

Writing Across Borders II Session B
Friday, February 18 1:00-2:30pm

B1

The National Study of Writing Instruction

Judith A. Langer, University at Albany, U.S.

Arthur Applebee, University at Albany, U.S.

At the present time, writing instruction is receiving new attention in both research and policy. Calls for more attention to writing (National Commission on Writing, 2003) are coupled with calls for the implementation of research-based instructional practices. Yet there has been no systematic examination of how writing is actually taught since Applebee's (1981) national study. Thus there is a real danger of prescribing remedies for the wrong problems, or for problems that do not exist. To address this knowledge gap, the National Study of Writing Instruction (NSWI) is asking: 1. How and why is "good practice" as indicated by research on learning to write (e.g., Graham & Perin, 2007) assimilated (or rejected) by teachers in schools that have made a commitment to the teaching of writing, and how does such instruction relate to that provided in more typical schools? 2. How do content area teachers in both types of schools address the special disciplinary demands of writing in their subject areas? And 3. How does the larger context for instruction, including the standards and assessments in individual subject areas, alter the writing experiences that students have?

The presentations will draw on two sets of data: 1) Case studies of writing programs in middle and high schools chosen because of local reputations for excellence in the teaching of writing, and 2) a national survey of a representative sample of middle and high school teachers of English, social studies, science, and mathematics. The case studies examined writing instruction in 20 middle and high schools situated in 5 states that differ in the standards and assessments they use to frame what they believe students should know and be able to do with respect to writing (NY, CA, TX, WI, and KY). In each state, NSWI solicited nominations of schools with local reputations for excellence in writing instruction from state leaders in the teaching of English (state education agencies, state affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project site directors). Nominations were checked against available data on student performance on literacy-related tests, as well as other information available about each school on the internet.

Each school was visited by a team of field researchers who were also experienced teachers. The three-day school visits included interviews with the principal and department chairs in English, math, science, and social studies, and with teachers at grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 in each of those subjects. Classroom observations were also scheduled for these subject areas, using both time x activity time-sampled records and field notes focusing on the kinds of instruction and writing-related activities that occurred. In addition to observations and interviews, all teachers in all grades were asked to complete an online survey about the kinds of writing required in their subject area.

At each school, a second set of visits was used to recruit focal students who were asked to share all of their work (worksheets, notes, and exercises as well as extended writing) in the four target subject areas for one full semester. At the end of the semester

these students were interviewed to explore their perceptions of similarities and differences within and across subject areas in the kinds of writing that were done, and the kinds of instruction that was offered.

In addition to individual case reports prepared by the visiting teams, cross site databases were constructed using NVivo for the qualitative data (field notes, interview responses, and school summary reports), and SPSS for quantitative data (including time x activity records, writing completed by the students, and surveys).

Surveys used in the case study schools were modified for use in the national survey, which will allow analyses of differences between “typical” and exemplary programs in the 5 target states, as well as a portrait of practice in middle and high schools nationally.

The presentations will highlight disciplinary differences in the goals and approaches to writing instruction, the influence of state policies regarding curriculum and assessment on instruction, and the (surprisingly limited) role of technology in writing and writing instruction.

B2**New Directions in Writing Assessment: Validity, Confidence and Corpus Linguistics**

Anne Ruggles Gere, University of Michigan, U.S.

Zak Lancaster, University of Michigan, U.S.

Moisés D. Perales Escudero, University of Michigan, U.S.

This session will discuss three dimensions of a research project, each of which suggests a new direction for further research in the assessment of writing. The first offers a rationale for using both quantitative and qualitative methods of text analysis, the second explains what we can learn from move analysis, and the third explores the implications of categories typically used to describe student writers. Taken together, these three dimensions demonstrate the need to employ new methods, use new technologies, and develop new terms in order to improve writing assessment.

B3

Disciplinary Writing in English: Research from Five Mexican Universities

Fátima Encinas, Aston University, U.K.

Jennifer Craig, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.

Rene de los Santos, DePaul University, U.S.

David Hanauer, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Nancy Keranen, Lancaster University, U.K.

Karen Englander, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexico

The purpose of this panel is to explore the role of English as a foreign language in disciplinary, university contexts in Mexico. Mexico is a particularly interesting country for investigation of English: It is still considered a developing nation (World Bank, 2010); its immediate geographic neighbor is the United States; and it is under scrutiny by international bodies such as OECD to participate in the knowledge economy. International bodies determine national standing by measures that include university and scientific productivity (OECD, 2010). A nation's ability to actively participate in such knowledge production is measurably affected by its level of English competence (Man, et al., 2004).

Thus as sites of higher learning, universities are an important context for research into the increasing role of English in Mexico. The literacy practices of students and professors are central. In this panel, learning, teaching, and using English for knowledge creation and dissemination are considered in three research projects. In the first paper, teaching English is the discipline to be mastered; in the second paper, pedagogies for using English for gaining disciplinary knowledge are explored and contested; and, in the third paper, English is used for disseminating disciplinary knowledge.

Within these investigations, each researcher explores answers from their situated contexts to questions such as: (1) What is the relationship between the foreign language and disciplinary practice? (2) What is the relationship between the first language and the second language in disciplinary participation? And (3) What are the individual or institutional characteristics that support or impede full access to English in the discipline? Following the presentation of the research, a response will be presented that explores the commonalities and differences apparent in the role of English at the university level in this peripheral context. The empirical work presented will give the audience an understanding of the complex relationships among the foreign language, disciplinary development and wider institutional and international demands.

Man, J. P., Weinkauff, J. G., Tsang, M., & Sin, D. D. (2004). Why do some countries publish more than others? An international comparison of research funding, English proficiency and publication output in highly ranked general medical journals.

European Journal of Epidemiology, 19, 811-817.

OECD. (2010). Statistics portal. Retrieved April 22, 2010, from

http://www.oecd.org/statsportal/0,3352,en_2825_293564_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

World Bank, (2010). Country classifications. Retrieved April 22, 2010, from

<http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups>.

Abstracts of each paper and biographical information follow below.
**University Sector Writing Development: Contextualizing Classroom
Practices within Institutional and the Wider Social Environments**

Fátima Encinas and Nancy Keranen
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico.

Investigation into classroom phenomena is often the starting point for understanding literacy issues. However, there is a certain point when this type of inquiry is insufficient in terms of helping to fully conceptualize the complex issues surrounding what happens in the classroom. At this point, researchers must attempt to contextualize the phenomena within the wider pedagogical and social milieus in which they exist (Clark, 2007). Although writing research in Latin America is a relatively new venture (Carlino, 2007), it follows the wider trend towards contextualization in writing research (Juzwik et al, 2006). This trend which started in Mexico with a focus on cognitive writing processes (e.g. Pamplón, 2005), surveys on teachers and students perceptions in specific contexts (e.g., Roux, 2006; Hidalgo, 2006) was complemented by studies on social and institutional practices (e.g., Perales, 2005; Englander, 2009; Mugford & Sughrua, 2007). In line with this overall trend to see writing practices as part of a larger ecology (Clark, 2007), this project involves a three phase investigation of literacy practices and processes associated with pre-service English language teachers situated in the modern languages department of a public research university in México. The three study phases examine departmental literacy issues from the following perspectives: 1) Institutional expectations (via curriculum plans – from historical and current perspectives) and academic staff / curriculum designers (interviews), 2) how interpretation of departmental and institutional factors are carried out, i.e., the correspondence between classroom literacy expectations and students' processes (literacy development), (interviews with academic staff and students) and 3) the wider social context that goes beyond the institutional context, i.e., literacy requirements / expectations (interviews with potential employers).

Results of the study so far have indicated a number of issues: 1) that official literacy requirements are open to a wide variety of interpretations, 2) writing expectations vary depending on the discipline area and the individual teacher / student. 3) Students may not be fully prepared to deal with professional type discourses which are generally carried out in Spanish.

Implications of the findings will be presented in the conference paper.

This project is funded by the *Secretaría de Educación Pública* PROMEP 2009-2010. Literacy Education for Pre-Service Teachers: A *Cuerpo Académico* Research Agenda. Convenio **PROMEP/103.5/09/4213**

Carlino, P. (2007). ¿Qué nos dicen hoy las investigaciones internacionales sobre la escritura en la universidad? *I Encuentro Nacional de Discusión sobre Políticas Institucionales para el Desarrollo de la Lectura y la Escritura en la Educación Superior*. ASCUN y Red Nacional de Discusión sobre Lectura y Escritura en Educación Superior. Universidad Sergio Arboleda, Bogotá, 26 y 27 de abril de 2007.

- Clark, M. (2007). *Common Ground, Contested Territory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English speaking scientists. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 8, 35-53.
- Hidalgo, H. (2006). *Students' and lecturers' beliefs and expectations regarding essays introductions: a genre-analytic qualitative study of academic literacy*. Unpublished MA dissertation. University of Essex, Great Britain.
- Juzwik, M., Curcic, S., Wolbers, K., Moxley, K. D., Dimling, L. M., & Shankland, R. K. (2006). Writing into the 21st century. An overview of research on writing 1999 to 2004. *Written Communication*, 23(4), 451-476.
- Mugford, G., & Sughrua, W. (2007). The role of the teacher as students struggle for participation and a 'voice' in the writing of their B.A. thesis in English. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 31(2), 73-79.
- Pamplón, N. (2005). *The writing process of four university level EFL students: A protocol based study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of London, United Kingdom.
- [Perales, M. \(2005\)](#). *Variation in academic papers as related to the enculturation process of a novice NNS graduate student into academia: a case study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Iowa, USA.
- Roux, R. (2006). *Los usos de la escritura en los estudios universitarios: géneros discursivos y principales dificultades*. Memorias en extenso del Tercer Congreso Internacional sobre Docencia. Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, Cd. Reynosa, Tamaulipas, México. ISBN968-7662-99-9.

Fátima Encinas (MSc Aston University, UK – 1996) and **Nancy Keranen** (Ph.D. Lancaster University, UK – 2008) are both professor / researchers in the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. They have worked together for over eight years on projects associated with academic writing and literacy issues in higher education. Their research group is focused on literacy, research on research, and teacher professional development. Their research publications fall within those broad areas. In addition to the project presented in this panel, they are currently engaged in a project with Dr. Charles Bazerman which seeks to understand and design intervention in the area of writing in English for physics postgraduate students in the UAP (UCMEXUS/CONACyT Grant number: CN-09-381).

Challenges in an International Writing Research Project Situated in Two Mexican Universities

Jennifer Craig
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.A

Globalization has increased the ease with which our students move across national boundaries as they seek undergraduate or graduate study or professional careers. But while our students cross national boundaries quickly, their ability to move beyond basic communicative English may not come so easily. Students moving into business or professional careers face a world where the “transnationalization of business” urgently

requires that students acquire advanced fluency in disciplinary writing (Starke-Meyerring, 2005, p.474). In addition, the level of English that is necessary for successful graduate study is difficult for many non-native speaking students to achieve. Moreover, when young faculty seek to publish in English language journals, a lack of advanced disciplinary English slows their admission into their intellectual communities of practice (Englander, 2009, p.35)

English as Foreign Language (EFL) pedagogy offers students a sound base in communicative English language skills, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) offers some career-specific orientation. Yet these approaches tend to focus closely on the linguistic and grammatical features of English. Moreover EFL programs in international settings are frequently oriented toward testing which leaves less time for the development of advanced disciplinary English skills, specifically writing and oral presentation. Recently, international faculty have become interested in exploring writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) pedagogy. In the international WAC/WID (writing-in-the-disciplines) mapping project, Thaiss (2008) documents 250 respondents from 47 countries other than the U.S. and Canada who have initiated WAC projects. Other scholars have explored the bridge between WAC and EFL (see Poe, 2007, 2008; McCleod, 2001, 2002, 2008; Matsuda, 1998, 2001). In this vein, beginning in 2008 research teams from MIT, U. de Quintana Roo, Cozumel, Mexico and Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores Monterrey (TEC), Monterrey, Mexico proposed to combine WAC methods with an EFL approach to determine how the two pedagogies would work in tandem and how WAC pedagogy might adapt to meet the needs of L2 students.

