writing and rhetorical study done at the post-secondary level has in large part arisen in places other than departments of English: in writing courses across the disciplines and across curricula; in departments of Communication, colleges of Engineering and sciences, writing centers, and to a lesser extent, in independent writing programs. As such, as more Canadian PhDs graduate from American institutions to work in Canada, future research will rely on a North American hybridization of writing and writing research, constructing sites that both "import" composition as well as give rise to research that must remain distinctly local in nature.

### ***G13. Academic voice: authorities, opportunities, and constraints***

#### **Developing "authoritative" academic voices: First-year students' writing for a disciplinary course as initiation to academic culture**

Dora Panayotova  
*U.C. Santa Cruz*

[panadora@gmail.com](mailto:panadora@gmail.com)

This paper analyses the written coursework of 12 first-year, first-quarter undergraduate students enrolled in an educational foundations course that explicitly focuses on developing students' academic writing. All participants are attending a medium-size Californian university and come from low-income, educationally disadvantaged backgrounds and are first generation college attendees. The sample consists of both US-educated language minority students and monolingual English-speaking students. The course represents a unique opportunity for students to focus explicitly on writing in the context of a "mainstream" credit-bearing disciplinary course.

The paper explores how the participants, in a Bakhtinian dialog with the field of knowledge they acquire and their TA's instructions and comments, build authority into their emerging voices. It explores how students use the resources available to them to make sense of the class content and how students use these resources to support claims, to prove or disprove points and to build academic argument in an authoritative way. The paper describes students' intertextual use of available texts as well as their perspective of what constitutes authority (personal narratives, cultural texts, etc.). Using Bazerman's taxonomies of intertextuality and notions from Cultural Studies that view culture as (series of) text(s), I argue that producing successful texts at the postsecondary level is not a simple sum of learning about the field of knowledge and of how to write for academic purposes within that field of knowledge, but rather represents a process of enculturation into academic culture.

### **Writing in the 'frame lock'; Writing across borders**

Frances Kelly

[f.kelly@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:f.kelly@auckland.ac.nz)

Researchers crossing disciplinary borders must negotiate the issue of writing across disciplinary frames of convention. In this paper, I examine what Charles Bernstein calls 'frame lock', or the 'prevailing stylistic constraints' of a discipline, and consider the role of style guides for how they impact on academic writing and research at the doctoral level. In particular, I look at the ways in which the style manuals of the APA and MLA articulate and perpetuate 'frame lock' among emerging researchers in the arts and social sciences, prompted by my own experience in which I finished my doctorate, then researched and published in a different field.

What crossing disciplinary borders and frames can highlight is that language is not neutral and its use is always strategic. Indeed, I consider that the examination of style and citation conventions is important in the broader re-examination of writing and language, engendered by post-structuralist thought. Now, as lecturer who teaches academic writing to doctoral students, I work with researchers who face challenges that are similar to those I also experienced, particularly if they are engaged in interdisciplinary research. In these classes, as I shall discuss, I work with emerging researchers in finding

ways of being strategic and self-reflexive in their writing practices, assisting them toward what John Tinker terms a ‘pedagogy of style’.

### **Which citation system did Derrida use?: The problem of poststructuralism, APA style, and writing in education research**

Tim Laquintano

[laquintano@wisc.edu](mailto:laquintano@wisc.edu)

In the past forty years, French poststructuralist philosophy has been influential in the American academy. Initially imported through departments of comparative literature, “theory” was picked up and disseminated, often with preposterous fervor and dogmatic sloganeering, to a number of academic disciplines. It was not applied without rigorous debate, and because of its provocative epistemological stance on a number of philosophical issues, debates about poststructuralism have remained both heated and relevant. Of central concern to many of these arguments are the anti-foundational presuppositions of poststructuralism: it has attempted to destabilize the “objective” premises of the sciences by challenging the stability of linguistic meaning, the possibility of language representing the real, and the notion of the autonomous and stable subject.

My paper focuses on the way in which poststructuralism has been taken up in the written research of American departments of education. Because such research tends to use the citation style of the American Psychological Association, and because citation styles bring with them epistemologies (Cronin, Bazerman, Leydesdorff, Marten,), my argument is that the epistemology intrinsic to the APA citation system is at fundamental odds with the epistemological stance of much poststructuralist theory. This is important for education research and research on writing, for example, because much “social justice” research uses theory to resist the classless, raceless, and genderless models of subjectivity sometimes inscribed in more “scientific” research. My paper is thus a case study that will trace out the implications generated by the conflict between the constraints of the writing conventions of an academic discipline, and the intellectual uptake of recent theoretical developments. Such a study suggests the ways in which disciplinary writing conventions condition and constrain the content of academic research, even as such research tries to resist established intellectual paradigms.

