

## **H Session Abstracts**

### ***H1. Needs of second-language writers: Overviews and contextualized applications***

#### **A synthesis of the results of basic research on second language writing: 1980 to 2005**

Tony Silva  
*Purdue University*  
[tony@purdue.edu](mailto:tony@purdue.edu)

This presentation will focus on describing and synthesizing the results of basic empirical research done between 1980 and 2005 on second language writers, their composing processes, and their written texts. Altogether, 193 studies were examined. Studies were limited to those in published form—books, book chapters, and journal articles. Not included were conference proceedings and ERIC documents. Additionally, studies in which writing was the medium, but not the focus were also excluded, as were studies in assessment.

A discussion of findings regarding the characteristics of second language writers will focus on second language variables, first language variables, transfer, psychological and sociological variables, and demographic variables, with special attention paid to second language writing ability, second language proficiency, and second language writing development. A discussion of findings regarding second language writers' composing processes will focus on revision, planning, general composing process issues, formulation, translation, and restructuring, with special attention paid to the findings on revising. A discussion of findings regarding second language writers' texts with regard to grammatical issues will focus on parts of speech/form classes, sentence elements, sentence processes, functional element classes, sentence qualities, and mechanics, with special attention paid to verb forms and lexical issues. A discussion of findings regarding second language writers' texts with regard to textual/discoursal issues will focus on cohesion, organizational/rhetorical patterns, and modes/aims, with special attention paid to the findings on lexical cohesion and narratives. Some generalizations about the entire body of second language writing research with regard to breadth, depth, and sustained programs of research, will also be presented.

#### **Genre interfaces: Investigating prior and evolving genre knowledge of second language writers**

Ilona Leki  
*University of Tennessee*  
[leki@utk.edu](mailto:leki@utk.edu)

Numerous studies of English language texts written by biliterate students have made claims about contrasts of rhetorics across cultures, but fewer studies have invited the students themselves to voice their own conscious and explicit understandings of the variety of influences that come to bear on their writing in English or their sense of their personal genre repertoires. This presentation reports on empirical research intended first to gauge the type and extent of genre knowledge, both first and second language, of international students newly arrived at a U.S. university and second to trace these students' evolving assumptions about genres by examining how that previous genre knowledge was acquired or developed and is maintained, transformed, abandoned, or expanded in the face of the new sociocultural and educational constraints and affordances of the discourse communities whose unfamiliar and potentially evolving communicative strategies these students may seek to understand.

Data for this study came from surveys of 100 incoming L2 English students and from both synchronic and longitudinal text-based interviews with a subset of that group. Information from the surveys suggests that, despite the emphasis among English as a Foreign Language programs in the last 10 years on communicative methods of language teaching which focus primarily on oral skills, the role of writing in English language education has expanded dramatically, possibly as a result of the inclusion of a writing exam with the TOEFL. However, interviews with the students suggested another effect of the washback from the TOEFL, the development among the students surveyed of consciousness of a genre that might be called an English writing test genre, one which the students describe themselves as having learned in writing classes, which they employ quite purposefully, and which they regard as narrow, though useful, and fairly strictly limited to English writing tests. Yet this constricted view of English writing is counterbalanced for some of the students interviewed by a less consciously elaborated but nevertheless clearly perceived understanding of a variety of other genres and of differences between L1 and L2 preferences for features of those genres.

## ***H2. Talk, text, and coherence***

### **How talk becomes text: an investigation of how talk activities support writing tasks in early years' classrooms**

Susan Jones

*University of Exeter, U.K.*

[susan.m.jones@ex.ac.uk](mailto:susan.m.jones@ex.ac.uk)

Debra Myhill

*University of Exeter, U.K.*

[d.a.myhill@ex.ac.uk](mailto:d.a.myhill@ex.ac.uk)

There is a strong tradition within primary classrooms of creating talk opportunities to facilitate learning. The oral skills that children have developed prior to formal schooling are viewed as a resource to support the development of the social, cognitive and

conceptual aspects of the curriculum. The use of talk as a key instructional tool for supporting emergent writers is well established practice in early years' classrooms. While there is an obvious relationship between speaking and writing, however, writing cannot be seen as merely speech written down. The Talk to Text Project, a two year study funded by the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, sought to investigate the strengths and limitations of creating specific strategies for talk as a support for writing in primary classrooms. Three specific talk opportunities related to writing were investigated: talk to support idea generation, talk to support the articulation of ideas before committing them to paper, and talk to support reflection about the demands of the writing task and metacognitive thinking. Lessons implementing these strategies were videoed capturing the teacher setting up a writing task supported by a talk activity. During the activity, a focus group of children were videoed talking and writing, and later, reflecting on the demands of the task in a whole class plenary. The writing produced in these lessons was also collected. This paper will focus on writing samples produced by four young writers aged 6-7 years, 2 boys and 2 girls, 2 able and 2 less able writers. The texts will be analysed in terms of the talk that was evident in the lessons that produced them, both teacher talk and children engaged with one another in talk activities. This paper will present a detailed contextualised analysis of how classroom talk transforms into written text.

### **Writing aloud: Oral rehearsal in the early years writing classroom**

Susan Jones

*University of Exeter, U.K.*

[susan.m.jones@ex.ac.uk](mailto:susan.m.jones@ex.ac.uk)

Debra Myhill

*University of Exeter, U.K.*

[d.a.myhill@ex.ac.uk](mailto:d.a.myhill@ex.ac.uk)

The principle that emergent writing is supported by talk, and that an appropriate pedagogy for writing should include planned opportunities for talk is well-researched and well-understood. In England, in the context of a curriculum which specifies both a programme of study for writing in the early years and expected outcomes, one pedagogic strategy for exploiting the talk-writing relationship is oral rehearsal. The term 'oral rehearsal' is now commonplace in English classrooms and curriculum documents, yet as a concept it is not well-theorised. Indeed, there is relatively little reference to the concept of oral rehearsal in the international literature, and what references do exist propose differing interpretations of the concept (Chaffee 1977, Murray 1979, Cleary 1996). At its most liberal, the term is used loosely as a synonym for talk; more precise definitions frame oral rehearsal, for example, as a strategy for reducing cognitive load during writing; for post-hoc reviewing of text; for helping writers to 'hear' their own writing; or for practising sentences aloud as a preliminary to writing them down. As part of a larger study investigating the transitions from talk to writing in the early years, this paper will offer an exploration of how oral rehearsal is enacted and realised in the early years'

writing classroom. The *Talk to Text* Project, a two year study funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, sought to investigate the impact of using talk to generate ideas and motivation for writing; the use of oral rehearsal of sentences as a preparation for writing; and the value of using talk to support reflection and metacognition. Drawing on video data, the paper will illustrate the diverse ways in which young writers use oral rehearsal before and during writing, and will show how oral rehearsal is used more actively by able writers in this age group.

### **‘Don’t forget your capital letters’: an investigation into the way teachers introduce writing activities to young writers**

Ros Fisher

*University of Exeter, U.K.*

[R.J.Fisher@ex.ac.uk](mailto:R.J.Fisher@ex.ac.uk)

It has long been argued that talk supports young writers in the act of writing. The *Talk to Text* Project, a two year study funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, sought to investigate the transitions from talk to writing in the early years. As part of the project, teachers and researchers developed a set of activities to encourage talk. Teacher and student talk during the implementation of these activities was captured on video and analysed using AtlasTi software.

The act of writing requires the orchestration of a range of knowledge and skills. Writers are ‘*creating coherent ideas in the private realm of thought and mapping those ideas into the public world of linguistic symbols*’ (Kellogg 1994). For young writers this includes the transcription of spoken or thought words into graphemic script, as well as the translation of ideas into written form. Yet teaching and learning take place within a socio-cultural context and participants’ understandings of what is taught and learned impact on student performance and attitudes.

Although each teacher used a variety of the project activities as well as their own favourites, the way in which each teacher introduced and taught the writing tasks varied considerably. Such variations seemed to impact on how children responded to the tasks. Close analysis of teacher practice together with analysis of children’s behaviour and the writing samples revealed important implications for how teacher talk impacts on student writing. This paper will explore how teachers’ understandings of writing can impact on the way they conduct writing instruction and on their students’ attitudes to writing. Drawing on in-depth interviews with teachers and students, as well as video data of writing lessons, the paper will explore the relationship between teachers’ views of writing, the lessons they give and the attitudes of their students to writing.