This presentation describes the challenges met by researchers who implemented the combined pedagogies in a molecular genetics class at Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores Monterrey (TEC) in Monterrey, Mexico. Despite shared objectives, enthusiasm for a common goal, and cooperation from administration, the research teams were challenged by differences in cultural, institutional, and disciplinary perspectives. This research contributes to the evolving understanding of how we might best use WAC in EFL settings as we encourage L2 students to become proficient in advanced disciplinary English.

Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision, *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8, 35-53.

Matsuda, P.K.(2001). Practicing WAC is practicing ESL. Opening statement: *academic writing*. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu>

McLeod, S. (2001) Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. *WAC for the new millennium: strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs*. Urbana IL: NCTE. 1-27.

McLeod, S. (2002). WAC in international contexts. *Language and Learning in the Disciplines*. 5 (3), 4-10. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>

McLeod, S.H. (2008). The future of WAC: Plenary address, ninth international writing across the curriculum conference, Austin, TX. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>

Poe, M. (October 2-4, 2008). Communication across the curriculum and English language learning: two movements learning from each other. *Asociacion Nacional*

Universitaria de Profesores de Ingles, 2008 Sixth International Congress, Puerto Vallarta, Mexico.

- Poe, M.(2007). Writing beyond disciplinary discourse: Power and politics in the teaching of scientific writing. In A. Elshimi&N.Kassagby (Ed.), *Sustaining excellence in 'communicating across the curriculum': Cross-institutional experiences and best practices*. (pp. 24-36). London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., (2005). Meeting the challenges of globalization: A framework for global literacies in professional communication programs. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 19(10), 469-499.
- Thaiss, C. (2008). The international WAC/WID mapping project: Objectives and methods. 2008. Retrieved from www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/beitraege/thaiss-wacwid.pdf

Jennifer Craig, M.S., M.A, is a Lecturer in the Program in Writing and Humanistic Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology where she teaches in the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics. She has consulted with university faculty from Chile, Mexico, Panama, and Guatemala on writing pedagogy. Craig is a co-author of *Learning to Communicate in Science and Engineering: Case Studies from MIT*.

Writing Research Articles in English as a Second Language: Quantitative and Qualitative Data from Mexican Scientists

David Hanauer, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA, and
Karen Englander, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexico

Recent research has focused on the difficulties faced by scientists who are required to publish their scientific research in English as an additional language (Ammon, 2001, 2006; Flowerdew, 2007; Salager-Meyer, 2008). To date, there has been no empirical data regarding the degree of difficulty that English poses for scientists in the “periphery” nor the trajectory that such scientists follow in becoming writers of scientific articles in English. Therefore, a two-year research project was undertaken that addresses the following questions: 1) To what degree is writing a scientific article in English as a second language more difficult than writing a scientific article in a first language? 2) Are these difficulties shared by researchers with different levels of scientific expertise and seniority? 3) How do scientists outside the “center” learn to write scientific articles in English?

A mixed-method investigation was conducted at two scientific institutions in Mexico: a teaching university and a research institution. Using a quantitative methodology, a questionnaire was distributed to 343 scientists in natural science disciplines, and 41% of the scientists responded. The results specify that language is a statistically significant factor that contributes to the difficulty, dissatisfaction and anxiety in writing research articles in English. The language burden of writing in English is reported as 24% more difficult than L1 science writing, involves an 11% drop in satisfaction and a 21% increase in anxiety during writing.

The statistical results motivated a further qualitative investigation with 16 scientists to understand the trajectory of becoming writers of science in English. Results

of the semi-structured interviews revealed a clear and consistent pattern. Reading and writing disciplinary texts in Spanish and English increased markedly from undergraduate education to graduate school to postgraduate and professional work. The group of scientists who report the least English language burden – the senior scientists at the research institution – began their English experience while still children. Junior research institute faculty and all teaching institution scientists reported greater degrees of language burden. These findings indicate that without early exposure to English, scientists face greater difficulties in participating in the international knowledge creation that is the basis of scientific development. Further, language support and interventions for professional scientists who lack early English proficiency is clearly warranted.

This project is funded by Internal Project grant No. 355.

Ammon, U. (2001). (Ed.). *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ammon, U. (2006). Ammon, U. (2006). Language planning for international scientific communication: An overview of questions and potential solutions. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7 (1), 1-30.

Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review*, 20, 14-27.

Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 121-132.

David Hanauer's applied linguistic research focuses on authentic literacy practices in scientific and poetic discourse, in first and second languages. He is Professor of English at Indiana University of Pennsylvania and the Assessment Coordinator in the PHIRE (Phage Hunting Integrating Research and Education) Program. He is co-editor of the Language Studies in Science and Engineering book series with John Benjamins.

Karen Englander (Ph.D., Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2006) is a professor in the Faculty of Languages at the Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. She is interested in scientific writing in English as a foreign language and her research has been published in the *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, *Mextesol Journal* and *Discurso y Sociedad*.

Respondent

René de los Santos (Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Discourse at DePaul University in Chicago, U.S.A. His research centers on understanding Mexican national rhetorical life as it has developed from the Mexican Revolution to the contemporary moment. He is also involved with work aimed at establishing formal ties between scholars working in the area of Latin American rhetorics across the American hemisphere, as well as internationally.

B4

Progressive Promises of Literacies from the Great Migration to the Computer Age

Maria Bibbs, University of Wisconsin-Madison, U.S.

Phillip Blackmon, University of Louisville, U.S.

Annette Vee, University of Pittsburgh, U.S.

Spanning three historical eras, this panel points to patterns in the promises made for personal and group literacies, including its potential for progressive democracy, social uplift, and individual empowerment. From the Great Migration Era to the Progressive Era to the age of computers, technologies of literacy and their promoters have promised to ameliorate social injustice for oppressed groups, yet as Harvey Graff and Adam Banks' work demonstrates, realities too often fall short of the myths surrounding what literacy can do in America. Despite the disparities between the promises and realities of literacy as a tool for personal and group uplift, these speakers ask: Can the "literacy myth" be used for progressive and productive ends? That is, are there places where the overblown promises of literacy help to materialize them? To answer this question, we analyze public support of literacy from 19th- and 20th-century African-American writers, and then move to how the literacy myth constructed within these writings is drawn upon in the promotion of new literacies, specifically the literacy of computer programming. Based on our comparative work, we argue that the progressive potentiality of literacy appears to be activated through writing more than reading, and that it is this emphasis on writing over reading that gets taken up in more recent iterations of the "literacy myth."

1. Promise of Literacy during the Great Migration Era (Phillip Blackmon)

Harvey Graff notes, "The black experience reinforces the value placed in literacy, the way in which a group who desired literacy was able to develop means for acquiring it, and the limits to many that the attainment of literacy represented." Although acquiring literacy did not lead to economic success for African Americans, the ability to write letters allowed African Americans to transform their lives. My project examines the legacy of letter writing as a medium of social protest and advocacy. To ground my discussion, I examine the role African-American newspapers played in giving voice to the hopes, fears, and exasperations of newly literate former slaves who wrote to black newspapers to express their hardships and longings for a better life. In particular, I examine letters written by African Americans to the Chicago Defender between the years 1916-1918, which were compiled in The Journal of Negro History, Volume 4, 1919, by Emmett J. Scott. Scott uses the letters to document the lives of American Negroes from a historical perspective. Few scholars, however, have examined the rhetorical sophistication employed by American Negroes in the crafting of the politically astute letters for transforming and protesting their oppressed condition in the South by co-opting the very literacy they were denied in slavery and systematically deprived of in freedom. This project examines letters written by early twentieth-century African Americans for the purpose of analyzing the rhetorical modes they used in addressing their audience and explores the rhetorical strategies in the letters to illustrate how literacy served to empower a "powerless" people.

The letters collected during this two year time period are of particular importance because the years 1916-1918 represent the height of the black migration movement. As

southern Negroes began their northward journey, they wrote letters to the [Chicago Defender](#) to request aid in migrating. In analyzing the letters, the following questions drive my research: What do the letters say about the importance and value of literacy to the American Negro? What commonalities link each letter? How did writing the letters (or literacy) allow African Americans to assert some control or agency over their lives? What rhetorical strategies do the authors use in order to elicit a favorable response to their letters? By answering these questions, I illustrate how literacy functioned as an agent for social, political, and educational change for the American Negro.

2. The Promise of Literacy in the Progressive Era (Maria Bibbs)

Archival sources such as government documents, the black periodical press, and scholarly writing focused on how literacy learning in the black community can help us understand the nature of a longstanding literacy ideology particular to African Americans. Much of this historical evidence suggests that the black community was well aware of the contradictions of the literacy myth before Harvey Graff published his text of the same name. Despite the dominant culture's viewpoint that literacy would promote democracy and bring about economic and social uplift, groups that had been historically denied the opportunity to acquire a literacy education understood all too well literacy's limited potential to open doors. However, since the antebellum period, African Americans have sustained a "literacy myth" that associates literacy with freedom and racial uplift. This rich and forward-thinking ideology that takes literacy's contradictions and limited access into account made way for a visionary practice of writing and literacy education that could galvanize the black community and bring about social change and racial uplift. This challenge to the mainstream and oppressive literacy ideology proves that "literacy myths" are potentially useful and even necessary.

The African-American quest for literacy and freedom during the Progressive Era, 1890-1920, presents a fascinating history of literacy's role in action. As the U.S. transformed from a mercantile to industrial society, economic competition between social groups became more of a factor in achieving the American Dream. Collective acts of writing became necessary responses to racial oppression and the struggle to obtain employment, education, and the vote. Cultural differences informed by the impact of a history of oppression, unequal access to education, and literacy sponsorship of the A.M.E. church shaped a revolutionary moral bases of literacy within the black community in ways that are typically misunderstood; this history has impacted African-American literacy practices and the way in which literacy has been a rhetorical object in black scholarly and popular writing. My attention to the literacy myth is complicated by Deborah Brandt and Katie Clinton's "Limits of the Local," which examines the interplay between dominant cultures and local communities vying for control over how literacy is accessed and made useful. My examination of cultural practices and protest writing by black educators and intellectuals provides a framework for understanding both the contradictory nature of literacy and the transformative potential of literacy myths in the black community.

3. The Promise of Literacy in the Computer Age (Annette Vee)

The promises surrounding literacy are persistent, and they can be repurposed for new, digital literacies—specifically, computer programming as a kind of literacy. Since

the 1970s, people have explicitly drawn on the perceived history and promises of mass textual literacy in order to promote programming literacy, or what I call "proceduracy." Myths are always constructed from something true, as Harvey Graff notes when reflecting on [The Literacy Myth](#) 30 years later. The intellectual history of arguments promoting computer programming as a mass literacy implicitly draw upon the literacy myth that—as my co-presenters argue—was at least partially fulfilled by African Americans in the 19th and 20th century.

As part of a larger project putting computer programming into a historical continuum with textual literacy, this presentation focuses on four specific initiatives to promote computer programming to a mass audience: projects led by Seymour Papert (Logo), Guido van Rossum (Python), Andrea diSessa (Boxer), and Mitchel Resnick (Scratch). Using a history of literacy based on scholarship by Harvey Graff, Jack Goody and David Vincent, and Edward Stevens, I look at persistent themes in the promises surrounding literacy, specifically, between 19th century literacy campaigns and 20th and 21st century proceduracy campaigns. Included in my investigation of how these promoters of proceduracy draw on the literacy myth are: the project leaders' own writings; an interview with one of the language designers; writings about these languages from the communities that support them and educators who critique their objectives; and finally, explorations of the programming languages themselves.