### ***G14. Nation(s) at risk: Issues of freedom and diversity within the academy***

**Academic freedom, writing instruction, and the American academy: A nation at risk**

Leanne Warshauer

*Suffolk County Community College, Selden, NY*

[warshal@sunysuffolk.edu](mailto:warshal@sunysuffolk.edu)

Tina Good  
*Suffolk County Community College, Selden, NY*  
[goodt@sunysuffolk.edu](mailto:goodt@sunysuffolk.edu)

In 2005, we both completed our dissertations. Leanne explored the constructed binary between WAC's two distinct pedagogical goals: Writing to Learn (WTL) and Learning to Write in the Disciplines (WID). She argued that at its core, WAC is a product-centered movement promoting a current traditional model of composition. In doing so, it helps maintain disciplinary discourse and disciplinary structures by teaching students to replicate them. She concluded that we need to follow the example of postmodern feminists and find power in the binary. We, as teachers, must find ways for both WTL and WID to be valued while exploring the tensions between the two. Tina examined the positioning of English Studies within the American Academy and the historical narratives used to construct it as a discipline. She challenged the hierarchical divisions within English Studies, such as the Literature/Composition/Creative Writing triumvirate, which threaten to destabilize its position within the Academy and suggested that the act of writing assessment could work to re-articulate the value(s) of English Studies if writing assessment theories are informed by our own discipline(s).

Two years have passed since we completed these projects. In that time, we have seen rising demands for accountability in higher education on a national level. We have only begun to experience the implications of the Spellings Commission Report. The Academic Bill of Rights has been discussed at both state and national levels, and the possibility of the "No Child Left Behind Act" becoming a political reality for higher education seems imminent. When we look back on our dissertations, we notice that we ignored issues of academic freedom that are so central to our lives as academics today. Our lack of theorizing through our suggested pedagogies with an eye toward protecting academic freedom became clear when our college recently attempted to begin its own WAC initiative. This administrative-driven directive to formulate a WAC program was met with resistance from faculty. It was only after our faculty governance established an approval process that protected the faculty's right to academic freedom could we begin to build enthusiasm for a WTL concept across the disciplines.

This panel will consist of two presentations that will discuss the need for more disciplinary theorizing through and articulation of academic freedom with regard to writing instruction within the American Academy. These papers will demonstrate how scholars and teachers within the fields of Composition and English Studies have aided in the national undermining of academic freedom and how higher education may be at a tipping point within America. We will also suggest that it is most urgent for these particular disciplines to reassert the need for academic freedom within a democratic society for it is these disciplines which are most targeted when language control becomes a political agenda.

**Writing nation(s): Addressing diversity in the new European classroom**

Erica Cirillo-McCarthy  
*University of Arizona*  
[erica.cirillo@gmail.com](mailto:erica.cirillo@gmail.com)

Writing instruction in the European Union (EU) is currently going through a significant transition. In the past, there was no perceived need for writing instruction; the homogenous student population, for the most part, was expected to know how to write at the college level. Therefore, there was a lack of research in the teaching of academic writing. But in the past ten years, things have changed dramatically. The EU is now facing similar problems that the U.S. faced with negotiating the tension in the classroom problematized by the intervention of the government, as in Project English, and the public perception of writing instruction, as seen in the 1975 *Newsweek* article “Why Johnny Can’t Write.” Due to the creation of new government funded student opportunities such as the Erasmus and Socrates programs, students in any EU member country can attend school in any other EU member country. This new student mobility forces administrators and instructors to address issues of language and identity. In addition, new immigration laws that allow for more refugees from non-Western countries have changed the composition of the classroom in most countries. This new diversity on a larger scale in the EU classroom has created a new reality of writing instruction in the classroom. Research on this project began as my master’s thesis. I discovered many parallels between the developing EU composition studies field and certain US composition studies historical moments and subsequently theorized the significance global research will have on US composition studies. However, I would like to focus this presentation on the negotiation of these “new” EU students, immigrants, non-Native speakers, and non-traditional students, into the dominant discourse.