### ***H3. Writing and special needs in higher education***

**Dyslexic students’ writing: what kind(s) of problem, and for whom?**

Kate Chanock  
*La Trobe University, Australia*  
[C.Chanock@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:C.Chanock@latrobe.edu.au)

While numbers of students identified as dyslexic have risen dramatically in the last twenty years, dyslexia has become a grey area traversed by very disparate discourses – medical, social-constructionist, experiential, pedagogical, even (indirectly) anthropological. These focus on different aspects of the syndrome, and reveal different understandings about the nature and meaning of literacy; but they share a tendency to think of writing as (in Goody’s phrase, 2000) a “technology of the intellect” – a concept that works well with the dominant medical understanding of dyslexia. Insofar as writing is, indeed, a technology, this conception has led to the development of electronic tools to compensate for dyslexic writers’ difficulties with the written word. Software programs for brainstorming and outlining capture holistic thinking and help to reshape it to a linear structure. Voice-recognition programs allow students to compose with greater speed and accuracy. Screen-reading programs allow them to hear what they have written and revise their texts. Spelling checkers improve accuracy, though they do not guarantee it. At the cost of much time and attention, a sensible oral composition can be rendered as a sensible written text.

However, while a technological approach to dyslexia can facilitate communication, dyslexic writers will often gain only limited advantage by conforming to conventional expectations of text structure and (imperfectly) policing their spelling, for the technology cannot make up for limited experience with written language. The value that academic readers invest in surface accuracy goes much deeper than a simple need to understand what the writer is trying to say, for spelling does far more than encode the denotative meaning of a word; it also encodes cultural capital. Connotations and nuances of words are gleaned from experience of text, in which dyslexic writers are often somewhat lacking. Moreover, the ancestry and history of words are preserved in their spelling, so that errors with homophones (e.g., elude/allude) carry particular risks, exposing the writer as a person who does not know *about* language. Academic readers take pleasure in evidence of textual experience and cultural memory; unhappily, they also often take offence at evidence that these are lacking.

As long as dyslexia is predominantly understood as a medical condition, amenable to technological solutions, the cultural factors of disability remain unrecognised. Hence the question this paper asks: what kind(s) of problem is dyslexic writing, and for whom? What constructions of literacy underlie the various responses universities make to dyslexic writing? And how do these responses help, or fail to help, dyslexic students to become better writers?

### **Writing and Attitudes towards Disabilities**

Kathleen Patterson  
*U.C. Santa Barbara*

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

In 1985, political scientist Harlan Hahn urged academic communities to reject the medical and economic definitions of disability shaping clinical, educational, and governmental policies and practices and embrace instead an expansive sociopolitical understanding of disability. Since that time, disability studies has emerged as a legitimate discipline and landmark legislation protecting the rights of people with disabilities has been enacted. However, despite measurable gains, essentialist definitions of disability persist.

Disability rights advocates frequently note that, due to accident, illness, and/or aging, or simply due to physical differences, disability is a status that ultimately will either be conferred on or impact all human beings. This inclusiveness--as well as its "invisibility" and unfamiliarity--makes disability particularly well suited to serving a wide range of pedagogical purposes, and so I have, like other teachers of writing in and across the disciplines (Brueggemann et al., 2001; Mossman, 2002), used materials drawn from disability studies to provide students with alternative perspectives on difference/diversity to those offered by minority models grounded in ethnicity, gender, or sexuality.

My study examines how materials adapted from disability studies function in a first composition course as a means of crossing and extending the border between normative and nonnormative corporeal experience. In particular, I will investigate how students' experience of completing a research project on disability (addressing either issues related to access or the language of disability) impacts the ways in which they understand and define disability. The impact of this experience will be measured by comparative analyses of two data sets collected at the beginning and end of the research project: a formal survey measuring implicit/explicit attitudes toward disability and informal pre- and post-writing assignments on the topic of disability.

My analysis builds on previous research that points to ways in which disability studies and composition studies intersect as they challenge culturally entrenched binaries of theory and practice, self and other, abled and disabled (Brueggemann et al.). That my subjects are historically situated as the first generation growing up with the ADA in place (most were born in 1990, the year that the ADA was enacted) ...

#### ***H4. Writing, multimedia, and working memory***

##### **Writing a story text with multimedia extensions: comparing the contribution of the working memory**

Vasily Tseptsov  
*Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow*  
[zepez@psychol.ras.ru](mailto:zepez@psychol.ras.ru)

The differences between the phonological loop and visual sketchpad involvement in writing were widely observed in series of investigations (Kellogg, 1996, 1998, Piolat, Olive, 1999). We supposed that working memory model could be effective to represent the peculiarities of visual and phonological information processing during writing in native and foreign languages.

We developed an experiment based on Kellogg's triple-task procedure to test the cognitive effort under eight conditions that include foreign vs. native language probe, planning vs. translating phases of writing, and visual vs. phonological secondary task conditions.

It was found that the planning phase occupied primarily visual slave system of working memory in native language series and it was congruent with the previous findings. However, in native language series were observed more important difference between visual and phonological SRT.

Participants (128 undergraduate students) composed a story in Russian (English) using six consequently linked pictures (or – condition B - six textual fragments with the similar to the pictures semantic content) to arrange the plan for the story and performed a concurrent task (phonological or visual) designed to occupy the working memory slave systems. The concurrent task was applied at the arrangement (planning) phase or while translating.

We could note that visual planning is less language dependent process in both NL and FL conditions. Therefore, FL does not affect visuo-spatial sketchpad.

We could note that textual plan slightly decrease the writing time. It is a bit contradictory to the working memory model, because the textual plan should be stored in the phonological part of working memory. As a result, we should expect the interference between the plan and the translating process needs for the recourses. Our results are consistent with previous data reported in several investigations (Kellogg, 1998, Piolat, Olive, Roussey, Thunin, and Ziegler, 1999). It means that the differences in methodic are not critical. It was reported also that the direct retrospection is difficult to many students. In our experimentation, we avoided this point and it helps subjects to demonstrate their cognitive effort.

### **Content interference during text composition: Effects of resources in working memory**

Maria Chuy  
*Laboratory LMDC-CNRS – University of Poitiers*  
[maria.chuy@univ-poitiers.fr](mailto:maria.chuy@univ-poitiers.fr)

Denis Alamargot  
*Laboratory LMDC-CNRS – University of Poitiers*

Jean-Michel Passerault  
*Laboratory LMDC-CNRS – University of Poitiers*

The aim of this study was to examine the effects of Working Memory (WM) resources on the dynamics of content generation during text composition.

Content generation requires manipulation of two information sources: (1) Task environment, providing assignments and referential documents and (2) Long Term Memory (LTM) including domain knowledge (Hayes & Flower, 1980). The contents of these internal and external sources are not always congruent, and they can sometimes interfere with each other. Resolution of such an interference problem during writing would depend on WM capacity, which constrains the amount of information to be processed and maintained (Just & Carpenter, 1992).

In a first experiment, the participants (adults) were asked to compose an argumentative text by using 16 arguments displayed on a computer screen. These 16 arguments were either identical or interferent with 16 other arguments learned during a previous experimental phase and stored in LTM as previous knowledge. Writing activity was recorded with a digitizing tablet controlled by the 'Eye and Pen' software (Alamargot, Chesnet, Dansac & Ros, 2006). Writing pauses analysis indicates that the conflict between external (16 displayed arguments) and internal (16 learned arguments) sources only appears when WM capacity is important. The high span writers would have more capability to process the information derived from two different sources (Environment and LTM), and therefore, would be sensitive to the content interference during text composition.

We confirmed and specified this interpretation in two other experiments, by using (i) a concurrent load which reduces WM capacity of high span participants (experiment 2) and (ii) an increase of LTM knowledge activation which facilitates retrieval process of low span participants (experiment 3). We conclude on validity of our interpretation, and suggest that high WM capacity, permitting to process different sources of information, makes writer more susceptible to content interference during writing.

### **Writing and working memory: Verbal, visual and spatial demands of the writing processes**

Thierry Olive  
*CNRS & Université de Poitiers, France*  
[thierry.olive@univ-poitiers.fr](mailto:thierry.olive@univ-poitiers.fr)

Writing involves several resource-demanding cognitive processes that have to be orchestrated in working memory when composing a text. Understanding how writers juggle with these processes means understanding their dynamic (for a review, see Olive,

Kellogg & Piolat, 2002), but also the demands these processes places on working memory. Accordingly, since more than a decade, research on cognitive processes of writing has emphasized the relationships between writing processes and working memory.