The slowly-growing movement sometimes called “computer programming for everybody” promises a new way of thinking for individuals and a more smoothly functioning, more participatory democracy—just as 19th century literacy campaigns promised. They also emphasize the power of writing--equated to programming--over reading, which is equated to software use. Differences between 19th century mass literacy and 20th century mass proceduracy campaigns include the increased emphasis on the technology of transcription in proceduracy campaigns, as well as the absence of a religious and moral basis for this new literacy. By connecting the archival research of 19th century literacy campaigns with contemporary oral and written history of proceduracy campaigns, this presentation shows one way the literacy myth can be “transformed and redirected,” as Graff charges in his recent reflection on [The Literacy Myth](#).

B5

Teaching English Writing in China: What Native-English Speaking Instructors Encountered in Teaching Writing to College Students in China

Qing Liu, University of Florida, U.S.

Xiaodi Zhou, Nanjing University, China

Danling Fu, University of Florida, U.S.

Mary McGann, University of Indianapolis, U.S.

This panel, with four speakers, will first give a general introduction on English writing instruction from elementary to college in China, and then follow with research on native-English speaking instructors' experience of teaching writing in different Chinese universities and discussion of personal teaching experiences in China from two different perspectives. Obstacles, mismatches, issues and triumphs involving teaching English writing in a cross-cultural context will be discussed with data collected by researcher who has conducted research in writing classes, and instructors who teach or have taught writing to the Chinese students.

The first speaker will give a general introduction on English writing instruction from elementary to college in China. Based on the statistics reported by the Chinese Ministry of Education (CMOE) (2002), currently there are over 200 million students who are learning English from elementary to college in China. To meet the needs of economic interdependence global wide, the Chinese government plans to invest its effort and budget in English language education, especially in English writing because it was reported that the Chinese students are ranked among the lowest in their English writing ability internationally (Cambridge International English Testing Center, 2008). CMOE urges researchers and educators in China to collaborate with experts outside the country and find ways to make rapid improvement in English writing instruction at all levels. HE will present her preliminary research findings in collaboration with Chinese scholars in the English education field on the curriculum and strategies in English writing instruction currently adopted in China from elementary to college. The data was collected through surveys of schools in six major cities in China, and interviews of a dozen educators and classroom observations from elementary to college in one metropolitan city in Southeast China. In addition, HE will share how she conducts her research in collaboration with the scholars/educators beyond the US borders and their longitudinal research plan (3-5 years) on English writing instruction in several far-east Asian countries.

The second speaker will present her study on native-English speaking (NES) instructors' teaching of English writing to Chinese freshmen and sophomore students in China. With the large demand of English teachers in China and lack of English writing teachers, more NES instructors have been hired to teach English writing at Chinese colleges in the past decade. Much research has reported tensions and unsatisfactory results in classrooms taught by NES instructors (Matalene 1985, Mckay 1992, Tang & Absalom 1998, Li & Fan 2007). SHE has conducted her study in a university of southern China, aiming at finding out the causes of the communication barriers between NES instructors and their Chinese students in English writing classrooms and the adjustment and adaptations the teachers and students need in teaching and learning in this cross-cultural context. The research data are collected through one semester-long classroom observations in six writing classes, interviews of 4 NES instructors and dozens of

students (focal students), close involvement with over 100 Chinese English learners on regular bases. Also SHE surveyed and phone-interviewed NES writing instructors in other seven universities across China. The data will be analyzed through the grounded theory with constructivism framework. The research findings present the existence of multilevel mismatches between the instructors and students: mismatches on the concept of English writing, on teachers and learners' role, on teaching and learning approach, on learning objectives, in addition to language and cultural barriers. This case study on mismatches between the NES instructors and their students and the process of their mutual adjustment in a cross-cultural context will make a significant contribution to the field of EFL writing, bridge the gap between instructors and students who come from different cultural and language backgrounds and bring a mutual understanding among people with different backgrounds who intend to work together to reach successful outcomes.

The third speaker will present his personal first-year teaching experience in a Chinese college writing class as a Chinese-American instructor. Raised and educated in the United States and after receiving his graduate degree, HE went to China to teach writing to college students in the hometown where his parents came from. As a good writer and fluent English speaker and being a Chinese-American, HE thought it would be a piece of cake to teach English writing to Chinese college students. But during the course of his first year teaching, he encountered endless obstacles. He was shocked by the passiveness of the students, the requirement of the text-bound approach in teaching, and the expectation of teaching writing for correctness. In addition, being a Chinese-American in China, he was constantly struggled with his identity (being a Chinese, but doesn't know the language and culture), his cultural image (sense of belonging at the certain level, but don't belong at many levels), and his language issue (can speak basic Chinese but doesn't sound like an educated person). All these factors affected his teaching experience in China and his relationship with his Chinese students and colleagues. In this presentation, Xiaodi will share his struggle and adjustment in his teaching writing to Chinese college students and the process of repositioning himself as a Chinese-American in China.

The last speaker will describe her two-semester's work at Ningbo Institute of Technology of Zhejiang University (NIT), teaching university students English Academic Writing in a dual degree program in Southern China. During that time, SHE used the research of Beers (2002) and Gallagher (2006) and Fu (2003, 2009) to support her students' English academic writing development. Throughout the course of her teaching, she collected writing samples, conducted formal and informal interviews and surveys of student attitudes. In addition, she also did some focused case studies of individual writers to demonstrate the students' classroom work. She collaborated in her research with Chinese teachers in the School of Foreign Languages at NIT. In analyzing the students work and the curriculum of the School and specifically its English courses which focus primarily on oral English, she has investigated a disconnect between what the central Chinese government has mandated (raise Chinese students' written English skills) and what is actually happening in the university classroom. In addition, SHE will share her personal experience of teaching writing to Chinese college students as a veteran English composition instructor and researcher from both teaching and research perspectives.

B6

The Frustrations of Reform in the Teaching of Writing: Historical Case Studies of New Theories, Faculty Development, and Empirical Research

Neal Lerner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.

Anne Ellen Geller, St. John's University, U.S.

John Brereton, Boston Athenaeum, U.S.

The conflicted relationships between theory, empirical research, and classroom practices have long vexed the teaching of writing (Haswell, “NCTE/CCCC War”). In this panel, we present three historical case studies of those conflicts, ones that speak strongly to present conflicts and potentially offer directions for future reforms.

Speaker 1 describes the movement in the late 19th and early 20th century to move from “mass instruction” to “individual methods,” whether in schooling as a whole or in teaching writing in particular. A key advocate of this method, Preston W. Search proposed in 1892 an approach in which a student “works as an individual, progresses as an individual, is promoted as an individual, and is graduated as an individual.” This attention was meant to counter the lecture and memorization/recitation methods that had dominated schooling. Actual practice in writing, as opposed to memorizing rules and tropes (Kitzhaber), was recognized as a “natural” application of these ideas. Nevertheless, theorizing learning as an individual activity ran into conflict with emerging “social” theories of instruction, just as they do now, though more fundamental conflict came from the expense and time needed to truly take into consideration each individual’s need and tailor instruction accordingly. Overall, this movement to radically re-theorize how students best learn was tempered by the power of the status quo to resist change and offers an example of what might be required for any reform to take hold.

Speaker 2 presents another key moment in the reform of writing instruction, the late 1970s and early 1980s, partially triggered when *Newsweek* declared in 1975 that “Johnny Can’t Write” and the National Endowment for the Humanities decided to respond to that “crisis” by making substantial amounts of money available for faculty development. These NEH seminars are perhaps best known for bringing together compositionists for intense study (Daly Goggin), but a less-well-known legacy is for disciplinary faculty who were deeply involved in learning to teach with writing at their home institutions. Through the NEH grants hundreds of faculty across the disciplines were introduced to new theories and practices of teaching writing, took part in cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations informed by humanistic studies, and, as a result, thought deeply about the place of the humanities in higher education alongside colleagues they might have never otherwise met on their own campuses. Nevertheless, at many institutions, the silo-ization and curricularization of education meant once the funding was over, programs were abandoned, and faculty who had been thinking and teaching together returned to their home departments and any changes in teaching, however significant (and faculty do note significant changes), were confined to the single faculty person’s classrooms rather than affecting teaching and learning at the departmental or institutional level. The effects of this reform effort, then, might be powerful for an individual participant, but the long-lasting legacy of innovation at the institutional or professional (or even disciplinary) level is far more mixed.

Speaker 3 examines a series of important though little-known studies of student

writing carried on over a thirty-year period, 1895-1925, the very time when composition was undergoing dramatic growth and eventually becoming confined to borderline status within English. These studies, conducted at Harvard, Berkeley, Washington, and other colleges, all examined the writing of entering first-year students in order to determine how to teach them more effectively. Colleges at that time were faced with a dramatic rise in enrollment, particularly of what they regarded as underprepared students. They quite naturally looked for ways of determining how best to meet the problem of poor writers in first year English, then and now the largest single course in the college curriculum. These studies conducted over that thirty year period have much to teach us (and warn us) about how to look at student writing, particularly what happens when we try to judge student writing empirically.

B7**Meta-analysis of Writing Interventions for Elementary School Children**

Steve Graham, Vanderbilt University U.S.

Sharlene Kiuahara, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Deborah McKeown, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Karen Harris, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

This meta-analysis examined the impact of different instructional approaches (e.g., strategy instruction, word processing, process writing, and so forth) on the quality of writing produced by students in the elementary grades. A comprehensive search of the literature was conducted to identify published and unpublished studies where (a) participants were elementary school students; (b) a pre- and post-test quasi-experimental or experimental design with a control group was used; (c) writing quality was measured reliably; (d) the independent variable was a writing intervention; and (e) data were available for computing an effect size. If a treatment was studied in 4 or more studies, we report an average weighted effect size and confidence interval using a random effects model. We further examined if effect sizes were moderated by genre tested, type of study (experiment versus quasi-experimental study), locale (urban, suburban, and rural), and quality of study. This is the first meta-analysis focusing specifically on elementary grade students.

B8

Writing and Social Issues

A Social Justice Imperative in International/Transnational Cultural Interactions
Godwin Y. Agboka, Illinois State University, U.S.

As the field of professional and technical communication expands internationally and is complicated by the forces of postmodern globalization and transnational challenges, it is increasingly confronted not only with complex issues of cultural and linguistic difference but also issues of power and ideological transformation relating to the production, deployment of, and access to technical and communication products and systems in which professional and technical communicators have vital roles. An inescapable concern that rises is how to ethically localize information and technology products for cross-cultural consumption. And, although localization is being vigorously explored in other fields, the field of professional and technical communication has paid it little attention, despite the importance of documentation and other modes of information transfer in localization practices.

Research in the field is (still) rife on how practices in localization place too much emphasis on business priorities to the neglect of important cultural concerns of target audiences, raising concerns about social justice and cultural sensitivity with respect to those with whom technical communicators do business. This neglect of important user concerns raises important issues: (i) designers of information and technology products may be better able to control the aesthetics of printed online and technical documents but may not be able to understand and conduct businesses with overseas markets and (ii) these practices may skirt the issue of culture and, inevitably, do a lot of injustice to those cultures for whom this communication is meant. Currently, one particular area that has not received the kind of critical attention it deserves is the impact—more specifically, the ethical and moral consequences—of the distribution of documentation/information and technology products on target cultures. This concern with its attendant issues of identity transformation, social justice, language loss, and cultural death are crucial issues begging for fuller exploration and investigation.

In response, using a decolonial theoretical framework, this presentation reports the findings and implications of a case study research that investigates issues of cultural identity transformation in the production, distribution, and use of documentation that accompanies sexuopharmaceuticals that are imported (both legally and illegally) into Ghana from China, to ascertain the effectiveness (or otherwise) of the documentation used in helping users use the products.