## ***G15. Source integration among L2 learners***

### **Source integration in students’ L2 writing in tertiary education**

Bojana Petric  
*Eotvos Lorand University, Hungary*  
[bojana\\_petric@yahoo.com](mailto:bojana_petric@yahoo.com)

Integration of sources into one’s text is an important aspect of academic writing. At the same time, this is a common source of difficulty for student writers in tertiary education, especially when writing in a foreign language. This paper investigates whether high and low rated student writing differ in source integration practices, and if so, in what aspects and why. I will address the question by focusing on both texts and writers, i.e., by combining text analysis and interviews with student writers. I will first present the findings of a comparative study of source integration in eight high and eight low rated Master’s theses written in English as a foreign language in the field of Gender studies at an English-medium university in Hungary. The theses were graded by members of the Gender studies disciplinary community. The analytical framework is based on Hyland’s (2000) typology, consisting of summary / paraphrase, direct quote, block quotation, and

generalization from multiple sources. Both qualitative and quantitative differences in the use of these types of source integration will be presented, and practices associated with high grades - and thus with the process of entering a disciplinary discourse community - will be discussed. To understand the reasons for the identified source integration practices, text analysis data will be complemented by the analysis of students' accounts of their practices regarding different types of source integration. Implications of the findings for the teaching of source use in academic writing courses will then be discussed.

### **The impact of internet-based plagiarism detection services on learner awareness of academic integrity**

Işıl Günseli Kaçar

*Middle East Technical University, Turkey*

Hale Işık-Güler

*Middle East Technical University, Turkey*

[isikhale@gmail.com](mailto:isikhale@gmail.com)

Given the variety of L1 and L2 perspectives into cultural perceptions concerning textual borrowing (Murphy, 1990; Pecorari, 2001; Pennycook, 1996; Sowden, 2005; Yamada, 2003), a need has arisen to tap into the rationale behind the development of the progressive discursal and cultural aspects of ESL/EFL writers which require a critical analysis of the related dimensions of classroom practices and learner cognition in terms of academic integrity. The study is concerned with to what extent classroom practices and technology (i.e. internet-based plagiarism detection services) can aid the plagiarism problem which greatly hinders the language proficiency development of learners in EFL contexts.

With this intention in mind, participant sampling for the study at hand was based on 80 students enrolled in an EFL composition course at an English-medium university in Turkey. Participation to the study was kept strictly voluntary. Throughout an academic term, learners were asked to submit 5 academic essays (i.e. classification, cause-effect, comparison-contrast, 2 argumentative essays; 7 Reflection journals; and 3 peer review assignments to Turnitin.com. In total, 361 learner essays were selected for the internet-based service to compute the plagiarism detection statistics. At the beginning and end of the course, surveys (containing open-ended, multiple choice and likert-scale items) were administered to tap on a variety of issues: learner background (i.e. educational, study skills, etc), perceptions and motives behind plagiarism practices, their awareness levels about academic integrity and ability to detect plagiarism in excerpts. The other parts of the surveys were concerned with the factors (i.e. internet use) that influence the rate of student plagiarism practices, and learner perceptions related to the major benefits and drawbacks of Turnitin.com for EFL writing classes. The study adopted both a qualitative and a quantitative perspective. The potential alterations in the students' perceptions, knowledge and practices were measured by end-of-term surveys and

comparisons were drawn on numerous dimensions. Thematic analyses were carried out on learner responses to open-ended items of the surveys and descriptive statistics were computed for the other data sets.

The findings suggest that through the interactive nature of internet-based plagiarism detection services, EFL learners can build an awareness for plagiarism and academic integrity. The thematic analyses of student responses revealed a multiplicity of factors as playing a role in learner motives for plagiarism which include lack of language proficiency; low self-esteem; lack of time/ time concerns; lack of knowledge on topic/ topic is beyond level; lack of interest in the topic assigned; easy access to online materials; concern/desire to get high grades; finding shortcuts; previous schooling experiences; plagiarism as a springboard to idea development; unconscious internalization and ownership of sources; facing problems in determining topics to write about; learner perceptions on instructors' lack of sensitivity/interest towards learner work. Data analyses showed that the adoption of plagiarism detection software has helped learners to self-recognize ways to overcome possible plagiarism, reduced the attempts to plagiarize from external sources, which resulted in an overall decrease in plagiarism practices.

## ***G16. Tutor training and placement***

### **Crossing classroom/ writing center borders: Comparing two models of classroom-based writing tutoring with multicultural and non-mainstream students**

Steven J. Corbett  
*University of Washington*  
[scorbett@u.washington.edu](mailto:scorbett@u.washington.edu)

Curriculum- or classroom-based writing tutoring (CBT) programs are well-established WAC components in some of the most prestigious colleges across the country. The recent collection *On Location* (2005) highlights various theoretical and practical issues involved in CBT, and Margot Soven's 2006 *What the Writing Tutor Needs to Know* is the first book to combine equal advice on training tutors for work in writing centers or CBT programs. But just as all writing centers are not alike, CBT programs differ from institution to institution. This presentation will discuss the findings of a qualitative study currently being conducted at a major state research university comparing the writing fellows (writing advisor) model to a model where the tutor is in class every day (in-class tutor).