Two theoretical perspectives have been adopted to describe the processing demands of writing (for a review, see Olive, 2004). Based on Just and Carpenters' (1992) theory, McCutchen (1996, 2000) elaborated a capacity theory of writing development and expertise. On the other hand, inspired by Baddeley's (1986) proposals, Kellogg (1996) proposed a componential model of working memory in writing which describes how the writing processes are supposed to engage the attentional, verbal and visuospatial components of working memory.

In this talk, I will focus on Kellogg's model to review findings of experiments that have explored the demands that writing processes place on the different components of working memory. More precisely, I will examine whether each writing processes and sub-process (generating, organizing, translating; reading, editing) require verbal, visual and spatial working memory. As a linguistic activity, writing indeed engages a verbal level of processing but, as a graphic activity, writing also involves a spatial level of processing. Finally, I will conclude by giving elements to develop future models of writing and working memory that take into account recent data and current models of working memory.

## ***H5. Literacies in a flat or fractured global landscape***

### **The psycholinguistics of writing and literacy in a flat world**

Alice S. Horning  
*Oakland University, Michigan*  
[horning@oakland.edu](mailto:horning@oakland.edu)

If Thomas Friedman is right that the world is “flat” we need to understand the linguistic implications of that claim. The forces creating the flat world enumerated by Friedman in *The world is flat* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2006) include political and technological changes. Many of these forces tie us increasingly to a screen and digital displays that include text and visual material. In this increasingly flat world, critical literacy is both urgently needed and poorly understood from a linguistic perspective. I propose that in this flat world, literacy is the most fully evolved of human language abilities, and that psycholinguistic research on literacy shows that humans' underlying abilities are constant from page to screen across digital and linguistic borders of all kinds, supporting three key claims.

The first claim is that the perceptual, cognitive and linguistic abilities required for literacy are consistent across print and digital environments, arising through processes like those in acquisition and in emergent literacy. Research of psycholinguists Frank Smith

(Understanding Reading, 2004), Kenneth Goodman (On Reading, 1996) and Stephen Kucer (Dimensions of Literacy, 2005) will provide the basis for this claim. To deal with print and digital texts, humans identify, categorize, discriminate, and predict, and make use of short-term memory, syntax and psycholinguistic redundancy. These will be illustrated with brief exercises.

The second claim runs counter to the view of many linguists. Human literacy, regardless of the venue in which it is purveyed, represents the most evolved form of human linguistic achievement. Additional exercises will show humans successfully navigate these new digital forms using two additional processing abilities: the ability to deal with bricolage (assembling from parts) and juxtaposition (positioning items in meaningful configurations). This claim is based on the work of literacy scholars Nicolas Burbules (“Rhetorics of the Web,” 1998), Jay David Bolter (Writing Space, 2001) and Lester Faigley (Picturing Texts, 2004).

My third claim is that the forms of literacy are themselves evolving through the development of new media that reflect the evolutionary processes of selection, hybridization, inbreeding and mutation. Here, the presentation will rely on the work of biologist Richard Lewontin (The Triple Helix: Gene, Organism, and Environment, 2000), and literacy scholars Gunther Kress (Literacy in the New Media Age, 2003) and Barbara Warnick (Critical Literacy in a Digital Era: Technology, Rhetoric, and the Public Interest, 2002).

A case study will illustrate these three claims, using Second Life as a base. The case study will show the use of basic linguistic abilities in combination with bricolage and juxtaposition and will show how the forms of literacy are changing. Finally, I will suggest several follow-up studies to explore the changing landscape of human critical literacy. Critical literacy in a flat world without borders requires a full understanding of the psycholinguistic research showing that literacy is the summit of human linguistic achievement.

## **Reading and writing in an age of violence**

Sanaa Makhlouf

*The American University in Cairo*

[sanaly@aucegypt.edu](mailto:sanaly@aucegypt.edu)

With today’s emphasis on the role of intensive writing in academic institutions, a more subtle neglect of the role of reading has been taking place. Difficult to assess it has been displaced by the seemingly simpler possibility of evaluating ‘thoughtful’ substantial writing. However, this neglect maybe exacting a higher cost than we have initially assumed. This paper intends to examine the tragic events of the University of Virginia Tech in the light of Hans Magnus Enzenberger’s concept of the “radical loser” to draw attention to the pivotal character of ‘writing’ as mirroring the deeper and darker thoughts of the suicide killer. It will further raise questions on the role of reading and writing in fostering such thoughts to determine the nature of their relation to violence thereby

placing the writing classroom in the center of the “war for the hearts and minds” of college students.

This is more so necessary in an age of violence which knows no cultural or social boundaries, and where a plethora of writing on ‘heroic’ violence, martyrdom, is available for glutinous consumption. It is even more essential to examine how to teach reading to the young, the potential radical loser, than it is to ask them to express their inner thoughts through writing. For as Enzenberger points out, the radical loser rarely invents his/her paranoid delusions... they are rather appropriated from the discourse of the culture they feel rejected from. Reading in classrooms under the guidance of teachers might offer college students the possibility to detect the banal in what is represented in popular culture as ‘heroic’ or ‘individual’ or ‘creative’ and help them counter its seductive power.

### **Appropriating critical spaces for counter narrative construction through international classroom exchanges**

Doris Jones

*American University in Cairo*

[djones@aucegypt.edu](mailto:djones@aucegypt.edu)

Brooke Comer

*American University in Cairo*

[brooke\\_c@aucegypt.edu](mailto:brooke_c@aucegypt.edu)

Drawing on the relevance of media theorist Marshall McLuhan’s “global village” argument,” this paper explores how international classroom exchanges can use the medium of film to stimulate critical discussions concerning cultural bias, cross-cultural confusion, stereotyping and counter narrative construction. By reviewing the impacts of globalization, the west can no longer take a parochial view of the world because media shapes our consciousness and further validates our perception of others. Given this powerful dichotomy, this paper argues that intercultural exchanges inherent in film can expand awareness about the variety of cultures found throughout the world. This multicultural exchange can build appreciation for rather than deprecate cultural differences. The advent of new information and communication technologies is providing the conduit through which innumerable opportunities for such exchanges can transcend distance between countries for purposes of exploring a variety of cultures. My teaching philosophy has combined content and critical pedagogical uses of diverse film narratives from Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas that communicate across many cultures and languages while simultaneously building a supportive learning environment to develop global perspectives for students to interrogate their own identities as economic, environmental, and technological changes impact their communities. Accordingly, the paper concludes with recommendations on how to incorporate intercultural communication into the classroom using films from across cultures. In addition, critical perspective is given to how might educators prepare their student to initiate communication with students around the world? Existing electronic

exchange programs such as E-Pals and Global Schoolnet can provide some guidance and lessons learned.

## ***H6. Current issues in writing research***

### **Present tense, past perfect: Research methods graduate training in technical communication and composition/rhetoric**

Rebecca Rickly

*Texas Tech University*

[rebecca.rickly@ttu.edu](mailto:rebecca.rickly@ttu.edu)

Stephen North has argued that the primary way we make knowledge in a discipline is through research. One of the most pressing issues in Technical Communication (TC) and Composition/Rhetoric(C/R) programs is how we prepare graduate students to "make knowledge" in their fields via the understanding of/ability to apply research methods. In her keynote address at the 2005 CPTSC, Rachel Spilka bewailed the inconsistent, inadequate preparation of graduate students in research methods, which manifested itself as non-rigorous applications of methods in CPTSC and STC grant proposals by faculty. Similar laments have been made in Composition as well. Knowledge is made in our fields primarily through research, and the preparation of graduate students in research methods is an issue that we're beginning to see as vital—and under-researched—in TC and C/R.

Most graduate programs in writing studies offer at least one course in research methods (often an overview, and often the only required course in research methods students will take), and I begin my presentation by reporting on the state of programmatic preparation garnered via a thorough analysis of PhD program websites in TC and C/R, building on initial work done by Kim Sydow Campbell. Using a relational database to gather and store information, we're able to see how similar programs prepare graduate students to make knowledge based on coursework preparation.