As part of my presentation, I will provide a theoretical framework of how decolonial theory and methodologies should inform research projects that study technological expertise and information/technology transfers, including undergraduate and graduate rhetoric and technical communication curricular and pedagogical practices that support a broadened scope of cultural literacy. Second, I will propose a heuristic of how both the fields of rhetoric studies and professional and technical communication could guard against a de-contextual ethnographic inscription of transnational communities. Finally, with its social justice imperative, the presentation will offer a model for destabilizing and transgressing the hegemonic domains of thought and

knowledge-power structures that ignore, silence, exploit, or negate the technological literacies and experiential knowledges of colonized cultures and communities.

B8 (continued)

Writing and Social Issues

Critical Ethnography---the Client and Outside Consultant: A Case Study from South Africa

Ann M. Johns, San Diego State University, U.S.

Leketi Makalela, University of Limpopo, South Africa

In many parts of the world, foreign writing consultants are asked to assist colleges and universities to develop academic literacy courses that will be appropriate for the students and the contexts in which they are studying. However, for a number of reasons (cultural, linguistic, contextual), this can become a challenging task for the both the outside consultant and, in time, for the university client(s). In this presentation, the client will describe his South African university context and his expectations for the project conducted during the outside consultant's Senior Fulbright at his campus. Then, the consultant, using the lens of critical ethnography, will respond (about herself) to the questions that Madison (2003, p. 4) argues researchers should pose as they conduct their work:

How do we reflect upon and evaluate our own purposes, intentions, and frames (as we approach our work)?

How do we predict the consequences or evaluate our own potential to do harm?

How do we create and sustain a dialogue of collaboration between ourselves and those in the context with whom we are working?

How—in what location or through what intervention—will our work make the greatest contribution to equity, freedom, and justice?

The client will conclude with his evaluation of the work completed in light of the university context and needs.

B8 (continued)

Writing and Social Issues

Opening up the 'Opaque Box' of Climate-Change Argumentation: Overcoming Discursive Barriers to Comprehension and Dialogue

Graham Smart, Carleton University, Canada

The discursive complexity of argumentation on the reality, impacts, and remediation of human-caused global climate change poses a major obstacle for deliberative dialogue. Combining multiple discourses and meanings—such as those of science, economics, technology, social justice, and governance—climate-change argumentation can be difficult to understand and evaluate for policy-makers, activists, disciplinary specialists, and citizens alike, with the result that potentially constructive discussion often ends in polarized debate (Hulme, 2009; Smart, in press). This is a particularly significant problem in the case of multi-lateral negotiations among national governments where, in addition to the complexities generally inherent in most instances of climate-change argumentation, the official positions (or macro-arguments: Toulmin, 1959) on climate change advanced by individual governments are shaped by a host of unseen historical, socio-cultural, and ideological influences.

This paper describes the work of an international and interdisciplinary team of researchers from Canada and Hong Kong who are attempting to open up the 'opaque box' of argumentation that characterizes the debate on climate change, with the aim of rendering instances of this argumentation more comprehensible and open to evaluation for policy-makers, citizens, and other stakeholders in the debate. On one level of inquiry, the researchers are investigating, in a broad-spectrum way, the discursive complexity of instances of climate-change argumentation produced by a wide variety of social actors. On a second, more specific level of inquiry, the researchers are investigating the official positions on climate-change advanced in multi-lateral international negotiations by the governments of Canada and the United States in North America and the governments of Hong Kong, China, and India in Asia, while at the same time exploring the distinctive set of historical, socio-cultural, and ideological factors shaping the position of each government.

With regard to methodology, the researchers are using a neo-Foucauldian discourse-analytic approach (Waite, 2005; Sharp & Richardson, 2001) to investigate the ways in which instances of climate-change argumentation produced by various social actors draw on and combine a range of discourses—scientific, political, bureaucratic, economic, legal, moral, aesthetic, to name several. In studying the official positions on climate change advanced in multi-lateral international negotiations by the five governments mentioned above, the researchers are employing an analytic framework that draws on four theoretical sources: Hajer's (1995) 'argumentative discourse analysis' approach, Bhatia's (2007) concept of the 'repository of experience', Bourdieu's (1984) notion of 'habitus', viewed on the level of the collective rather than the individual agent, and an adaptation of Goffman's (1959) metaphor of 'front-stage' versus 'back-stage' discursive behavior. This framework is being used to analyze a large and diverse collection of qualitative data—texts of various types as well as interviews and ethnographic observations—gathered from organizations such as government agencies, environmental NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, political parties, policy think

tanks, scientific bodies, business associations, and laboratories in universities and government research institutes.

B9

Thinking and Writing in College

Explaining Knowledge Change through Writing

Veerle Baaijen, University of Groningen, Netherlands

David Galbraith, Staffordshire University, U.K.

Problem solving models of writing (e.g. Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987) attribute the development of understanding through writing to deliberate planning designed to satisfy rhetorical goals. By contrast, Galbraith (2009) claims that the development of understanding depends on the spontaneous formulation of thought during text production. The first experiment of my PhD project was designed to test these contrasting predictions by asking writers varying in the extent to which their writing was assumed to be directed towards rhetorical goals to write either planned or non-planned texts.

42 high self-monitors (whose writing is assumed to be directed towards rhetorical goals) and 42 low self-monitors (whose writing is assumed not to be directed towards rhetorical goals) were asked to write an article for the university newspaper. Half the participants were asked to make an outline before writing (planned text production) while the other half were asked to write down a single sentence summing up their overall opinion (non-planned text production). We used the latter as a control planning condition which we defined as synthetic planning. To assess the development of understanding, participants were asked to list ideas and to rate their understanding of the topic both before and after writing. To assess the extent to which content was modified during text production, keystroke logs were collected during writing (Leijten & Van Waes, 2006).

The problem solving models predict that high self-monitors writing outline planned texts should experience greater developments of understanding and should show more evidence of text modification during writing. By contrast, Galbraith's dual process model predicts that low self-monitors writing synthetically planned texts should experience greater developments of understanding and should show more evidence of text modification during writing.

This experiment showed three important results. First, writers reported significantly more development of understanding after synthetic than after outline planned writing. Secondly, a measure of the extent to which writers modified their text during text production showed that low self-monitors writing synthetically planned text showed much higher levels of text modification during writing than the high self-monitors writing outline planned texts. Third, developments of understanding within the synthetic planning condition were significantly related to the extent of text modification during writing.

These results are broadly compatible with Galbraith's dual process model insofar as the development of understanding was strongly related to the extent to which writers modified their texts during writing, and this was highest for low self-monitors writing synthetically planned texts. However, a key question here is the process by which text modification occurs during writing. Is it a consequence of the spontaneous formulation of thought in language, or of a more deliberate planning and rhetorical evaluation of sentences as they are produced? In order to examine this, a more detailed analysis of the

key-stroke logging data is currently in progress, the results of which will also be discussed in the paper.

References

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Galbraith, D. (2009). Writing as discovery. *British Journal of Educational Psychology Monograph Series II 6 - Teaching and Learning Writing*, 5-26.
- Leijten, M., & Van Waes, L. (2006). Inputlog: New Perspectives on the Logging of Online Writing. In K.P.H. Sullivan & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Studies in Writing: Vol. 18. Computer Key-Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications*, (pp.73-94). Oxford: Elsevier.

B9 (continued)**Thinking and Writing in College**

Pedagogical Memory and the Genre Awareness Project

Irene Clark, California State University, Northridge, U.S.

In “Pedagogical Memory: Writing, Mapping, Translating,” Susan C. Jarratt et al report on a study aimed at discovering what students remembered of their early college writing instruction and the extent to which they were able to transfer what they had learned to subsequent writing tasks. One insight obtained from their study is that most of the students lacked what they refer to as “pedagogical memory” –that is, students were unable “to identify genres beyond the most basic (‘research paper’) or to distinguish modes of development, such as summary and development” (48). Based on this study, the authors recommend helping students “translate discourses about writing as they move from one academic site to another” (46), acquiring the awareness and terminology that will maximize the possibility of transfer. In the context of the focus of the Jarratt et al study, my presentation will report on the “Genre Awareness Project,” a project that aims to help students acquire familiarity with relevant genre based terminology that can foster literacy transfer and trigger pedagogical memory. The project was based on the idea that genre awareness, a term used by Amy Devitt and others, can enable students to make connections between academic argument, as it is presented in a first year writing class, and the writing genres they encounter in other disciplines, helping students apply terms such as exigence, audience, rhetorical situation and rhetorical appeals to other writing genres. Conducted over two semesters, the project utilized several assignments, each building upon the other to foster transferability through genre awareness. The first was an academic essay on a subject of general interest; its goal was to enable students develop a metacognitive understanding of how writer, audience, text, and rhetorical situation interact in constructing a genre. The second required students to select a genre associated with another discipline, analyze the features that characterize that genre, and write a text in that genre. The results of this study were obtained through pre and post semester surveys, reflective essays, and student interviews.

The concepts of pedagogical memory and genre awareness are associated with the concept of transfer, an issue that continues to generate significant scholarly debate. The difficulty of determining what skills transfer from one writing context to another has been noted by Devitt 2007, Freedman 1993, Perkins 1988, Petraglia 1997, and Russell 2002, among others, a perspective most recently reiterated by Downs and Wardle (2009) and Wardle (2009). Others, however, such as Bartholomae 1995, Beaufort 2007, Bizzell 2002, LeCourt 2006, and Thaiss and Zawacki 2006, suggest that “genre awareness” can be useful in fostering transfer. Beaufort argues that talking about genres can facilitate students’ meta-cognitive reflection” (188), a view that corresponds to Devitt’s definition of genre awareness as “a critical consciousness” of genre (192). This presentation will discuss the extent to which the genre awareness project has been successful in providing students with terminology that will enable them to access pedagogical memory, understand genre distinctions among disciplines, and distinguish transferable components of writing from those that are context specific.

B9 (continued)

Thinking and Writing in College

Critical Thinking and the Basic Writer: Problems, Paradoxes, and Prescriptions
Cheryl Hogue Smith, Kingsborough Community College-CUNY, U.S.

This presentation will begin with an analysis of research and recent theory to demonstrate how critical thinking is less a determinable process or set of procedures than a constellation of attitudes, habits of mind, role relations, and participation motives. Drawing on recent longitudinal studies and my own classroom-based research, it will further demonstrate why college instruction in critical thinking in composition classes—particularly for basic writers—needs to be focused not on a set of discrete skills for thinking, but on helping students to take on the roles and identities of persons who are critical thinkers. It will then present and unpack the paradoxical fact that basic writers among all college students are often the ones who in their courses must of necessity exercise the highest levels of critical thinking. It will conclude with an analysis of two samples of student writing to show how exercises requiring students to think about their own thinking foster critical thinking and a disposition to think critically in reading and writing.

Relevant Research Includes:

S. Blau, S. Carter, J. Dewey, J.H. Flavell, W. Iser, A. Lewis & D. Smith, M. Lu, A. Lunsford, S. McLeod, J. McPeck, J. Moffett, M. Rose, L. Rosenblatt, M. Salvatori, M. Shaughnessy, R. Vacca & N. Padak, and L. Vygotsky.

Research Questions:

- (1) What kinds of thinking are our students doing that seem to represent an insufficiency in thought?
- (2) What kinds of thinking are we trying to foster in them that are different from the kinds they are already doing?
- (3) What sorts of learning must our students experience to become persons who exhibit the forms of thinking that are rewarded by the academic community?

B10

Empirical Intercultural Studies of Professional and Academic Discourses

Ulla Connor, Indiana University-Purdue University, U.S.

Viviana Cortes, Georgia State University, U.S.

Jack Hardy, Georgia State University, U.S.

Pilar Mur Dueñas, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain

*Ana Moreno, Universidad de León, Spain**

Miguel F. Ruiz-Garrido, Universitat Jaume I, Spain

*Inmaculada Fontanet-Gomez, Universitat Jaume I, Spain**

Juan Carlos Palmer-Silveira, Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Lorena Suarez,

This session features empirical Spanish-English intercultural studies of texts in academic and professional settings. The varieties of Spanish are from Argentina, Spain, and Mexico.