First I will compare practical and theoretical aspects of the two models of CBT. Depending on the needs and desires of the tutors, instructors, and program administrators some programs: do not ask tutors to comment on student papers; have tutors embedded in the classroom every day, or as often as possible; make visits to tutors optional, while others make them mandatory; offer hybrids that mix various approaches. Behind all these

methodological and practical choices also lie complex theoretical issues of power/ authority, collaborative control/ flexibility, and writing process/ product.

Next, I will illustrate how the preliminary study, began in 2003 and continuing to the present, compares versions of the writing advisors model to the in-class tutor model in multiple sections of a first-year composition stretch-course designed for multicultural/ non-mainstream students. Questionnaires, interviews, field observations, one-to-one tutorial transcripts and textual analyses of student portfolios triangulate complex, critical negotiations involving the roles, interactions, and expectations of the border-crossing collaborations between TAs, tutors, students and administrators.

### **But what difference can it make? A small-scale study of course-based peer tutoring**

Dara Rossman Regaignon  
*Pomona College*  
[dara.regaignon@pomona.edu](mailto:dara.regaignon@pomona.edu)

Candace Spigelman and Laurie Grobman have recently pointed out that “WAC tutors . . . play an increasingly important role in WAC pedagogy” (5). Similarly, Margot Soven argues that “peer tutoring” has become “the new mainstay of many WAC programs” (200) in the twenty-first century. If this is the case, then it is an important moment to assess the effectiveness of such programs. If WAC is likely to rely increasingly on course-based peer tutoring in the near future, then the time is ripe to study how and why it works. Why should faculty like the possibility? Why should higher administrations fund it?

Pomona College provides an ideal site for such research. For the first time in its history, Pomona will run three “Writing Fellows Courses” in Spring 2007. While these courses follow a common format (students submit drafts of their papers to dedicated Writing Fellows for feedback before turning revised versions in to the professors to be graded), because this is the beginning of the program, in the course we’re offering two additional courses with the same sequence of assignments *but without dedicated Writing Fellows*. As a result, we can examine time-sequenced portfolios of student writing in order to understand what kind of difference the integration of peer tutors into the courses has made.

Our findings will help us to make a case for the expansion of the program; we hope that they will enable WPAs at other institutions to make similar arguments. In addition, the Pomona study of course-based peer tutoring provides an opportunity for a critical re-examination of how and why – and *whether* – this approach to WAC works.

### **The efficacy of writing tutor training: Workshop versus course**

Alison Bright  
U.C. Santa Barbara

[alisonsbrown@yahoo.com](mailto:alisonsbrown@yahoo.com)

Although university-level writing centers are currently considered by many in the academic community to be a standardized resource on university campuses, the manner in which the peer-tutors are trained to work in such centers is by no means standardized. Some centers require their students to take a course in tutoring writing, while others train tutors in a short work-shop style module over a few days, typically held directly before the commencement of the fall term. Other writing centers extend this veritable crash course of tutor training over the term by requiring their tutors to attend staff development meetings or to read and/or respond to selections of readings from dominant voices within the writing center discourse.

Why is there such a large discrepancy in the manner in which students are trained to be writing tutors? Available resources for training may play a significant role in determining the mode in which some writing centers are able to employ training techniques. However, the lack of generalized agreed upon best practices necessary to include in tutor training sessions from within the writing center community, may in turn have a more significant role in the disparity of tutor training modules and content. Despite the multitude of practical reasons for implementing brief training workshops, many voices from within the writing center community continue to call for the implementation of tutoring training courses that carry academic credit, as the best means of training writing tutors. The results from the few empirical studies concerning various styles of tutor training often indicate a preference for implementing training, as opposed to abstaining from training all together, rather than a partiality of one module over another. Therefore, the endorsement of one training module over another may be based primarily on anecdotal evidence and the historical practices at specific universities. The persistent, underlying preference for a tutor-training course, in theory rather than practice, begs the question: what are the benefits of training tutors through a course module, as it is a significant expenditure in both time and money?

In this presentation, I will share the results of an investigation into the perceived benefits of a tutor-training course, in comparison with a workshop-style tutor training. I will examine possible differences in the modules through the guise of tutors' perceptions of their role within the writing tutorial. This specific aspect of peer tutoring dynamics will be examined as an illustrative difference in training styles. This aspect is one that may manifest itself during the course of a typical writing tutorial. Data will be gathered through tutorial observations and interviews with the participating writing tutors who were trained in the two different modules. This data may assist in isolating a specific connection between training modules and the philosophies of writing centers. This knowledge will assist in determining which training module best cultivates a tutor's understanding of his or her role. With this limited and preliminary data, clearer distinctions between training modules may be hypothesized.