Simply knowing what is read and produced in required methods courses, however, might not give us an idea of how prepared students feel after taking this course—how confident they are to apply the methods they've studied in conducting actual research. Once we've established the state of programmatic preparation, my focus will move to the attitudes of new faculty concerning how satisfied they are with their preparation in research methods coursework, and how confident they feel they are to conduct research based on the training they've received. Junior faculty in TC and C/R with less than three years on the tenure track are being surveyed, and a preliminary survey indicates that a large portion of "training" that they deem most valuable did not come from coursework, but rather from self-sponsored learning (say, while conducting dissertation research) or learning from co-researchers or colleagues. This result is troubling, signifying that perhaps we aren't doing enough to prepare faculty to feel confident in conducting, analyzing, and representing research in their fields.

As technology has become more complex, as cultures and globalized contexts have become more accessible, our programs of study have naturally responded with more content courses—leaving less opportunity for students to gain experience with research methods. Is one course sufficient to prepare students to make knowledge in our field? And do graduate students feel prepared to make knowledge as a professional based on that one course? By examining these questions from a variety of angles, the professional nature of writing disciplines will be interrogated, and, more importantly, we will have a baseline—a starting point—for an important dialogue about what the required methods course should do, and how we might better prepare our graduate students to conduct good research in our field in this course.

### **Interdisciplinarity and writing research: Manifest citationality trends in three primary research journals**

Anthony Garrison  
[agarris1@kent.edu](mailto:agarris1@kent.edu)

Amanda Lindsay

Research in the field of writing can hardly continue to be completely labeled as thus. A cursory reading of any of the primary research journals in the field of rhetoric and composition will reveal a continued reliance on fields outside those typically concerned with the study of writing to find new and innovative ways to approach writing research or explain writing phenomena. This interdisciplinarity both distorts typical perceptions of the research article genre as well as broadens a commonly narrow scope of research agendas, indicating a renewed evolutionary path for the discipline. This paper presents current research on publication trends in three writing research journals over the past eighteen years. Covering more than 800 articles, this meta-analysis charts the manifest citationality, noting common moves in each journal to draw significantly from other disciplines to establish research goals. Using genre theory and assuming a sociohistoric lens, this presentation investigates the data to draw inferences based on the aforementioned trends as they stipulate the types of research performed currently in the writing field and the training of future scholars through evolving Ph.D. program curricula. Ultimately the data evidence a new disciplinary doctrine of conceiving research in innovative, post-compositional ways.

### ***H7. Models for describing writing practices***

#### **Toward a dynamic conception of written production**

Michel Fayol  
*Université Blaise Pascal & CNRS, France*  
[fayol@srvpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr](mailto:fayol@srvpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr)

Writing is one of the most complex and uniquely human of cognitive activities. Psychological research has enhanced our understanding of the cognitive processes, mental representations, and textual properties that contribute to successful writing. Many factors that influence written production have been identified. However, each factor tends to be studied in isolation with little consideration of how they operate alongside each other and in interactive ways.

Two types of studies have been conducted. Some of them are exclusively concerned with written products ; some others are concerned with the writing processes. They must be closely connected. Two types of mechanisms have been proposed, some being highly automated, the writer having (almost) no control over the information activated, and some others being strategically triggered to produce efficient texts. Such processes must be combined in a single framework.

We will present a large series of studies conducted in written French. Some of them deal with the description of the evolution of writing products (mainly narratives) in children from 6 to 10 years of age. Some others are concerned with the on-line management of writing by children and adults : pauses as well as writing rates are studied as a function of content and formal factors. A third series reports experiments aimed at trying to integrate the results of on-line and off-line studies : determining the impact of low-level processes (e.g. graphic transcription ; spelling) onto the management of higher level processes (quantity and quality of texts), and the reverse.

We will thus try to provide a dynamic conception of written production, a framework for considering and integrating multiple factors during writing.

### **Constructing knowledge objects in writing**

David Galbraith

*Centre for Educational Psychology Research, U.K.*

[d.galbraith@staffs.ac.uk](mailto:d.galbraith@staffs.ac.uk)

This paper will describe a dual process model of writing, outline some of the empirical evidence on which it is based, and explore its implications for the teaching and learning of writing. According to the model, writing involves two distinct kinds of processing. The first – knowledge-transforming – process involves the creation and manipulation of an explicit mental model in working memory designed to satisfy the writer’s rhetorical goals. The second –knowledge-constituting – process involves the dispositional articulation of the writer’s implicit understanding of the topic in spontaneous text. Both processes are required for effective writing, but are optimized under opposing conditions. This is the source of a fundamental conflict in writing, which is resolved in different ways depending on the goals prioritized by different writers and on the specific conditions under which particular episodes of writing are carried out.

The main basis for the model is the results of experiments examining the conditions under which different writers develop their ideas through writing (Galbraith, 1992, 1996, 1999; Galbraith, Torrance & Hallam, 2006). These experiments consistently show that low self-monitors (who are assumed to prioritize dispositional goals when they write) discover new ideas when they write rough drafts of spontaneous text, but not when they make plans in note-form prior to writing. This is assumed to involve a bottom-up process, in which the writer's implicit understanding of the topic is articulated in spontaneous text, and emerging content is then organized into a coherent mental model of the text. Recent research showing that the new ideas produced by low self-monitors during writing maintain the conceptual coherence of writer's thought support this claim (Galbraith, Torrance & Hallam, 2006). By contrast high self-monitors (who are assumed to prioritize rhetorical goals during writing) discover more new ideas when planning in note-form than when they write full text. This is assumed to reflect a top-down process, in which high self-monitors first develop an explicit mental model for the text designed to satisfy rhetorical goals, and then use this to guide the realization of the model in text. Recent research suggests that, although the new ideas produced by this process may satisfy rhetorical goals, they are not conceptually coherent with the writer's existing ideas. There is also evidence that the extent to which ideas are transformed by this form of explicit problem solving is reduced by secondary tasks loading on the spatial component of working memory (Galbraith, Ford, Walker & Ford, 2004).

The paper will conclude by discussing how the model can account for individual differences in the effectiveness of different drafting strategies (Galbraith, Torrance & Hallam, in preparation) and different teaching strategies (Kieft, Rijlaarsdam, Galbraith & Van den Bergh, in press).

## ***H8. Assessment as a tool for student learning***

### **Automated essay scoring feedback vs. teacher feedback: Effects on student writing**

Noreen Moore  
*University of Delaware*  
[nmil@UDel.Edu](mailto:nmil@UDel.Edu)

Automated Essay Scoring (AES) technologies have been gaining steady ground in schools across the United States as writing assessment and instructional tools. Much of the research conducted on AES technologies has focused on issues of reliability and validity. However, very little research has examined this technology as an instructional tool. Still, many of the technology and educational companies who market these technologies to schools package them as writing instruction. One area of particular interest within AES technologies is the feedback provided to students and its potential to impact students' overall writing quality and revision processes. AES feedback often takes the form of holistic or trait scores; in-line comments on grammar, style, mechanics, organization; and summative comments about the content of the essay. In this panel presentation, I will share the preliminary findings of a study that examined several

aspects of the feedback provided by MY Access!, an application of AES technology in a web-based instructional format. This study examined the nature of comments provided by classroom teachers (5th-8th grade) compared to comments provided by MY Access! and the effects of these different types of comments on the quality and quantity of students' revisions.

### **Homeopathic writing: The use of technological, student self-assessment strategies**

Aurora Matzke  
*California Polytechnic University*  
[asturley@calpoly.edu](mailto:asturley@calpoly.edu)

Genesea Carter  
*California Polytechnic University*  
[gcarter@calpoly.edu](mailto:gcarter@calpoly.edu)

Maureen Maithison  
*University of Utah*  
[maureen.mathison@hum.utah.edu](mailto:maureen.mathison@hum.utah.edu)

Chuck Paine suggests composition has become “medicinal”: instructors inoculate students against “bad” rhetorical arguments, instead of teaching students to assess different levels of argumentation concurrently. Similarly, Writing Centers are oftentimes perceived as laboratory environments—where students go to get grammatical and structural errors “fixed.” Unfortunately, a “medicinal” approach often alienates students: the focus is on quick compositional surgery, rather than students' self-actualization. Particularly in danger are at risk students—those already on the outskirts of writing instruction.