Three papers (Cortes and Hardy, Mur-Duenas, and Moreno) provide analyses of academic corpora – history writing, finance writing, and book reviews – using a variety of text analysis approaches. Two papers (Garrido, Fontanet-Gomez and Palmer-Silveira, and Connor) present results of discourse studies in business and health care settings.

Paper 1

Comparing the semantic prosodies and preferences of lexical bundles in history writing in English and Spanish

Viviana Cortes and Jack Hardy

The study of recurrent word combinations such as lexical bundles has become the focus of many corpus-based studies in the last decade. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan (1999) defined *lexical bundles* as sequences of three or more words that occur frequently in a register.

This presentation reports the findings of a study which analyzed the use of lexical bundles in two one million-word corpora of published history writing. One corpus was made up of history articles written in English and published in American journals, and the other was made up of history articles written in Spanish from Argentinean publications. The most frequent 4-word lexical bundles were identified in each corpus and classified structurally and functionally. Then, the use of these bundles was compared across languages.

The results of this comparison showed that the bundles identified in each language had many features in common. One group of bundles could be considered the result of a direct translation (literal translation or close synonym translation). A second group of bundles showed structural characteristics that are closely related to bundles frequently found in academic writing in both languages. Finally, a functional classification showed that some bundles from both languages shared functions connected to academic prose and to the essence of the discipline, as well as to the topics discussed in the publications from where the texts had been extracted.

Currently, our comparison focuses on semantic prosodies and semantic preferences of lexical bundles across languages (Xiao & McEnery, 2006). Those bundles

identified as literal translation or quasi literal translation bundles are being analyzed for semantic prosodies. Several bundles showed similarities in the positive or negative prosodies expressed in the surrounding discourse. A second procedure has been designed to continue with a semantic analysis of these contexts. For this purpose, a taxonomy that reflects the domains frequently referred to in these contexts is currently being designed out of the examples identified in both languages. Similarities and differences will be analyzed and illustrated with samples from the English and Spanish corpora in the fall of 2010.

The proposed presentation will introduce various pedagogical applications of the findings of the present project, implications for translation studies, and suggested paths for future research.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Xiao, R., & McEnery, T. (2006). Collocation, semantic prosody, and near synonymy: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (1), 103-129.

Paper 2

An analysis of critical attitude in L1 and L2 English research article introductions: a quantitative and qualitative analysis

Pilar Mur-Dueñas

English has no doubt become *the* language of publication in the academia. Most high impact journals are nowadays published in English, and getting one's research accepted in any of them is a great concern for scholars worldwide, included Spanish ones. Intercultural text-based research has shown remarkable differences in the rhetorical structure and style of several academic genres written and read in different linguistic/cultural contexts of publications, including the Spanish local context and the English international context (e.g. Martín Martín, 2003, 2005; Salager Meyer et al., 2003; Martín Martín & Burgess, 2004; Moreno, 2004; Lorés, 2006, 2009a, 2009b; Mur Dueñas 2007, 2010; Moreno & Suárez, 2008, 2009; Suárez & Moreno, 2008; Sheldon 2009). Less research has focused on the analysis of L2 English academic texts written by scholars and the actual discursive difficulties non-native scholars have when drafting their research articles for publication in international high impact journals. Drawing on corpus-based analysis and ethnographic methods (Lillis 2008) I intend to carry out an analysis of the frequency and type of critical acts referring to other authors' research and to the authors' own research in the research article introductions in the field of Finance published in three highly prestigious journals. I will then compare the results with the frequency and type of critical acts included in the manuscripts written by a group of Spanish scholars and which have many times required major revision or have been rejected for publication in those same journals. It is my aim to explore to what extent a deviant use of critical attitude from what seems to be the norm in those journals may hinder these Spanish scholars' publication of their research in an international context. Also, the feedback they received from editors and reviewers will be looked into, which will help unveil the importance given to critically analysing previous research and highlighting the contribution of the research for the field at the very beginning of the

paper. The findings will be of great relevance to gain an insight into the rhetorical preferences in the best known sites of publication in the field of Finance as well as to uncover some important rhetorical difficulties that non-native (Spanish) scholars undergo when attempting to disseminate their research internationally in this field.

References

- Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology and ‘deep theorising’: closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication* 25 (3), 353-388.
- Lorés, R. (2006). ‘I will argue that’: first person pronouns as metadiscoursal devices in research article abstracts in English and Spanish. *ESP Across Cultures* 3, 23-40.
- Lorés, R. (2009a). Different worlds, different audiences: A contrastive analysis of research article abstracts. In E. Suomela Salmi & F. Drevin (Eds.). *Cross-linguistic and Cross-cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse* (pp. 187-197). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lorés, R. (2009b). (Non-) Critical voices in the reviewing of history discourse: a cross-cultural study of evaluation. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.). *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 143-160). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Martín Martín, P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes* 22, 25-43.
- Martín Martín, P. (2005). *The rhetoric of the abstract in English and Spanish scientific discourse: A cross-cultural genre-analytic approach*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Martín Martín, P., & Burgess, S. (2004). The rhetorical management of academic criticism in research article abstracts. *Text* 24 (2), 171-195.
- Moreno, A. I. (2004). Retrospective labelling in premise-conclusion metatext: an English-Spanish contrastive study of research articles on business and economics. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3 (4), 321-339.
- Moreno, A.I., & Suárez, L. (2008). A study of critical attitude across English and Spanish academic book reviews. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7 (1), 15-26.
- Moreno, A.I., & Suárez, L. (2009). Academic book reviews in English and Spanish: critical comments and rhetorical structure. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.). *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 161-178). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mur Dueñas, P. (2007). ‘I/we focus on...’: A cross-cultural analysis of self-mentions in business management research articles”. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6 (2), 143-162.
- Mur Dueñas, P. (2010). Attitude markers in business management research articles: A cross-cultural corpus-driven approach”. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19, 50-72.
- Salager-Meyer, F., Alcaraz Ariza, M.A., & Zambrano, N. (2003). The scimitar, the dagger and the glove: intercultural differences in the rhetoric of criticism in Spanish, French and English medical discourse (1930-1995). *English for Specific Purposes* 22 (3), 223-247.

- Sheldon, E. (2009). From one I to another: discursive construction of self-representation in English and Castilian Spanish research articles. *English for Specific Purposes* 28 (4), 251-265.
- Suárez, L., & Moreno, A. (2008). The rhetorical structure of literary academic book reviews: an English-Spanish cross-linguistic approach. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout & W. Rozycki (eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 147-168). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Paper 3

Academic book reviews in English and Spanish: is “giving reasons for critical comments” a universal politeness strategy?

Ana I. Moreno and Lorena Suárez.

A crucial purpose of academic journal book reviews is to evaluate the scholarly work of a professional peer (Lindholm-Romantschuk, 1998). In the public context of academic book reviewing, critical comments on the academic book under review (henceforth “critical comments”) can be considered potential face-threatening acts (Hyland, 2000). Given the interpersonal conflict that they may cause, it may be wise for reviewers to mitigate their force. In the present paper we focus on a politeness strategy that commonly serves reviewers to redress the force of the face-threatening acts potentially caused, i.e. giving reasons for evaluative comments (Gea Valor and del Saz Rubio, 2000-2001). We aim to provide insight into the extent to which scholars from different but comparable writing communities justify their critical comments with supporting reasons. Our empirical comparison is based on two comparable corpora of academic journal book reviews of literature, 20 written in British and American English, and 20 in Castilian Spanish (Moreno and Suárez, 2008). The results show that, while reviewers in the two corpora offer a substantial amount of unjustified critical comments, these are proportionally more frequent in the Spanish corpus. Also, while the English-speaking reviewers are more inclined to justify negative critical comments than positive ones, the opposite tendency holds for the Castilian Spanish reviewers. An e-mail interview is piloted to see whether responses from reviewers to an open-ended question on these issues could reveal any explanatory information. Implications for intercultural rhetoric (Connor, 2004), politeness theory (O’Driscoll’s, 1996) and English for Academic Purposes (Swales and Feak, 2004) are drawn.

Scope and duration: This is a pilot study (2007-2009) for a part of an ongoing research project beginning in 1993. In its present state, it has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, Plan Nacional de I+D+i (2008-2011), Ref: FFI2009-08336, of which Ana I. Moreno is the Principal Investigator.

References

- Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3(4), 291-304.
- Gea Valor, M.-L. and del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2000-2001). The coding of linguistic politeness in the academic book review. *Pragmalingüística* 8-9: 165-178.
- Hyland, K. (2000). Praise and criticism: Interactions in book reviews. In Hyland, K. (ed.), *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing* (pp. 41-62). Harlow, England: Longman.

- Lindholm-Romantschuk, Y. (1998). *Scholarly book reviewing in the social sciences and humanities: The flow of ideas within and amongst disciplines*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Moreno, A. I. and Suárez, L. (2008). A framework for comparing evaluation resources across academic texts. *Text & Talk* 28 (6), 749-769.
- O'Driscoll, J. (1996). About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 1-32.
- Swales, J. M. and Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Paper 4

The Chairman writes about the crisis: Conveying negative messages in the Chairman's Statement of US and Spanish Annual Reports

Teaching English for specific purposes often entails the difficulty of finding real and interesting materials to use in the classroom. Annual Reports (ARs) combine several characteristics that make them a suitable genre for this aim: they are relevant in a variety of disciplines (accountancy, law, business organisation, human resources...), are easily available, and have heterogeneous contents. Among the several sections of ARs, the Chairman's Statement, a personal communication signed by the Chairman of the company which is often placed at the beginning of the report, plays an important role as the first contact between the writer and the reader. In this document, usually the highest authority in a company summarizes its development during the previous twelve months for the shareholders and other stakeholders. Several studies have been carried out regarding ARs (Myers 1996, 1999; Thomas 1997), and even Chairman's Statements (Gillaerts 1996; Skulstad 1996, 2005; Garzone 2005; Nickerson and de Groot 2005).

The global economic crisis has recently affected most — if not all — important companies. The Stock Exchange market has continued working and most companies have remained in the lists. However, the ups and downs of the Stock Exchange have caused dramatic fluctuations in the value of their shares. In addition, low demand of products has also affected turnover and, consequently, benefits. Our questions at this point are: How are companies coping with negative situations? How are they re-creating their own image to avoid being negatively affected?

With both questions in mind, our aim is to analyse the rhetoric devices used by the writers of the Chairman's Statement to give the best image of the company when dealing with the negative messages the current economic crisis may convey. With this objective, a corpus of 50 Chairmen's Statements (25 from U.S. and 25 from Spanish companies ARs from the last two years) have been compiled and analysed. To start with, moves previously identified in this genre will be applied to establish the structure of these Statements. Then, how the identity of the company is created will be looked at by identifying several devices such as personal pronouns, salutations, promotional language or personal comments. Finally, and as our main aim, we will show how Chairman's Statements have dealt with the bad news of the crisis and how they have mitigated them or made them sound positive in US and Spanish ARs.

Our hypothesis is that despite the bad economic situation the global economy (or even the company's) is going through, the Chairman's Statement will have a positive tone trying

to disregard any negative message. Finally, some pedagogical implications are drawn from this research and its results.