To bridge the gap from the “lab” to student understanding and practice, Writing Centers should strive to affect students beyond classroom and assignment boundaries. To place creative, technologically driven tools into the hands of students who may feel marginalized due to their “illnesses,” we are in the process of implementing an online, university, Writing Center Hub with student-created blogs.

The Hub is currently available to a select group of composition and argumentation students, who, in conjunction with their instructors, are helping build the site by developing materials, available pages and visual media. The hub now includes links to several different learning-style quizzes, handouts, and exercises built around student preferences; furthermore, we are researching how the materials enable writing skill self-assessment. Additionally, we are implementing student-created blogs to encourage communication; these online spaces will allow students to chat with each other and ask tutors writing-related questions—bridging the gap between “The Google Generation” and traditional Writing Center spaces.

Our ongoing case studies, with freshmen throughout our writing program, are

enlightening us as to what students will and will not use and why. By conducting interviews with students, tutors and instructors, we hope to determine what really will work.

Writing Centers—or the equally common “medicinal” term, Writing Labs—can expand students’ understanding of what it means to learn, giving students the skills to assess themselves, so they can self-actualize their educational needs.

### **Developing reflection as a genre**

Ellen Krogh, Ph.D.  
*University of Southern Denmark*  
[ellen.krogh@ifpr.sdu.dk](mailto:ellen.krogh@ifpr.sdu.dk)

The paper discusses reflection as a classroom genre balancing process and product. It draws on a case study of portfolio assessment in the Danish upper secondary school, referring to socio cultural writing theory, genre theory and reflection theory.

In the portfolio class reflective writing and reflective communication on writing were integrated parts of writing processes and portfolio assessment practices. ‘Reflection’ covered both oral and written activities. It was initially established as a classroom genre, i.e. as recurrent ritualized and staged *processes* which appeared transparent as to textual qualities. However, as reflections were assessed as part of the presentation portfolios, the teacher initiated discussions of textual qualities in reflections and also gradually developed normative instructions on the textual features of the reflective texts in the presentation portfolios. Still, the students were allowed somewhat different genre interpretations and personal styles.

Drawing on Yancey’s (1998) conceptualization of three kinds of reflection the paper presents an analysis of student reflections focusing on two interdependent features: the students’ conceptions of reflection as a text genre, balancing the reflective and rhetorical aspects, and their ways of positioning themselves as writers. The analysis highlights both gender differences and differences of cultural resources, manifesting themselves in the students’ rhetorical styles as well as in their weaker or stronger invocation of an out-of-school identity as a writer.

The analysis, however, also highlights delicate balances in reflection as an educational genre. The question of process and product genres represents a wider perspective. At what point does reflection stop being reflective activity, turning into just another discipline specific text genre? And at the other hand: at what point does reflection stop being reflection on discipline content, turning into a personal process diary?

## ***H9. Global academic, and professional writing***

### **Research writing for international audiences: Problems and prospects**

John M. Swales  
*University of Michigan*  
[jmswales@umich.edu](mailto:jmswales@umich.edu)

The current strong trend whereby scholars and researchers with English as an Additional Language (EAL) are expected to publish in Anglophone international journals is both spreading and intensifying. Countries that have recently adopted this policy include Spain, Taiwan, Malaysia and Sri Lanka; in China, salary supplements are now offered to those who publish in high impact ISI journals (Cargill & O'Connor, 2006). While the causes of this phenomenon are somewhat unclear, the consequences are fairly obvious: Increased competition, increased emphasis on “hot” international topics such as global warming or nanotechnology at the expense of local priorities, and increased anxiety among EAL researchers.

Certain constituencies in the world community of academic writing teachers, materials producers and researchers have begun to respond to the EAL challenge. In January 2007, the first conference on “Publishing and Presenting Research Internationally” was held in Tenerife, and the title of the biennial conference of the British Association of Lecturers in English in April 2007 was “EAP in a globalizing world: An academic lingua franca”.

In this paper, I evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the current research base for helping people write for publication. There are, for example, considerable differences in the amount of information we have about the texts produced by and for different disciplinary communities (Hyland, 2000). There are some studies of the processes of getting published, and much more information available today (often on the web) than even a few years ago, raising questions about whether there are any “occluded genres” (Swales, 1996) left. I discuss the contributions that content-area specialists can make, such as John Benfield, the ex-editor of the *Annals of Thoracic Surgery*. And there are issues about the best way to exploit specialized electronic corpora, such as those constructed for workshops for post-doctoral fellows in perinatology in Detroit and for graduate students in political science at Waseda University, Tokyo.

### **Some rhetorical and discursive features of Spanish dental academic writing: A exploratory study**

Oscar Alberto Morales  
[oscarula@ula.ve](mailto:oscarula@ula.ve)

Daniel Cassany

We will describe some typical rhetorical and discursive features of the Spanish Dental Academic Writing (SDAW), which haven't been studied yet. We analyzed three different genres of four leading Hispanic Dental journals (Spanish, Venezuelan and Cuba) published between 1989-2005: 10 review articles (RA), 10 case reports (CR) and 10 research papers (RP) from each journal (120 texts). Using Swales' genre analysis model,

we analyzed the rhetorical structures, the movements of the rhetorical sections and the hedging devices used in each genre, and compare the results with some research done in English.

We found that even though SDAW has some common features with other academic and professional writing, such as medical writing, it has some particular features, rhetorical movements and communicative functions. The prototypical rhetorical organizations found were: In the RA, introduction-development-conclusion; its movements coincide partially with **Swales'** CARS model, **Murlow's** criteria, and **Myers's** findings. In the CR, a three-section structure predominated: introduction-case presentation-discussion. Its movements coincided in some way with those **Taavitsainen & Pahta** found in medical CR. Finally, RP followed predominantly the IMRyD format. Its movements were similar to the medical RP (**Day, Huth, Nwogu, Williams, and Hopkins & Dudley-Evans**). Finally, we found that hedging is a common semantic-pragmatic strategy used in the SDAW, among those shields, approximators and impersonal constructions reported a high frequency (**Salager-Meyer**).

We conclude that the characteristics of the SDAW, its communicative functions and the position of the authors, condition the writing of the different discursive genres. Moreover, the expectations of members of the Dental community related to academic writing could determine the way authors present propositions. Results could have didactic implications for teaching SDAW. It should be based on the empirical evidence: the way dentists (clinicians, researchers and professors) produce and interpret discourse in professional and academic settings.

### **Peer review practices in engineering: Patrolling the border between local research and public knowledge**

Marty Patton

*University of Missouri-Columbia*

[PattonMD@missouri.edu](mailto:PattonMD@missouri.edu)

What is accepted as public knowledge in engineering or in any other discipline are those claims that have been justified in writing and have survived a process of peer review. In engineering and elsewhere, peer reviewers are entrusted to guard the border between fact and fiction, science and pseudoscience, sound engineering practices and risky ones. Peer review, however, is a human activity saturated with socio-historic variables, and the border between sound engineering practices and risky ones exists partly in the mental maps of the reviewers. In this presentation, I investigate some of the socio-historic variables in the peer review practices of engineering, not to impugn science or peer review, but to counter a naïve faith in objectivity and to underscore the importance of an open, ongoing system capable of self-correction.

This study builds on an existing literature about peer review practices in medicine, physics, and psychology by focusing on rhetorical practices in the peer review activity of engineers. Already completed is an IRB-approved survey of engineering faculty and their

peer review practices. Interviews followed from a number of the surveys. Not yet completed is an investigation of journal-specific variations in engineering, including but not limited to submission and acceptance rates, rates of disagreement among reviewers, and the status of the contributors and their institutions. Other socio-historic variables will be discussed, too, especially as they illuminate differences in various engineering activity systems and the role of argumentation in each of them.

While the study may help foster a healthy self-consciousness among engineers about the strengths and limitations of peer review, it may also articulate some significant differences between genre systems in engineering (heavily constrained and conserved) and in rhetoric and writing studies (far more open and interpretive).