References

- Garzone, G. (2005). Letters to Shareholders and Chairman's Statements: Textual Variability and Generic Integrity. In Gillaerts, P. & Gotti, M. (eds.) *Genre Variation in Business Letters* (pp. 179-204). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Gillaerts, P. (1996). The Address to the Shareholders in Annual Reports. A Genological Approach. In *1996 European Writing Conferences*. Barcelona: Institut de Ciències de l'Educació (CD-ROM: EARLI Special Interest Group Writing).
- Myers, M. (1996). A Syntactical and Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Annual Reports. Paper presented at the 47th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, March 27-30.
- Myers, M. (1999). The Influence of the Purpose of a Business Document on Its Syntax and Rhetorical Schemes. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 29 (4), 401-408.
- Nickerson, C. and De Groot, E. (2005). Dear Shareholder, Dear Stockholder, Dear Stakeholder: The Business Letter Genre in the Annual General Report. In Gillaerts, P. & Gotti, M. (eds.) *Genre Variation in Business Letters* (pp. 325-346). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Skulstad, A. S. (1996). Rhetorical Organization in Chairman's Statements. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6 (1), 43-63.
- Skulstad, A. S. 2005. The Use of Metadiscourse in Introductory Sections of a New Genre. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (1), 71-86.
- Thomas, J. 1997. Discourse in the Marketplace: The Making of Meaning in Annual Reports. *Journal of Business Communication* 34, 47-66

Paper 5

A Cross-Linguistic Analysis of Patient Narratives

Ulla Connor

The Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication (ICIC) is currently completing a study funded by the Eli Lilly & Co. Foundation to improve the understanding of self-managing a chronic disease through discourse analysis of diabetes patients' own words. The purpose of this research was to focus on the patient, and the patients' own words, as we explore the effects of literacy, patient life attitudes, health beliefs, and demographic factors upon adherence to medical regimens. ICIC completed 43 English language interviews and 22 Spanish language interviews, yielding a wealth of both quantitative data on demographics, medication adherence, diabetes knowledge, and literacy practices; and qualitative data from recorded patient narratives of their diagnosis, treatment, and experiences with self-management. Analyses were directed into three main areas: 1. the relationships among information sources, knowledge creation, and action as determined by literacy practices and patients' own accounts; 2. the identification of linguistic realizations of patients' health beliefs and world views, their confidence to act, their attitudes and emotions, and the relation of these variables to adherence and health outcomes; and 3. the examination of linguistic and cultural differences between

American-born and immigrant Spanish-speaking patients in health literacy practices and related adherence.

In this presentation, I will discuss the differences found between Spanish and English interview transcripts in terms of patients' access to written health information, health beliefs, and patients' confidence to act to improve their health. Implications of this text analysis research for the composition and production of more effective patient communication materials will be discussed.

Selected ICIC Health Research Publications

- Connor, U., Goering, B., Matthias, M., & Mac Neill, R. (2010). Information use and treatment adherence among patients with diabetes. In M. Ruiz-Garrido, J. Palmer-Silveira, & I. Fortanet-Gomez (Eds.), *English for professional and academic purposes* (89-104). Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
- Connor, U., Ruiz Garrido, M., Rozycki, W., Goering, B., Kinney, E., & Koehler, J. (2008). Intercultural study of patient-directed medicine labeling: Text differences between the United States and Spain. *Communication & Medicine*, 5, 117-132.
- Wolf, M.S., Davis, T.C., Shrank, W., Rapp, D.N., Bass, P.F., Connor, U., Clayman, M., & Parker, R.M. (2007). To err is human: Patient misinterpretations of prescription drug label instructions. *Patient Education & Counseling*, 67, 293-300.
- Rozycki, W., Connor, U., Pylitt, L., & Logio, L. (in press). Assessing cultural knowledge among international medical graduates. In B. Hoekje & S. Tipton (Eds.), *English language and the medical profession: Instructing and assessing the communication skills of international physicians*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Connor, U. (in press). Intercultural rhetoric and language of healthcare. In K. Aijmer & G. Andersen (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Society. Handbooks of Pragmatics, Vol. 5*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Connor, U., Antón, M., Balunda, S., Goering, E., Hayat, A., Lauten, K., & Roach, P. Linguistic features of adherence. Manuscript submitted.

B11

Forming Identities through Transcultural & Transnational Writing Research

Margaret Willard-Traub, University of Michigan-Dearborn, U.S.

Steven Salchak, The George Washington University, U.S.

Dacia Dressen-Hammouda, Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France

The relationship between writing competence and identity has been increasingly investigated in the research literature. Writing competence entails more than simply the words that are communicated through the act of writing, but also represents the writer's identity in terms of her or his relationship with (similar and different) others, how she or he is connected to others, what power relations regulate the relationship between the individual and the group, etc. Likewise, research methodologies and practices entail issues of relationship and identity, and are simultaneously governed not only by disciplinary but also socio-cultural factors such as those related to higher educational policy.

Paper #1: Using Transnational Partnerships to Promote a Global Research Agenda and Identity: An Analysis of Policy and Working Conditions at an U.S. and Bangladeshi University

Canagarajah (1996) and others (Gosden, 1992; Gibbs, 1995; Flowerdew, 1999; Wood, 2001; Scully and Jenkins, 2006) have pointed to the material and discursive barriers preventing scholars from the developing world from greater participation in global communities of research. This paper analyzes policies in place at both U.S. and Bangladeshi universities that impact the building of collaborative research partnerships in the context of the unique history of Bangladesh and the recent rise of English medium private universities there.

Roughly the size of Wisconsin, Bangladesh is a Muslim majority country of 155 million people and a per capita income of 621USD. Despite tremendous challenges, Bangladesh has made major investments in education and in recent years has seen an explosion of the private university sector in response to an immense need for increased capacity as more students meet the requirements for university admission. Since 2000, nearly 50 private universities have been founded, almost all in the capital city of Dhaka. In response to global market pressures, nearly all of these universities are English medium.

Operating in a context where there is very weak accreditation oversight and high levels of corruption, many of these new universities cultivate international partnerships as a way to establish legitimacy. More recently, the more ambitious and well established of these private universities have begun to push faculty to engage in research and to publish in English. This shift in policy seeks to transform teaching faculties into research faculties, offering support for local conferences and journals and encouraging individual faculty to conceptualize themselves as researchers as well as teachers despite limited resources, heavy teaching loads, and few doctorates.

This new policy focus has had limited results, creating vibrant local communities of scholars engaged in writing research, but ones that remain largely isolated and not well integrated into a global body of work. Ironically, through a very different history and set of institutional conditions, many American researchers of writing have also remained isolated and not well integrated into a global body of work.

Growing out of an established partnership between an U.S. and Bangladeshi university that seeks to address this parochialism and contribute through sustained engagement to the formation of global research agenda and identity, this study looks to identify policies that can better create conditions promoting authentic collaboration while acknowledging significant institutional asymmetries. In doing so this study develops two sources of data: first a review of policy documents covering such issues as promotion, teaching loads, software licensing, and library borrowing privileges, and second, fieldwork in Bangladesh involving interviews and direct observation.

Paper #2: Developing Transcultural Identity in U.S. Student Writers

This paper builds on research by such diverse scholars as Paul Matsuda (2001), Nedra Reynolds (2004) and Eileen Schell (2006), and reports on the second phase of a transcultural and transnational research project involving student writers at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and the Université Blaise Pascal - Clermont-Ferrand, France.

In the first phase of this project, the reflections of U.S. second-language writing students, who had completed Skype-mediated peer reviews of writing done by their French peers, suggested that the concept of rhetorical location – which Schell defines as “the notion that a rhetor speaks or writes from a particular location in time and space to a particular audience” – is especially helpful for U.S. second-language and multilingual writers. Pedagogical strategies mobilizing this concept help to increase L2 students’ confidence by increasing their awareness that forging an effective relationship with a particular audience – for any writer – often also involves articulating a relationship to the culture and language of the particular nation-state in which they find themselves, albeit a relationship that is never a given but rather complex and changing over time and through space.

The focus of this paper is the second phase of the same project, which builds on the work of scholars such as Matsuda as well as Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner (2009) and Lisa Eck (2008). In this phase, L1, L2 and Generation 1.5 students in an advanced expository writing class at the University of Michigan-Dearborn collaborated in a series of interview exchanges (mediated by Skype) with Masters level students in France. These exchanges raise important questions for U.S. higher education broadly, e.g., about curricular and pedagogical approaches aimed at addressing (for students and policy makers) the practical relevance of a broad-based liberal arts education. As significantly, however, these exchanges raise important questions for writing research aimed at helping students increase their awareness of their own rhetorical locations within both local and global contexts, as well as raising important questions for writing research aimed at helping students see themselves as engaged participants within a globalized, public sphere.

Paper #3: Raising Awareness of L1/L2 Writer Identity through Intercultural Exchange

One particular difficulty encountered by L2 writers is the need to construct a writerly identity and subsequent voice in another language that may be quite different from the one in which they were raised and educated, and of which they may not even be aware. Raising their awareness of their own cultural assumptions as writers and learners is therefore as important in shaping writer competence as is helping them to see the 'surface' linguistic and rhetorical differences between their L1 and their L2.

Drawing on a rich research tradition established by scholars who have long examined the interplay between writing competence and cultural identity, including but not limited to Helen Fox (1994), Paul Matsuda (2001), Roz Ivanic (1997), and Yamuna Kachru (1997), this study will present results from an ongoing international writing research project involving collaboration between undergraduate and graduate writers from two universities: Blaise Pascal University in Clermont-Ferrand (France) and the University of Michigan-Dearborn. A previous phase of the study (Willard-Traub, 2010, Dressen-Hammouda, 2010) examined the effects of the intercultural peer review on the developing writing strategies of second year students at the two universities, looking in particular at how the peer review exchange allowed each group to gain a better understanding of the need to construct their voices for an international audience. In the current phase, we are studying the effects of the intercultural interview between advanced undergraduate students (U. Mich) and graduate students in intercultural technical communication (UBP), as it pertains to their growing awareness of cultural voice, identity, and the constraints of writing for international audiences. Because voice and writer identity are both socially and culturally situated, the intercultural interview brings students to reflect on their multiple identities (social, cultural and personal) and how these identities come to be portrayed in their own and others' writing.

References:

- Canagarajah, A.S. 1996. 'Non-discursive' requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*, 13(4), 435-72.
- Dressen-Hammouda, D. 2010. Learning to construct academic voice in the NNE classroom through intercultural peer review. Paper presented at the 61st Conference on College Composition and Communication Convention, 17-20 March 2010, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Eck, L. 2008. Thinking globally, teaching locally: The "nervous conditions" of cross-cultural literacy. *College English*, 70(6), 578-98.
- Flowerdew, J. 1999. Problems of writing for scholarly publication in English: the case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 243-64.
- Fox, H. 1994. *Listening to the world: Cultural issues in academic writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Gibbs, W. 1995. Lost Science in the third world. *Scientific American*, August, 92-99.
- Gosden, H. 1992. "Research writing and NSSs: from the editors". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(2), 123-39.
- Ivanic, R. 1997. *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kachru, Y. 1997. Cultural meaning and contrastive rhetoric in English education. *World Englishes* 16, 337-350.

- Lu, M. and Horner, B. 2009. Composing in a global-local context: careers, mobility, skills. *College English*, 72 (2), 113-33.
- Matsuda, P. 2001. Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, 35-53.
- Reynolds, N. 2004. *Geographies of writing: Inhabiting places and encountering difference*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Schell, E. 2006. Gender, rhetorics, and globalization: Rethinking the Spaces and locations of feminist rhetorics and women's rhetorics in our field. In K. Ronald and J. Ritchie (Eds.) *Teaching rhetorica* (160-173). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.
- Scully, C. and Jenkins, S. 2006. "Publishing in English for non-native speakers". *Oral Oncology*, 42(7), 753.
- Willard-Traub, M. 2010. Intercultural peer review and developing self-reflection in US second-language writers. Paper presented at the 61st Conference on College Composition and Communication Convention, 17-20 March 2010, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Wood, A. 2001. International scientific English: the language of research scientists around the world. In J. Flowerdew and M. Peacock (Eds.) *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (71-73). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

B12

Identity in Undergraduate Writing

Metaphors of Writing and Intersections with Jamaican Male Identity

Vivette Milson-Whyte, The University of the West Indies, Jamaica

Carmeneta Jones, The University of the West Indies, Jamaica

The speakers propose to consider how metaphors that a group of Jamaican male university students use to describe writing suggest their desire to gain mastery in their academic and personal pursuits. The speakers will draw on data from a semester-long qualitative enquiry that was designed to provide a channel – in the form of conversations and written reflections – through which a selected group of male university students could share their perspectives on writing prior to, during, and after their completion of a first-year writing course. This study was designed as one means to address the resultant concerns about Jamaican male students' underperformance in writing in university courses and in national and regional examinations. The presenters acknowledge that although one cannot generalize from qualitative studies, the findings could provide useful insight for other writing course designers/instructors with similar concerns.