## ***H10. Expanding the borders of literacy practices***

### **“At the crossroads”: South African students’ negotiation of language, home, institutional and disciplinary discourses in a time of transition**

Assoc. Prof. Rochelle Kapp  
*CHED, University of Cape Town*  
[rkapp@ched.uct.ac.za](mailto:rkapp@ched.uct.ac.za)

Bongi Bangeni  
*CHED, University of Cape Town*

Our paper is drawn from a longitudinal case study (2002-4) in which we have tracked the progress of twenty ‘at risk’ undergraduate Social Science students over the course of their undergraduate degrees at the University of Cape Town, a historically ‘white’, English-medium institution. Aside from one Chinese student, the students are all ‘black’, from disadvantaged educational backgrounds and/or speakers of English as a second language. They are nearly all the first in their families, sometimes the first in their communities, to attend university. As a result of increasing access to higher education in the ‘new’ South Africa, over 50% of the University’s student population is ‘black’. However, at present, 75% of academic staff members in Humanities are ‘white’ and many of the dominant institutional academic and cultural practices are still male, ‘white’ and English in character.

We use post-structuralist and post-colonial theory to describe how students position and reposition themselves in relation to English; institutional and disciplinary discourse practices and in relation to home over the course of their undergraduate years. In their personal lives, our students both absorb and resist the values of the institution and of their disciplinary discourses in response to (often conflicting) pressures from the institution and home. They also use English more and more in their informal, everyday environments. In their quest to construct a place to belong and as part of signaling their identities as ‘rainbow’ nation ‘new’ South Africans, they cross ethnic, class and linguistic

boundaries. They clearly signal separate 'black', working-class identities and are articulate in their critique of disciplinary and home discourses.

The paper explores the connection between students' shifting notions of self and their writing identities. The critical reflection and boundary crossing evident in their everyday discourse is absent from their writing in their senior years. Through analysis of their essays, we argue that their writing becomes increasingly fluent in reproducing the appropriate content and conventional structure of Social Science discourse, but that their writing stance becomes increasingly deferential and conformist. We show how this identity construction connects to their ambivalent positions as border-crossers.

The paper ends with a discussion of how disciplinary disciplines can make it possible for students from marginalized/ working class communities to enter into the discourse with critical reflection.

### **Institutional critique and research ethics: Theorizing a “border” approach to discussions of institutional and administrative identity**

Steve Lamos

*University of Colorado-Boulder*

[lamos@colorado.edu](mailto:lamos@colorado.edu)

In this presentation, I explore the difficulties that can arise when writing researchers reference the identities of specific institutions and/or specific administrative actors (e.g. Deans, Chairs, WPAs) within “institutional critique” scholarship designed to analyze “how power operates within institutional space” (Porter et al. 631).

I begin by suggesting that contemporary examples of such scholarship have tended to characterize institutional / administrative identity either “historically,” i.e. as part of a public record to be interrogated and critiqued (e.g. Parks' *Class Politics*; Soliday's *Politics of Remediation*), or “ethnographically,” i.e. as part of a private institutional record to be protected via pseudonym (e.g. DiPardo's *A Kind of Passport*; Grabill's *Community Literacy Programs*). I then argue that both approaches are potentially flawed, as the former risks doing inadvertent harm to the reputations of individual administrative actors (particularly in cases where administrators may not have perceived their work as “public”), while the latter risks omitting historical and contextual information necessary for detailed understandings of institutional power.

Next, I propose a hybrid approach to such scholarship designed to straddle the borders between “historical” and “ethnographic” approaches: simply put, I argue that researchers begin identifying institutions directly within their work while identifying administrative actors by institutional title alone. I claim that this border approach, though not without its limitations, ultimately permits some degree of historical and contextual specificity while simultaneously assuring some degree of semi-anonymous protection for administrators under scrutiny.

Finally, I highlight the ways in which this border approach has proven useful within my own attempts to analyze “EOP Rhetoric” at the University of Illinois, a writing program for “high-risk” minority students operating from 1968 until 1993. Specifically, I discuss how this approach has helped me to address concerns regarding EOP Rhetoric administrator identity as raised by parties both at Illinois and within the larger field of composition.

### **The law of unintended consequences: Out-of-school literacies in sustaining and enriching social futures**

Sundy Watanabe  
*University of Utah*  
[suwatanabe@comcast.net](mailto:suwatanabe@comcast.net)

“The unglamorous though gratifying work of sustainable humanitarian design is making an impact far beyond the populations served.” ~ Sergio Palleroni, (2006, December)  
*Architectural Digest*, p. S34

Gee (1996) suggests literacy is a tool utilized according to its embedded “Discourse” with “no generalized meaning or function apart from the . . . social activities which render it ‘useful’ and which it in turn shapes” (p. 37). Literacy defined as a locally situated/mediated technology is, then, useful only by community decision. Work of the New London Group (1996) indicates that traditional literacy may not be as essential to “social futures” as we often believe. According to Collins and Blot (2003), many people “do not rely on literate practices or do so only recently and secondarily” yet exhibit capacity for “language, intellect, . . . social living [and] technical resourcefulness (p. 2).

Flower (2005), Hocks (2003), and Key (2002) also question how literacy might be more broadly defined and ask us to consider alternative design<sup>1</sup>, instruction, and product. When we consider this approach in light of Cavalcanti’s (2004) study, literacy instruction outside the realm of traditional schooling becomes significant. He notes, “If writing *on its own* solved the problem, there wouldn’t be thousands of people who actually know how to read and write dying of hunger in big towns” (p. 319, emphasis added).

Reaching across academic disciplines to interrogate the privileging of writing may create additional communicative resources and recognize a greater variety of Discourses and modes than have previously been available, including the “visual [and] gestural,” as well as those evoked through “music and movement” (Thesen, 2001, p. 136). This paper juxtaposes three alternative and interdisciplinary modes – intercultural inquiry, visual rhetoric, and literacy-in-community – to analyze their applicability for North American Native populations in sustaining and enriching social futures.

---

## ***H11. Environmental and sustainability writing***

### **An evolving genre, sustainability reporting in a global setting: How and why organizations learn to write sustainability reports**

LeeAnne Kryder

*U.C. Santa Barbara*

Within the past decade, in response to concerned stakeholders and the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), increasing numbers of global businesses, local governments, and non-governmental organizations (NGO's) have initiated a new genre: sustainability reports. While similar to established annual reports, these sustainability reports mark a new approach whereby much of the organizational structure and content is determined by external agencies and audiences; the content is complex and crosses a variety of disciplines; and the authorship is more diverse than traditional public relations and financial departments. A rich, global sensibility and refined measurement through enhanced technology also characterize these reports.

This presentation reviews the development of this new genre, identifying a variety of external and internal pressures and agencies that have contributed to its formation. These include knowledgeable investors, concerned employees, business associations, advocacy groups, and intergovernmental agencies. While still evolving, the sustainability report has specific elements that can be identified. These elements are noted in specific sustainability reports recently published from businesses, government, and higher education. The reports are examined using a combination of rhetorical analysis, secondary research, and informational interviews with report authors. Preliminary findings, as well as suggestions for further research and application within professional writing pedagogy, will be presented.

### **Intertextuality, representations of science, and the social construction of argumentation in professional discourses: The case of climate change**

**Graham Smart**

*Carleton University*

[graham\\_smart@carleton.ca](mailto:graham_smart@carleton.ca)

As debates over global climate change intensify in public and political forums, researchers in different disciplines have turned to methods of discourse analysis to study socially constructed argumentation within contesting professional discourses (Carvalho & Burgess, 2005; Hovden & Lindseth, 2004; Livesey, 2002; Weingart, Engels, & Pansegrau, 2000). To contribute to this line of research, I have begun to examine the discursive field (Bourdieu, 1984; Foucault, 1999; Liepins, 1998) jointly enacted by various professional organizations—environmental NGOs, political parties, government agencies, scientific bodies, business corporations, and think-tanks—as they construct and

deploy arguments about the reality and implications of climate change in efforts to influence public opinion and government policy. This paper will report on one aspect of this research: how science and scientific knowledge are variously represented by different professional organizations in advancing arguments over climate change.

The paper begins by presenting a theoretically informed analytical framework for studying socially constructed knowledge and public argumentation in professional discourses, drawing on theories of discourse (Dryzek, 1997; Fairclough, 1992; Gee, 1999; Hajer, 1995), genre (Artemeva & Freedman, 2006; Bazerman & Russell, 2003; Bhatia & Gotti, 2006), and intertextuality (Bauman, 2004; Bazerman, 2004; Devitt, 1991; Fairclough, 1992; Linell, 1998) as well as on ‘argumentative discourse analysis (Hajer, 2005, 1995), an approach that provides conceptual tools for examining the public arguments constructed by opposing ‘discourse coalitions’ of social actors. The paper then applies this analytical framework in examining the discursive practices, discourse genres, and texts employed by professional organizations in advancing public arguments on climate change. The first part of the analysis describes two competing discursive positions regarding climate change: what I term the ‘*status quo* discourse’ and the ‘the discourse of global action’. The second part of the analysis looks at differing textual responses by social actors holding these two opposing positions to a set of four reports released sequentially during 2007 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, focusing on how science and scientific knowledge are represented across these textual responses as authoritative, uncertain, or misleading.