In the data analysis, each male student's metaphor of writing helped the researchers to get a deeper understanding of his realities and how he sees writing as a part of his realities. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work on metaphors proved useful. Lakoff and Johnson assert that metaphors can reflect attitudes about what they describe and include motives for behavior. Identification of such attitudes through metaphor analysis can involve analyzing the tenor (the subject) or the vehicle (the frame or lens), with the frequency or intensity of tenors and vehicles providing clues about the individual's worldview.

In the study, "writing" is the tenor and the vehicle is the image each male student uses to describe writing. The images the participants use suggest their desire to obtain mastery in English and writing. Images such as double-edged sword, obstacle, mirror, and swimming through rough waters reflect a complex layering of the male students' desire to control their private, intellectual, and public worlds. The participants think writing is extremely important in the control for which they strive in their different worlds, but as they seek empowerment they struggle.

For Jamaican males, struggle and control are particularly interesting. Chevannes (1999) reported that Jamaican males pass on knowledge to each other using their own language, values and meanings. Another researcher suggests that, in their talk-driven events, males also create their own rules. They are in total control (A. Grant, personal communication, April 10, 2005). Hence, they experience difficulties when they are required to adhere to the conventions of formal language that is required in classrooms. In this structured context, males struggle to come to terms with the fact that their power and control are subordinate to the teacher's.

The research findings confirm Evans's (1999; 2001) suggestion that Jamaican males may wrestle with written literacy development because of the conventional and traditional ways in which it is facilitated. However, the findings also indicate a need to critically analyze male students' desire to conquer and control writing in order to excel in it. Therefore, the speakers propose that an understanding of male students' metaphors of writing could inform educators' efforts to diversify writing courses.

References

- Chevannes, B. (1999). What you sow is what you reap: Violence and the construction of male identity in Jamaica. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Evans, H. (1999). *Gender and achievement in secondary education in Jamaica*. Working Paper No. 2, Policy Development Unit Planning Institute of Jamaica.
- Evans, H. (2001). *Inside Jamaican schools*. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

B12 (continued)

Identity in Undergraduate Writing

An Environment for “Back Stage” Writing Development

*Nancy Lea Eik-Nes, Norwegian University of Science and Technology,
Norway*

Students in higher education are expected to develop as academic writers in the course of their education. They are expected to be able to demonstrate their disciplinary knowledge in the papers they write, and eventually in their theses or dissertations. A dilemma in higher education is that in spite of an increasing number of writing courses and writing centers provided for students, the claim that “students cannot write” continues to echo in the halls of higher education.

This dilemma has forced us to consider what we actually mean by “learning to write”. Recent work (e.g. Donahue, Dressen-Hammouda, Ivanic, Lea, Lillis) has moved away from a focus on writing as a skill that the students need in order to succeed in a discipline; instead, writing is viewed as an integrated part of a students’ development of identity in a discipline – as a reflection of students’ development as members of a disciplinary community. It is a matter of what Dressen-Hammouda calls “disciplinary becoming”, where writing is both part of, and reflects, a student’s way of seeing, thinking, valuing, acting in a discipline.

Writing can be viewed as a process that takes place as students resolve the tension between their own resources, values, practices, and the resources, values and practices of their target disciplines. One of the problems in resolving the tension, however, is that much of the knowledge about the resources, values and practices is tacit knowledge. Perhaps our work as educators should be to provide an environment which facilitates students’ development of their identities in their disciplines, and in which tacit knowledge may become more explicit. Such an environment could be similar to what Goffman calls “back stage”, where the student has an opportunity to rehearse and experiment with various roles.

This paper presents a study of a practice that may help create such an environment. It is the practice of writing “e-logs” as part of a writing course. E-logs are e-mails that students submit weekly throughout a semester. In the study, doctoral students in engineering were asked to write a minimum of 8 e-logs as part of a scientific writing course. The teacher responded briefly to each log, but did not correct or assess any of the log texts. Analysis of the logs showed how students used the logs to reflect upon, for example, their progress, their roles, the values they may or may not share with other members of their target disciplines, questions they asked themselves with regard to the practices of their disciplines. Students used the logs as a “back stage” space (see Goffman) – a space where they could let off steam, rehearse their new roles and discuss how they viewed those roles without being evaluated or penalized for having more questions than answers. E-logs provided a space for identifying and working through both explicit and tacit knowledge – including writing – in the students’ disciplines.

B12 (continued)**Identity in Undergraduate Writing**

Writing against One's Opinion: Can Senior Communications Students Set Aside their Knowledge of the Field?

Denis Alamargot, University of Poitiers, France

Céline Beaudet, Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

In a situation of conflicting values, the professional writer is confronted with the necessity of writing a text that is based on facts, knowledge and opinions that do not correspond to his or her usual representation of reality. This is a very difficult situation. Consequently, it is not surprising to note that research has proven on numerous occasions that writing against one's own beliefs and opinions results in fewer ideas being brought forward in the text. The purpose of this study (Alamargot & Beaudet, 2009) is to thoroughly investigate the impact of opposing opinions by analyzing temporal and linguistic properties within the text. Seventeen Communications students from Quebec, enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs at the Université de Sherbrooke, have agreed to write two texts on the same subject; that is, the pending environmental threat, after having read two contradictory articles on the economy and the environment. Participants, whose training includes courses in professional writing, were asked to write two texts in succession, playing the part of a professional writer working for either the Friends of the Earth association (defending the ecological point of view), or for the BioPetrol Society (defending the industrial point of view). Both organizations were fictitious. Results show that although temporal markers are not affected by different opinions, the differences between the two texts (for and against) essentially lie within the content itself (number of ideas) and in its linguistic structure (markers, discourse connectors). Supporting one's own opinion indeed results in a more emphatic development of the content, whereas supporting an adverse opinion leads to the creation of a more factual, encyclopedic article, with a limited number of ideas which are nonetheless articulated by a greater number of discourse connectors.

B13

From Monolingualism to Translingualism in Writing Research

Bruce Horner, University of Louisville, U.S.

Samantha NeCamp, University of Louisville, U.S.

Christiane Donahue, Dartmouth College, U.S.

This panel argues that monolingual assumptions about language and language norms limit the scope and aims of both writing instruction and research. We demonstrate these limits and the institutional barriers to overcoming them, and call for basing our field's understanding of writing and writing research on a translingual norm in which language practices are taken as always "in translation" (Pennycook 2008).

Speaker 1: From Monolingualism to Translingualism in Writing Research

In "From Monolingualism to Translingualism in Writing Research," Speaker 1 argues that monolingualism can be usefully defined in terms of a set of powerful beliefs about language and language users: languages are reified, treated as uniform, static, and discrete sets of forms, and users are seen as operating within one or these as their "native" tongue. In this model, even multilingual individuals are seen as "two monolinguals in one person" (Grosjean). Against this set of beliefs, the speaker draws on the findings of scholarship on multilingual societies (Khubchandani), lingua francas (Canagarajah, House, Meierkord), and bilingual individuals (Cook, Heller) to pose a notion of translingualism distinct from conventional notions of multilingualism that merely pluralize monolingualism across groups and individuals (Makoni). Translingualism assumes as a norm individuals with specific but fluctuating fluencies and competencies with a variety of languages which themselves are subject to change in forms and meanings through users' deployment of them. While aligned with movements associated with conventional multilingualism for increasing individuals' range of linguistic fluencies, a translingual model of language use elides barriers associated with insistence on achieving "native-like" fluency in a "target" language by allowing for and encouraging users to collaborate to improvise both user- and situation-specific language competencies in their speech, writing, and reading. Such a model is salutary for research in two ways: it refocuses scholars' efforts away from working in their research within languages taken as discrete and toward working across and translating between languages (and within them); and it refocuses their attention toward writers' production of transnational and translingual connectivities and toward a model of all language use as acts of translation (Pennycook). Speakers 2 and 3 illustrate the possibilities of such a shift.

Speaker 2: Monolingualism in U.S. Composition Research

Speaker 2 documents and discusses the monolingualist bias of U.S. composition research. Through an analysis of the submission requirements of major composition journals, Speaker 2 shows that English is the required submission language of all journals in this field. Often, this requirement is not explicitly specified: a monolingual bias exists to the extent that it is not deemed necessary to state the submission language. Through an examination of all citations included over a five-year period in six of the leading composition journals (*Assessing Writing, College Composition and Communication,*

College English, Computers and Composition, JAC, and Written Communication) Speaker 2 also demonstrates that with one notable exception (*Written Communication*) published articles show no evidence of writers' consultation of non-English language scholarship. Furthermore, few of the articles published in the period of our study take as their subject either writers of or writing composed in languages other than English.

Speaker 2 explores one example of the potential benefits of consulting non-anglophone research through an analysis of one of our own published articles. She demonstrates that this article's critique of dominant approaches to language difference would have benefited from the distinction between *diversité* and *diversalité* made in Bernabé, Confiant, and Chamoiseau's *Éloge de la Créolité*.

Speaker 3: Strategies for Combating Monolingualism in Graduate Training for Writing Research and Instruction

Speaker 3 addresses the monolingualist bias that dominates preparation for postsecondary writing instruction and research in the U.S., in relation to instruction in many European countries. She argues that while most U.S. graduate programs offer standard "reading in French/Spanish/Chinese" courses used to fulfill language requirements, these courses are insufficient in preparing graduate students to work in multilingual ways because they teach languages as discrete entities rather than working with and through the complex processes of cross-language interaction. Speaker 3 argues that we must emphasize the importance to the field of the experience of working *across* languages.

Speaker 3 suggests several ways that composition might better prepare its students and new scholars for this kind of working across languages. One such strategy, Speaker 3 argues, would be re-tooling the standard foreign language reading course required of most graduate programs to address reading non-anglophone scholarship in rhetoric and language education and to aim at the production of translations of non-anglophone journal articles into English and at the production of abstracts into other languages of English-medium articles. The work of producing such translations would not only provide a "service" to the profession but would necessarily contribute to individuals' professional development as scholars by familiarizing them with non-English medium scholarship and the challenges and benefits of cross-language writing. Further, this move could include fostering young scholars' conference attendance in other countries in languages other than English. Another strategy is to exchange relevant scholarship with colleagues in foreign language departments, and to develop collaborative support for students who are writing in other languages.

B14

Writing Development in the Middle Years

Naming in Pupil Writings (9 to 14 years old)

Christina Romain, Université-IUFM Aix-Marseille, France

Marie-Noëlle Roubaud, Université-IUFM Aix-Marseille, France

This communication will present the results of a study on the analysis of the naming processes across 262 pupils, aged from 9 to 14, during narrative writing production. It was tested on six school grades (classes of pupils from 9 to 14 years old). Every time, it was realized in the same conditions with two different socio-cultural backgrounds. This corpus was collected in several establishments of various municipalities of Bouches-du-Rhône (department of the region Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur in France).

First of all, this analysis is linguistic as it describes the naming processes used by the pupils when writing their text. It studies the assignment of the lexicon and emphasizes the linguistic element concerned by naming, in other words the way naming is introduced into the narrative. It also questions the link between these naming operations and the age of the pupils.

By naming we understand the study of the processes used for naming (mark linguistically a narrative reality) in link on one hand with the anaphoric processes :

Example : a little boy he(it) the little boy ... Paul ...

and on the other hand with the processes of explicitation:

Example : two dogs : a husky and a bulldog.

Secondly, this analysis is contrastive because it takes into account the socio-cultural background of the pupils (population either from favored neighborhoods or from Zone of Priority Education classified as depressed ones). In this perspective, it tries to establish a comparison of the means summoned by these pupils from different circles, what we had already realized about the control of the textual grammar tools used by these same pupils.