## ***H12. Writing in graduate programs – Languages and genres***

### **Mediating tools in PhD defenses: Affordances or constraints**

Christine Räisänen  
*Chalmers University of Technology*  
[christine.raisanen@chalmers.se](mailto:christine.raisanen@chalmers.se)

The most important rite of passage in a graduate student’s career is the PhD defense. Yet, this system of genres has been little researched, probably due to the fact that in many countries the defense is occluded. In Sweden, however, the PhD defense is a public event; a fascinating performance in which two protagonists (or should I say) an antagonist and a protagonist, engage in a battle of words. Silent characters are also involved in this dramatic event. These are the arbitrators; the ones who, subsequently, may or may not bestow the title of “legitimate knower” upon the hero. Furthermore, the hero has one or more accomplices, or advisors, also silent observers, who have high stakes in the unfolding genre. The props used to mediate meaning in the situated social interaction are multi-modal, consisting of written and spoken texts, other semiotic means and technical tools and arrangements.

Using a dialogic and socio-cultural perspective (Bakhtin 1986; Scollon 1998; Wertch 1998), this paper analyses PhD defenses in two disciplines, focusing on the semiotic tools used to mediate meaning and action. The disciplines, Technical Design and Building

Economics are hybrid (Räisänen 1999), at the interfaces of technology and social science. The actors therefore lack an ontological, epistemological and ideological foundation from which to draw in constructing their arguments. They have to borrow from their technological and social-science peers. In addition, the mix of actors involved in the defenses is heterogeneous, representing many disciplines and cultures. Thus, the linguistic tools used may be affordances for some and constraints for others. How do PhD candidates negotiate meaning in such a situation? How well prepared are they for this critical rite of passage?

**Language and learning online: <http://www.monash.edu.au/lls/llonline/>  
Writing tuition as writing research**

Jan Pinder  
*Monash University, Australia*  
[jan.pinder@calt.monash.edu.au](mailto:jan.pinder@calt.monash.edu.au)

Doctoral writing is becoming an increasing area of concern to writing instructors and teachers of graduate students, with changes to student and academic demographics, the need for students to produce publishable work during their candidature, and increasing pressure on universities to shorten completion times. Writing instruction and support in this area has traditionally been a matter of one-to-one teaching, in line with the individual nature of the research degree itself – especially in the Australian context, where research students generally do no coursework at all. Instructors are often under pressure from their institutions to provide more group teaching, but this can be a challenge when students come from different educational and linguistic backgrounds, and may be at different stages in their writing process. It is here that the notion of using one-to-one work as a form of research to inform group teaching, elaborated most notably by Kate Chanock (2007), is useful. In my paper I relate the development, over three semesters, of a writing course for non-native doctoral writers, using an individual teaching phase to gather data for the building of a curriculum. In the first semester of the course, students referred by their supervisors were given up to 20 hours of individual tuition. Data was gathered in the form of student writing samples and a journal in which I kept notes on each teaching session. Analysis of this data formed the basis of the next phase, a series of classes combined with a limited number of individual consultations. In this phase, I used an action research methodology to further refine the curriculum for the following semester and improve the balance between individual needs and contexts. This paper presents a reflection on this action research process.

**Teaching EAP writing at the graduate level: The role of first year ESL writing courses**

Hyunju Lee  
*Ohio State University*  
[lee.2445@osu.edu](mailto:lee.2445@osu.edu)

Many North American Universities require incoming international students to meet certain writing requirements upon arrival. At a glance, what sets these students apart from their domestic counterparts seems to be proficiency in English. Thus, first-year writing courses are expected to cover sentence-level and discourse-level proficiency. For graduate students, these courses are also perceived as preparation for writing in their own discourse communities. This brings us back to the question of whether the EAP teacher can meet the tall order of providing domain-specific instruction (Spack, 2001). A tangible solution for this problem seems to be genre-based writing instruction. By learning the general principles of common academic genres, students are expected to acquire the ability to pick up new genre conventions as they go on with their academic careers (Hirvela, 1997). While genre-based knowledge has provided much insight on what the students' needs are and how to prepare materials to teach, we know little about how individual learners actually respond to this type of instruction (Cheng, 2006). This presentation will report preliminary findings of a 20week (2 quarter)-long investigation on the learning process of 10 graduate student writers during their first two quarters at a North American University. The researcher is the instructor of both courses. While completing prototypical genre assignments through several drafts, students are instructed to pay additional attention to sentence-level or discourse-level language items that are especially prominent in each genre. The study qualitatively analyzes data from multiple sources to arrive at a "constructed reality" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of how specific learners interact with genre based instruction.

### ***H13. Student roles and strategies across the curriculum***

#### **Three students join a community of practice and acquire an academic voice to write from: Chicano Activist Writers and their writing development**

Sarah Boggs  
U.C. Santa Barbara  
[sarah-boggs@hotmail.com](mailto:sarah-boggs@hotmail.com)

The current literature in service learning fails to look at how adding a service component to a writing class affects student writing development. In this retroactive interview study I examine how a kind of service learning that focuses on moving students towards activism affected student writing development. I study three students who describe themselves as Chicano activists and took courses from an activist professor who encourages and requires students to participate in activist work, examine their cultural identity through the readings and writing assignments and share their personal stories with the classroom public. At least one of the case studies suggests that it was not until the student became an activist that she was able to speak from a voice of authority and maintain a subject position that was valued in academic writing.

#### **Preparing students to write: A case study of the role played by student questions in their quest to understand how to write in economics**

Barbara Wake  
*University of Adelaide, Australia*  
barbara.wake@adelaide.edu.au

This paper presents results from a case study of the apparent challenges facing second language international students as they prepared to write a short answer assignment in economics. Using tutorial discussion to mediate the students' understanding of their task, the results reveal that while the lecturer and students' interactions were a highly collaborative process, any transformations in the students' understanding were not at all neatly incremental, as described in the literature on social mediation and classroom talk. Indeed, it was found that the lecturer's explanations necessarily provided assumed background knowledge before the students could undertake their writing task. It will be shown that the students' questions played a key role in influencing this process.

The examination of the students' questions will use the analytic categories for asking questions developed by Hasan (1983, 1989) and Hasan and Cloran (1990). As well, the presentation will show linguistically the kinds of strategies undertaken by the lecturer in response to the students' enquiries and the impact these strategies had on the students' appropriation of meaning; and secondly, how prediction and consequence, being the *raison d'être* of written economic discourse, were reconstrued dialogically in the discussion.

### **Science-based written summarization and opinion essay-writing of academically-underprepared community college students**

Dolores Perin  
*Teachers College, Columbia University*  
[dp111@columbia.edu](mailto:dp111@columbia.edu)

Many students enter community colleges underprepared for the writing demands of postsecondary education. The colleges offer remedial programs, called developmental education, but rarely is the curriculum related directly to subject matter the students will later study, such as science. Further, there is a shortage of controlled intervention studies with postsecondary remedial students, despite that fact that 40-90% of community college entrants have difficulty with literacy tasks. The current study measures the effectiveness of an intervention designed to improve several literacy skills including written summarization and the writing of opinion essays. In particular, the study measures the effect of contextualizing the instruction in science content. The research, funded by the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education, is in progress, and findings for year 1 and the first half of year 2 will be presented.

The intervention, called the "Content Comprehension Strategy Intervention" (CCSI), is a self-paced, self-directed supplement to the community college remedial writing curriculum. CCSI consists of ten units that provide practice in tasks including written summarization and the writing of opinion essays. Intervention effectiveness is measured

using a no-treatment comparison group, and the effects of contextualizing the instruction in science content are measured through random assignment of intervention participants to a science or generic-content condition. Forty-eight classrooms in three community colleges are participating in the study.

Science summarization, opinion-essay writing and reading comprehension are measured pre-post and throughout the intervention. Covariates include science knowledge, motivation and interest, and student variables such as general academic performance, ethnicity, and English language proficiency. Pre-post comparisons are measured using a repeated measures MANCOVA and growth curves are plotted for responses over the 10 intervention units. Besides presenting quantitative findings, the presentation will include a discussion of selected writing samples illustrating improvement in writing skill resulting from the intervention.

### ***H14. Words and gatekeeping in academic writing***

#### **Spanish scholars writing research articles in English: an intercultural analysis of the use of hedges and boosters**

Pilar Mur Dueñas  
Universidad de Zaragoza (Spain)  
[pmur@unizar.es](mailto:pmur@unizar.es)

In the Spanish academic context scholars are increasingly pressed to get their research articles (RAs) published internationally in English in order to establish their credentials as competent members and be promoted accordingly. Nevertheless, a lot of research is still published in Spanish for a local readership, perhaps as a consequence of the few successful scholars who get their research articles accepted in international journals. The present paper focuses on the use made of hedges and boosters, which are considered disciplinary and also culture-specific, in RAs written in English by Spanish scholars and compare it both with the use made of the same features in RAs written in Spanish by Spanish scholars and in RAs written in English by scholars at English-speaking institutions. The analysis will be based on the frequency of inclusion of hedges and boosters as well as the preferred lexico-grammatical realizations in a corpus of 24 RAs from a single discipline, Business Management, taken from SERAC (Spanish English Research Article Corpus). The results will be compared to those obtained from the analysis of these features in a comparable corpus of RAs in Spanish written by Spanish scholars and in another comparable corpus of RAs in English written by scholars based at English-speaking institutions. Such an analysis will enable us to determine whether Spanish scholars in this discipline transfer the rhetorical practices in their mother tongue and cultural context into their writing in English for an international readership or whether their rhetorical strategies as regards this particular type of markers are adjusted to those used by their peers working in an English-speaking context. The results obtained may indicate the importance that adjusting these particular rhetorical conventions may have for publication success. Further, it is believed that findings may have important pedagogical implications.

## **The social function of gate-keeping and mentoring: A genre analysis of moves and the use of “I” in peer-reviews of journals**

Tiffany Brook

[tbrook@calbaptist.edu](mailto:tbrook@calbaptist.edu)

Occluded or hidden genres, such as peer-reviews, may be hidden from the public, but they play a significant role in shaping novice writers. This paper will examine the genre of the peer-review from two standpoints. First, it will explore how peer-reviewers’ comments function socially as a means of both mentoring novice writers by providing constructive criticism, while also functioning as a means of gate-keeping by preventing the publication of articles that do not meet certain academic criteria. Second, using a corpus analysis, it will identify the “moves” within the genre, as well as investigating how certain linguistic features—such as the use of the first-person pronoun “I”—within the corpus may exemplify the reviewers’ social role as both gate-keepers and mentors. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the genre of peer-review as a social space wherein novice members are initiated into their respective fields.

## ***H15. Dialogism in academic argument***

College biology laboratory reports and urban elementary classrooms are unlikely venues for the teaching of written argument. Yet, situated in local goals for improvement in student performance, these action-research studies challenge conceptions of persuasion, performance goals, and structural formats, finding that they often function as academic constraints. These studies explore local meanings, writer identities, and agency to ground persuasive writing in a rhetoric of truth-seeking based on local sites, encountered in the college biology laboratory and the cultural capital of the fifth grader. These studies involve novice writers, college student researchers, and teachers collaborating across writing borders to discern "best practices for local contexts" and the implications for policy.

## **“Why does “it” matter?”: The role of perception and argument in writing process of the college lab report**

Jill M. Gladstein

*Swarthmore College*

[jgladst1@swarthmore.edu](mailto:jgladst1@swarthmore.edu)

Drawing on theories of WAC and WID and the belief that scientific writing is a social practice, this in-progress research project attempts to uncover the assumptions and perceptions students and faculty have about what it means to teach and learn how to write in an introductory science course and how these perceptions inform the actual teaching, the writing process, and the written product. During the spring of 2005, we\* collected,

copied and analyzed the lab reports of consenting students enrolled in an introductory biology course. We chose this course because of its heavy use of Writing Associates (WA), peer tutors who are trained to work with their peers on their writing. We also surveyed students before the writing of each lab report and audio-taped the WA conferences of a subset of participants. We interviewed these students twice during the semester as well as the faculty and WAs working with the course. Due to the inclusion of a workshop (based on our initial results and discussions with the bio faculty) into the biology course during the spring of 2006, we collected another full set of data.

This presentation will explain details of how we assigned students into categories by using a coding rubric for analysis of the lab reports and conference and interview transcripts. Each category illustrates how students' perceptions of the role of argument in scientific writing may have carried over into their lab report and writing process. We will examine factors that may be influencing the students' perceptions of argument including: 1) previous writing experiences, 2) perceptions of writing in and out of science courses, and 3) the design, implementation, and evaluation of the writing assignment.

\*We refers to myself and a rotating group of student research assistants.

### **Perceptions of persuasion: Persuasive writing, audience, and agency in contrastive fifth grade classrooms**

Diane Downer Anderson  
*Swarthmore College*

The problem of persistent underperformance in writing by urban youth is alarming and policies are implemented which often push teachers to teach that which appears on this year's test rather than drawing on local *habitus*, which has the potential to advantage the child for the long-term -- high stakes assessments, college admissions, and active citizenship.

The study examined in this presentation was conducted as an action research project during the spring of 2006. Eight action researchers in an undergraduate literacy research seminar spent four months in two fifth grade classrooms, one urban and one suburban, observing the teaching of persuasive writing, interviewing the children and teachers, and developing and teaching a persuasive letter drawing on the children's local (community and school) sense of persuasive strategies.

The researchers used a frame for writing as socially-situated discursive practice. Bourdieu's conception of *habitus* (1999) and Bakhtin's conception of *dialogism* (1991) informed the study and grounded thinking about how discourse strategies are evoked and operate in persuasive letters.

The suburban classroom engaged in a 6-week project called "The Cookie Campaign," in which a *broad conception of persuasion* was evoked, drawing on local, cultural, and media sources prior to the actual task of writing a persuasive letter, and attending to

issues of audience and persuasive tactics. The urban classroom engaged the children in writing persuasive essays primarily drawing upon a *narrow conception of persuasion* linked to state assessments and traditional rhetorical forms. The action researchers drew on these goals of the teachers to create new approaches and, in doing so, encountered new problems and tensions.

This study begins to discern factors that might be attended to through instruction, including those that link perceptions of persuasion and their examples in popular culture and everyday practice with audience and agency in academic writing.

## ***H16. The challenges of international collaboration***

Mya Poe  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*  
[myapoe@mit.edu](mailto:myapoe@mit.edu)

Chris M. Anson  
*North Carolina State University*

Tiane Donahue  
*Université de Lille III, France*

Rob Oliver  
*University of London*

Mary Scott  
*University of London*

Paul Skrebels  
*University of South Australia*

Over the past three decades, most collaborative transnational research on writing has focused on writing assessment practices across cultures (Purves, 1992; Gorman, Purves, & Degenhart, 1989) or on contrastive rhetorical analyses highlighting differences between discursive traditions (Connor, 1996, Panetta ed. 2001). Only recently have studies of student writing in different countries led to calls for “cross-national perspectives” on writing and writing cultures (Foster, 2006; Foster & Russell, 2002). We believe that it is important to extend this latest call for “cross-national perspectives” by developing rigorous practices for collaborative literacy research in multiple national contexts.

In this roundtable, six writing researchers will describe the process of designing and trialing a collaborative research study mapping the role of literacy practices in the transition of students from secondary to higher education in four countries: Australia,

France, the United Kingdom, and the United States. We ask: How do national contexts play a role in the shaping of transitional literacy practices? How are these practices embedded in international systems of relation and influence, including dominant national ideologies of learning, systemic aspects of education, and surrounding cultural and familial practices?

Our session will offer a metacritique of the challenges of this transnational research project. We will provide preliminary data and discuss the need to analyze situated practices and assumptions within national contexts as a “precursor method” in order to establish appropriate questions and methodologies for conducting multi-national writing research. We will also discuss the “limits of the local” in analyzing data as well as the inherent problems in many contrastive approaches (Brandt and Clinton, 2002). Finally, we will propose useful distinctions emerging from our work, notably the term “cross-system” to describe situated literacy practices that do not necessarily map onto national identities yet reflect the global influence of various agents across educational settings.