Data processing, from a quantitative and qualitative point of view, allows to establish that if there are differences, they are not only connected to the socio-cultural backgrounds. There are also other factors that come into play - as the access to the literary culture - and besides, resemblances appear between both types of pupils. The analysis of this corpus allows going back on this a priori regarding pupil writings.

References

Bentolila A., 1996, *De l'illettrisme en général et de l'école en particulier*, Paris, Plon.

Bernstein B., 1975, *Langage et classes sociales*, Paris, éd. de Minuit.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 1984, La dénomination dans le français parlé : Une interprétation pour les « répétitions » et les « hésitations ». *Recherches sur le Français parlé*, 6, 109-130.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 1986, Une chose dans la syntaxe verbale, *Recherches sur le Français parlé*, 7, 141-168.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 1997, *Approches de la langue parlée en français*, Paris, Ophrys.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 1999, Langue parlée et écrite : décalages en morphologie et en syntaxe, in D. Moura (org.), *Os múltiplos usos da língua*, Maceió : UFAL, 16-25.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 2003a, La naissance des syntagmes dans les hésitations et répétitions du parler, in *Le sens et la mesure. De la pragmatique à la métrique, Hommages à Benoît de Cornulier*, Paris, Champion, 153-169.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 2003b, Nom et verbe dans l'opposition entre oral de conversation et écrit informatif, in *Nom et verbe : catégorisation et référence, Actes du Colloque International de Reims 2001, Recherches en Linguistique et Psychologie cognitive*, 18, P.U. de Reims, 35-61.

Blanche-Benveniste, C., 2007, Formes de compréhension approximative, in *Les enjeux de l'intercompréhension – The stakes of intercomprehension*, Eric Castagné (Coordinateur), Université de Reims : Epure (Coll. « ICE »), 167-179.

Bouchard R., 2000 : « Ecriture en L2, Registres, Préconstructions. Des questions pour la seule didactique des langues ? Et/ou pour la R.A.L. ? ». *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, 120, Paris, Didier Erudition, 475- 486.

Bronckart J.-P., 1996, *Activités langagières, textes et discours. Pour un interactionnisme socio-discursif*, Lausanne-Paris, Delachaux-Niestlé.

Charlot B., Bautier E., Rochex J-Y, 1992, *Ecole et savoir dans les banlieues...et ailleurs*, Paris, Armand Colin/Masson.

Clanché P., 1999, « Contribution to the study of the links existing between real daily experience and daily scholar experience as regards the teaching of mathematics : Example of an 'additional structure' within a first year group in Kanak school » avec B. Sarrazy in M. Hejny et J. Novotna eds. *Proceedings of International Symposium Elementary Maths Teaching*, Univerzita Karlova, Prague, 41-48.

Dolz, J., Noverraz, M. & Schneuwly, B., 2000, *S'exprimer en français. Séquences didactiques à l'oral et à l'écrit*. Bruxelles, De Boeck.

Fayol M., 1992, « L'écrit : Perspectives cognitives », in *Entretiens Nathan*, Vol. 2, Paris : Nathan.

Fayol M., 1996, « La production d'écrits narratifs : Approche de psycholinguistique textuelle chez l'enfant et l'adulte », in David J. et Plane S. (éds), *L'apprentissage de l'écriture de l'école au collège*, Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 9-36.

Fayol, M. (dir.), 2002, *Production du langage. Traité des sciences cognitives*, Paris, Hermès/Lavoisier.

Kernan, K.T., 1977, « Semantic and expressive elaborations in children's narratives ». S. Ervin-Tripp, J. Michell-Kernan (éds.). *Child discourse*, 91–102.

Labov W., 1976, *Sociolinguistique*, Paris, éd. de Minuit.

Lahire B., 1993, *Culture écrite et inégalités scolaires*, Lyon, P.U.L.

Lammertyn P., 2000, « La sollicitation de l'imaginaire dans l'écriture des récits : intérêts et problèmes », *Repères*, 21, *Diversité narrative*, Paris, I.N.R.P.

- Loufrani, C. et Roubaud, M-N., 1990, La notion d'approximation : langage ordinaire ou pathologique, *Recherches sur le Français parlé*, 10, 131-142.
- Roubaud, M-N. et Loufrani, C., 2001, La dénomination dans le discours perturbé, de type aphasique, *Recherches sur le Français parlé*, 16, 207-226.
- Sarrazy B, 2001, « Les interactions maître-élèves dans l'enseignement des mathématiques : Contribution à une approche anthropo-didactique des phénomènes d'enseignement », *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 136, 117-132.
- Sarrazy B, 2002, « Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre l'expérience quotidienne 'réelle' et l'expérience quotidienne scolaire dans l'enseignement des mathématiques: Cas de l'enseignement d'une structure additive dans un cours préparatoire kanak », avec P. Clanché, *Recherches en didactique des mathématiques*, vol. 22-1, 7-30.
- Sarrazy B, 2002, « Pratiques d'éducation familiale et sensibilité au contrat didactique dans l'enseignement des mathématiques chez des élèves de 9-10 ans » *Revue Internationale de l'Education Familiale*, vol. 6-1, 103-130.
- Schneuwly, B., 1988, *Le langage écrit chez l'enfant*, Neuchâtel, Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Schneuwly, B. & Dolz, J., 1997, Les genres scolaires. Des pratiques scolaires aux objets d'enseignement, *Repères*, 15, 27-40.

B14 (continued)

Writing Development in the Middle Years

Exploring Subskills of Writing Literacy: Lexicon, Cohesion and Partner Orientation

Matthias Knopp, University of Cologne, Germany

M. Becker-Mrotzek, University of Cologne, Germany

Joachim Grabowski, Leibniz Universität, Hannover, Germany

Writing literacy, in the sense of the ability to produce well-performing text(s), is a complex skill comprising many different cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and affective subcomponents. Hitherto, these were predominantly studied and instructed rather holistically, i.e. with respect to individual genres, where the typical composition tasks at school play a particular role. In the interdisciplinary project "Subcomponents of writing literacy: Diagnosis and didactical support" (founded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research) our aim is to identify, through psychological, linguistic and didactical cooperation, overarching subcomponents of writing literacy, i.e. abilities that become operative in all kinds of writing processes. In doing so, we concentrate on skills that (a) are compatible with linguistic insight, (b) correlate with the quality of text products, and (c) are suitable for purposeful didactical measures.

In our research we exemplarily study three subcomponents: (a) the ability to take a partner's perspective and to adapt to the addressee's needs, (b) the differentiated and thematically adequate use of vocabulary, and (c) the creation of coherence by the use of the respective linguistic means of cohesion.

Two classes of each fifth and ninth grade were being studied between April and November 2010 in German Hauptschule, Realschule, and Gymnasium as well, looking for correlational patterns between the general writing ability and the above-mentioned subcomponents within the most central genres in school, namely narratives/reports, instructions/descriptions, and argumentative texts. For this purpose new writing tasks specific for the subcomponents under investigation were developed.

For the longer term we are targeting the development of a model of writing literacy that includes competences in the use of linguistic forms and structures, and the strategic use of the related processes as well. Different from existing approaches, we neither want to describe this literacy solely based on the progression through text types of ascending complexity, nor based on mere text products. Rather we are trying to identify relevant aspects of competences across the various text types, which are (psycho-) linguistically reasonably describable.

We expect that the observed correlation patterns can be interpreted such that didactical recommendations will emerge. Based on the results of both quantitative and qualitative analysis we suppose that it is possible to make predictions about overall text compositions from well-conceived and well-described subcomponents. Furthermore we presume that the didactically delimited text types aren't as separate as they are often treated (e.g. the didactical tradition one thing at a time). It might be worthwhile to glance across text types and to look at small, precisely outlined skill sections. If it's true that the various subcomponents are independently distinct, the training of single subcomponents might entail transfer effects on various text types.

B14 (continued)

Writing Development in the Middle Years

Quick Writing for Middle School Students Who Struggle with Writing

Linda H. Mason, Pennsylvania State University, U.S.

Shawn Michael Datchuk, Pennsylvania State University, U.S.

Writing is an important foundational skill that facilitates learning and is critical for school success (Langer & Applebee, 1987). Writing, however, is a difficult process for many students. Lack of writing skills may negatively impact students' ability to maximize learning opportunities and may adversely affect academic outcomes. Researchers, fortunately, have established that evidence-based interventions do improve writing (Graham & Perin, 2007).

One intervention, Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD), has been validated as especially effective for improving writing skills for students who struggle with writing tasks (Baker, Chard, Ketterlin-Geller, Apichatabutra, & Doabler, 2009). Instruction is supported by a line of research for students with and without disabilities in a range of settings, grades, and ability levels (e.g., author, 2006; author, 2008). Recently SRSD research has targeted writing instruction for a timed "quick write" response.

Quick writes are short 10-minute responses frequently used in general education classrooms as opening/closing activities, often for assessment purposes (Author, 2009a). SRSD for persuasive quick write instruction was developed specifically to address students' needs in content classrooms. Four studies have investigated the effects of SRSD for quick writes with struggling middle school (7th and 8th-grade) adolescents. Instruction in two single subject studies included 16 students with learning disabilities and ADHD (Author, 2009b). Instruction in a third single subject study was provided to five students in an alternative school for emotional and behavioral support (Author, 2010a). A fourth quasi-experimental study was conducted in four urban low socio-economic charter schools for 32 students identified as struggling writers (Author, 2010b). In each study the following research questions were asked: (1) What are the effects of SRSD instruction in improving 10-minute time limited student written persuasive responses? (2) Do effects generalize to a standardized writing fluency assessment? (3) Do students find instruction acceptable?

Results of written responses after SRSD instruction indicated that all students who participated in the studies improved and maintained their quick write performance as measured by quality, number of words, and the number of essay parts written. These effects generalized to a writing fluency assessment (i.e., Woodcock-Johnson Fluency subtest). Variability across assessments among individuals was minimal. Descriptive data in each study indicated that students noted improvement in writing and were positive about instruction.

In this presentation, results of the four studies in the context of each setting are highlighted. The six steps for strategy acquisition included in the lessons – develop pre-skills, discuss the strategy, model the strategy, memorize the strategy, guided practice, and independent practice – are described. Procedures for imbedding self-regulation (self-instruction, goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-reinforcement) throughout instruction

are noted. Instruction is illustrated with the POW (Pick an idea, Organize my notes, and Write and say more) and TREE (Topic sentence, Reasons, Explanations, Ending) persuasive writing strategies. Tips for building fluency for quick writing will be explained. Development of maintenance skills and generalization are presented. Modifications to accommodate a variety of student needs relevant to disability, culture, socio-economic status, and language as noted in the presenters' research are set forth.

References

- Baker, S.K., Chard, D.J., Ketterlin-Geller, L.R., Apichatabutra, C., & Doabler, C. (2009). Teaching writing to at-risk students: The quality of evidence for self-regulated strategy development. *Exceptional Children*, 75, 303-318.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K.R. (2003). Students with learning disabilities and the process of writing: A meta-analysis of SRSD studies. In H.L. Swanson, K.R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 323-344). New York: Guilford Press.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007a). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high school*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellence in Education.
- Langer, J., & Applebee, A.N. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Author (2006). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, and motivation of struggling writers in second grade: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42, 295-340.
- Author (2008). Writing instruction for adolescents with learning disabilities: Programs of intervention research. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 23, 103-112.
- Author (2009a). Quick writing for students who struggle with writing. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 53, 313-322.
- Author (2009b). Developing quick writing skills of middle school students with disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*. J Spec Educ OnlineFirst, published on October 21, 2009 as doi:10.1177/0022466909350780.
- Author (2010a). Evaluating effective writing instruction for adolescent students in an emotional and behavioral support setting. *Behavioral Disorders*, 35, 140-156.
- Author (2010b). Quick writing instruction in four charter middle schools: A regression discontinuity study. Manuscript in preparation.